

## More Testimony Over BlueTriton H<sub>2</sub>O Diversions In SB National Forest

By Mark Gutglueck

The State Water Resources Control Board's hearing relating to the proposed issuance of a cease-and-desist order to BlueTriton Brands, Inc. curtailing that company's drafting of water from the San Bernardino National Forest's Strawberry Canyon resumed this week after a two-week hiatus.

In April 2021, One Rock Capital Partners, LLC in partnership with Metropoulos & Compa-

ny, having formed Triton Water Holdings, Inc., purchased all of the American and Canadian assets of Nestlé Waters North America, Inc. with the exception of its Perrier bottling rights.

Overnight, Nestlé Waters North America, Inc. was rechristened BlueTriton Brands, Inc. and One Rock/Metropoulos took possession of operations relating to Poland Spring® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water,

Deer Park® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Ozarka® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Ice Mountain® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Zephyrhills® Brand 100% Natural Spring Water, Arrowhead® Brand Mountain Spring Water, Pure Life® and Splash.

In making the buyout from Nestlé, it seems that One Rock/Metropoulos had not taken full stock of the controversy surrounding Arrowhead

Mountain Spring Water, a flagship brand celebrated as being "bottled from a higher source" in marketing campaigns. Within one month of the acquisition, BlueTriton found itself faced with the prospect that it would need to reduce by more than 95 percent the amount of water it was diverting from near the top of the San Bernardino Mountains to provide its customers with the Arrowhead product.

The Arrowhead Moun-

tain Spring Water bottling operation had been obtained by Nestlé Waters North America, Inc. as a consequence of Nestlé's 1992 acquisition of Perrier, which came amidst some confusion about the chain of title to Arrowhead, which was included within the portfolios of otherwise non-existent entities, shell companies or distributorships such as the Arrowhead Water Corporation and Great Spring Waters. See P 2

## Scrutiny On Baca Intensifies As Bloomington Truck Terminal Decision Looms

Next Tuesday a decision by the board of supervisors is due with regard to a proposal by David Weiner and Scott Beard to build a truck terminal on a 9-acre parcel at 10746 Cedar Avenue in Bloomington.

County officials have been temporizing for nearly seven months in coming to a conclusion with regard to the project. At issue at this point is how spiritedly Supervisor Joe Baca, Jr., in whose district the Bloomington community lies, will oppose the project.

Stated differently, Baca very likely has the ability, many of his constituents believe, to dissuade his board colleagues from approving the project, but it is unknown whether he is willing to expend the political capital to thwart Weiner's and Beard's designs on the property, given the level of generosity the duo have displayed toward local officeholders in general over the last three-plus decades and the current crop of county supervisors, specifically.

San Bernardino County, the largest county in the lower 48 states at 20,105 square miles, covers territory that is larger than New Jersey, Delaware, Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. It is divided into five supervisorial districts. A tradition going back virtually to the founding of the county in 1853, at which point it was headed by three supervisors and contained all of its present territory and most of what is today Riverside County, has been that each Bernardino County supervisor is entrusted with significant autonomy within his/her own district. That tradition holds true today, with the board having grown to include See P 3

## Indian Wells Valley Water Plan Pushing Searles Lake Mine Toward Extinction

A tri-county collection of government officials last month hailed the California Department of Water Resources' acceptance of a groundwater sustainability plan in the Indian Wells Valley, a development that entities within that region's private sector decried as one which will likely drive them out of business.

Indian Wells Val-

ley lies at the extreme northwestern end of the Mojave Desert and the confluence of the northwestern corner of San Bernardino County, the southeastern end of Kern County and the southwestern extension of Inyo County.

In the face of a three-year running drought, California state officials in 2014 undertook efforts to head off the absolute

depletion of the state's regional water sources. In September 2014, then-California Governor Jerry Brown signed into law the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, which requires local agencies to draft plans to bring groundwater aquifers into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. That was followed in 2015 by Brown mandating water-saving

measures throughout the state.

In response, pursuant to a joint exercise of powers agreement, the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority was formed with Kern County, San Bernardino County, Inyo County, the City of Ridgecrest and the Indian Wells Valley Water District as general members and the United States Navy and

the United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management as associate members, with each general member having one voting seat on the authority board and the federal associate members participating in all board discussions, but not having a vote.

The joint powers authority took as its mandate counter- See P 5

## Closure Mandate-Defying Victorville Gym Owner Enters Plea On January 6 Protest Charge

Jacob Lewis, the now 38-year-old Donald Trump supporter who defied Governor Gavin Newsom's mandate to shutter his Victorville business as a precaution against the spread of COVID-19 in 2020 and thereafter sojourned across the country to storm the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, has accepted a plea deal with federal prosecutors over insurrection charges lodged against him last year.

Lewis, despite wearing a red beanie and a black neck and face gaiter as well as a grey hoodie while he was both inside and outside the Capitol building, was among the first of those identified by the FBI as having taken part in what prosecutors say was an effort to overthrow the government.

On January 8, 2021, an informant told a federal agent Lewis "flew from Victorville, CA to Wash-



Jacob Lewis

ington, D.C. to attack the Capitol along with many Trump supporters to stop the certification of the electoral college," according to the complaint against Lewis filed on January 26, 2021.

On January 11, 2021 someone who claimed to be Lewis's friend said Lewis told him in December 2020 to "watch what happens to the Capitol on the 6<sup>th</sup>," according to the federal complaint. An FBI technician thereafter accessed Lewis's Instagram page, which displayed a video taken by Lewis posted on January

6, 2021 showing a crowd on the Capitol steps, according to the complaint. A corresponding Capitol Police video taken at the same approximate time showed Lewis transiting the Capitol's corridors and passing through doors into the Senate's wing.

Contacted by the FBI, "Lewis admitted that following the rally, he walked toward the Capitol, and that he then entered the capitol building with a number of people after it had been breached by others," according to the U.S. Justice Department. "He stated that he was never told that he could not enter, and that he was 'escorted' by the police in the building. He stated that he did not partake in any violence while he was in the building and that he believed that some individuals involved in agitating were Antifa members in disguise."

The Capitol Police video did not show Lewis had a police escort.

Lewis was preliminarily charged on January 26, 2021 and arrested on January 27, 2021. He was charged via criminal information on February 9, 2021 with entering a restricted federal building; disorderly and disruptive conduct in a restricted building; violent entry into a capitol building; and parading, demonstrating, or picketing in a capitol building. He was not charged with making false statements to the FBI. He pleaded not guilty to all four counts against him on March 4, 2021.

Records show that in a plea arrangement worked out by his lawyers David Bigney and Dan Eckhart, Lewis pleaded guilty on January 6, 2022 to parading, demonstrating, or picketing in a capitol building. The other charges were dropped.

## Environmentalists & Residents Kept Pushing The U.S. Forest Service To Look Into Nestlé's Commandeering Of San Bernardino Mountain Springs For Its Arrowhead Brand Bottled Water *from front page*

Perrier had acquired Arrowhead from the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company, a division of Beatrice Foods, in 1987.

There had been several companies bottling water under brands incorporating the Arrowhead name, some going back to the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Names used over the years included Arrowhead, Puritas, Arrowhead and Puritas, Arrowhead Puritas, Arrowhead Spring Water and Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water among them, all under the aegis of the Arrowhead Hot Springs Company, Arrowhead Springs Corporation, Arrowhead Water Corp, Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company, Coca-Cola Bottling of Los Angeles, Rheem, and California Consolidated Water Company.

Arrowhead's pre-1930 bottling operations had drawn water from a spring near the privately-owned historic Arrowhead Hotel as well as from Arrowhead Springs on the east side of Arrowhead Mountain and in Coldwater Canyon at a level below the San Bernardino National Forest, which was established higher up in the San Bernardino Mountains in 1893.

At the time of a corporate transition in 1930, one of the Nestlé/Blue Triton predecessors had begun water drafting operations at the approximate 5,200-foot to 5,600-foot elevation in the San Bernardino Mountains, within the national forest. Water rights cannot be awarded on U.S. Forest Service land. Nor is it possible for an entity to assert prescriptive rights to water on U.S. Forest Service land. Prescriptive water rights, sometimes referred to as appropriative water rights, are created when a water user infringes upon the established water rights of another entity by means of trespass or unauthorized taking of that water. Upon making what would otherwise be illegal or illicit use of a given quantity of water openly and without the use of force for a period of five or

more consecutive years, under California law, the interloper who took the water can then claim an annual right to the minimum amount of water taken during each of all of the five years. While the appropriative rights are granted to anyone making such a showing of use of another private citizen's or local or state agency's water, federal law supersedes state law, and federal law does not permit the federal government's water rights to be taken away or stepped upon by prescription.

So, despite the consideration that BlueTriton's corporate predecessors had been drafting substantial amounts of water from what is referred to as Strawberry Canyon at the 5,200-foot-to-5,600-foot elevation level in the National Forest, neither Blue Triton, nor Nestlé nor Perrier nor any previous company bottling water under the Arrowhead brand had established water rights in Strawberry Canyon.

In 1978 the U.S. Forest Service issued a permit for a pipeline conveyance system involving water drafting in Strawberry Canyon to the Arrowhead Puritas water bottling operation, then under the ownership of Beatrice Foods, for a standard fee of \$524. The permit granted no water rights. Under the ownership of Beatrice Foods, Arrowhead Puritas had morphed into the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company. When the Arrowhead Puritas water drafting permit in Strawberry Canyon expired, the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company applied to extend the permit. In 1987, while that application was still pending, Perrier purchased the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company.

The water pipeline conveyance extraction special use permit renewal process entailed a U.S. Forest Service review of the water drafting arrangement and its environmental/ecological impact, which in the late 1980s and 1990s the U.S. Forest Service did not have the immediately available

resources to carry out. In a gesture of compromise, Perrier was allowed, pending the eventual U.S. Forest Service review, to continue to operate in Strawberry Canyon by simply continuing to pay the \$524-per year fee to perpetuate the water extraction under the terms of the expired permit. In 1992, when Nestlé acquired the Arrowhead brand bottling operations from Perrier, it inherited the Strawberry Canyon operation and continued to pay the \$524 annual fee without renewing the permit, which at that time existed under the name of the "Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Co."

The diversion of that water left a parched and dewatered forest canyon below Strawberry Canyon, which burnt in the "Old Fire" in 2003.

Nestlé's intensive water-drafting activity was long decried by environmentalists. That water removal came under increasing criticism as a statewide drought, which lasted for more than five years after it first manifested in 2011, advanced. In 2015 environmental groups were gearing up to file a lawsuit claiming the U.S. Forest Service had violated protocols and harmed the ecology of the mountain by allowing Nestlé Waters North America to continue its operations in Strawberry Canyon for 28 years after its permit expired. At that point, the Forest Service moved to make an environmental review. In the meantime, Nestlé continued its water extraction, pumping an average of 62.56 million gallons of water annually from the San Bernardino Mountains. Environmentalists lodged protests with the water rights division of the California Water Resources Control Board, alleging Nestlé was diverting water without rights, making unreasonable use of the water it was taking, failing to monitor the amount drawn or make an accurate accounting of the water it was taking, and wreaking environmental damage by its action.

Following a two-year investigation, state officials in late 2017 arrived at a tentative determination that Nestlé could continue to divert up to 26 acre-

feet of water (8.47 million gallons) per year. Nestlé had gone far beyond the water drafting limit the company was entitled to, the State Water Resources Control Board said, and was actually drafting 192 acre-feet (62.56 million gallons), such that 166 acre-feet (54.09 million gallons) the company was taking annually was unauthorized, according to a report released on December 21, 2017.

The Water Rights Division of the State Water Resources Control Board called upon Nestlé to immediately end its diversions beyond the 26-acre-foot threshold or otherwise marshal evidence supporting its level of diversion.

Nestlé, despite being unable to produce any historical record of water rights approaching the volume of its diversion, continued to maintain it had established rights to roughly 190 acre-feet of water per year in Strawberry Canyon. The company refused to comply with the State Water Resources Control Board's mandate, continuing to take 144 acre-feet in 2017, 141 acre-feet in 2018, 210 acre-feet in 2019, and 180-acre feet in 2020. By 2020, Nestlé was in negotiations with One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company for the sale of Nestlé Waters North America. In late March 2021, in what was represented as a \$4.3 billion transaction, that deal was closed.

A month later, on April 23, 2021, the State Water Resources Control Board's Division of Water Rights, through its permitting and enforcement branch, issued a cease-and-desist order relating to the Strawberry Canyon water diversion activity. Initially, that cease-and-desist order went to Nestlé Waters North America, as the State Water Resources Control Board had not been informed of the buyout of Nestlé Waters North America, including the Arrowhead Spring Water bottling operation, by One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company.

By that point, the State Water Resources Control Board had revised the maximum amount of water to be diverted from

### The San Bernardino County

# Sentinel

Published in San Bernardino County.

The Sentinel's main office is located at 10788 Civic Center Drive in Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with

Countywide News Service

Mark Gutglueck, Publisher

**Call (951) 567-1936**

**to learn of locations where the Sentinel is available or to provide news tips**

10808 Foothill Blvd., Suite 160-446

Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

SBCSentinel@yahoo.com

Legal Notice Department 909 957 9998

Message Line 909-276 5796

Strawberry Canyon to 7.26 acre feet per year.

In the April 23, 2021 notice, signed by Julé Rizzardo, the assistant deputy director for the permitting and enforcement branch of the State Water Board's Division of Water Rights, a revised report of investigation and a draft cease-and-desist order was served upon Nestlé Waters North America, Inc., informing it to end its unauthorized and unlawful activities, which was defined in the cease-and-desist order as taking any more than 7.26 acre-feet (2.342 million gallons) of water annually out of Strawberry Canyon.

The draft order alleged that Nestlé's diversion and use of water from Strawberry Creek in San Bernardino County violated or threatened to violate the prohibition in Water Code section 1052 against the unauthorized diversion or use of water subject to Division 2 of the Water Code. The draft cease-and-desist order notice, issued under Water Code section 1834, advised Nestlé that if Nestlé wanted to request a hearing on the draft order it had to submit a written request for a hearing to the administrative hearing office within 20 days from Nestlé's receipt of the notice.

On May 11, 2021, eighteen days after the issuance of the notice, Robert E. Donlan of Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan, L.L.P., the law firm representing BlueTriton Brands, Inc., filed a request for a hearing on the matters and allegations in the draft cease-and-desist order notice, noting that BlueTriton is the "successor by name change" to Nestlé.

Donlan asserted that BlueTriton is "the owner of the water rights and obligations subject to the notice."

Even before One Rock/Metropoulos closed the deal with Nestlé for the Nestlé Waters North America buyout, inquiries were made, including ones by the *Sentinel*, with regard to whether One Rock/Metropoulos fully understood that Nestlé's claim to rights to water in Strawberry Canyon was in dispute. One Rock Capital Partners, LLC and Metropoulos & Company nonetheless proceeded with the Nestlé Waters North America buyout.

After it became widely known that Donlan and his firm were seeking the hearing on behalf of BlueTriton, a multitude of entities and individuals, many of whom had been instrumental in prompting the State Water Resources Control Board to make its inquiry into the activity in Strawberry Canyon, made requests to weigh in on the matter and add additional hearing issues. Those parties eventually grew to include the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District; the *Center for Biological Diversity*; the *Sierra Club*; the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; the *Story of Stuff Project*; Steve Loe, a retired U.S. Forest Service biologist; Hugh Bialecki, a Lake Arrowhead-based dentist who is the president of the *Save Our Forest Association*; Amanda Frye, a Redlands resident who has done extensive historical research relating to water rights holdings and claims by various entities and corporations in San Bernardino County;

*Continued on Page 4*

## In Making Choices Between The Welfare Of Bloomington's Residents & Deep-Pocketed Campaign Donors, Supervisors Side With The Money *from front page*

five supervisors, each of whom oversees one of five districts. Each of those districts is considered a fiefdom over which its supervisor exercises discretion based upon an understanding that the same courtesy is to be extended to all of the other supervisors.

This authority applies to land use decisions with regard to development proposals. And while the county has a land use services division in which the county's official planning function is entrusted and ostensibly carried out, the fate of project proposals developed in the county's unincorporated county areas are determined, with only the rarest of exceptions, in accordance with the wishes of the supervisor in whose district the development is proposed.

Bloomington is a 6.01-square mile unincorporated community with 25,482 residents, bounded by Rialto on its east and northeast sides, Fontana on its west and northwest sides and the Riverside County line on its south side. Historically, Bloomington was an agricultural community. Over the last 60 years, it has transitioned into a heavily-used transportation corridor, primarily because four major east-west arterials – Valley Boulevard, Slover Avenue, Jurupa Avenue and Santa Ana Avenue, all of which lead to or toward Ontario International Airport – traverse it, along with the I-10 Freeway and the Santa Fe/Burlington Northern/Union Pacific rail line. The community is saturated with over one hundred illegal truck-related operations which county officials seemingly lack the will to rein in. Simultaneously, the county has been permitting trucking-related operations and warehouses to be built within the community, while the cities of Fontana and Rialto and the Riverside County city of Jurupa Valley have given approval to trucking related concerns and warehouses at the periphery of Bloomington.

A respectfully-sized contingent of Bloomington's residents has resisted,

or attempted to resist, the efforts by land speculators and developers to foist industrial and logistic-related construction projects on the community. Their protestations have been only marginally successful.

Cedar Avenue and Locust Avenue are the major north-south thoroughfares in the community. Cedar Avenue under the Bloomington Community Plan is zoned to serve as the major commercial route other than Valley Boulevard in the town, where it was anticipated a mall or substantial shopping centers would locate, together with restaurants, a theater or other entertainment venues. On April 6, 2021, however, the board of supervisors gave go-ahead to Chandi Group USA's proposal to build a seven-diesel fuel pump/eight gasoline pump truck stop to be located at 10951 Cedar Avenue, at the southeast corner of Cedar and Santa Ana Avenue, three-quarters of a mile south of the I-10 Freeway. That 8.9-acre site is immediately adjacent to 28 acres of property owned by the Colton Joint Unified School District, upon which the district had future intentions of building a school. Chandi's Cedar and Santa Ana Avenue project was to consist of 260 parking spaces including 149 for cars, 36 to accommodate trucks, and 75 for recreational vehicles or smaller or mid-size trucks, a 9,900-square-foot convenience market, two fast-food drive-thru restaurants, truck scales, the aforementioned fuel pumps and above-ground fuel tanks. In the project's final form, the restaurant, the project's original selling point, was dispensed with altogether.

Given the proposed transformation of the property now under the control of Wiener and Beard at 10746 Cedar Avenue, a half mile south of the freeway and a quarter mile north of the Chandi project, into a truck terminal, Bloomington residents saw the prospects for Cedar Avenue becoming the once-promised commercial draw to the

community dashed. Rather, it appeared that both sides of Cedar were destined to become part of an industrial wasteland, with a haphazard patchwork of fast-food restaurants and convenience stores being substituted for the more impressive venues county officials had once assured the community's residents would eventually come in.

Bloomington was given a potential reprieve from that fate, however, when the Colton Joint Unified School District on May 5 filed a lawsuit in San Bernardino County Superior Court challenging the approval of the Chandi project. The school district's legal action called into question the thoroughness of the county's evaluation and consideration of the project proposal, and the suit sought a court order that the county rescind the approval given to the project so that a full environmental impact report was prepared before it was reconsidered. Concessions were made, most notably the removal of the above-ground fuel storage tanks, and that suit has been settled.

Of note was that Baca had voted with all four of his board colleagues in favor of the Chandi project. Indeed, Chandi Enterprises owner Nachhattar Singh Chandi has proven himself to be a prolific donor to the campaign war chests of both national and state politicians, including half of a million dollars provided to a political action committee supporting former President Donald Trump. He is also one of the major donors to local officeholders in Riverside County, where he has developed large numbers of Black Gold fueling station projects and fast-food outlets. The Riverside County city Indio is the home of the Chandi Enterprises corporate headquarters. This year alone, Baca received \$4,900 from Nachhattar Chandi; \$4,900 from his wife, Suzana Chandi; and \$4,900 from his brother, Sandeep Chandi. \$4,900 is the maximum amount of money that a single donor can provide to a politician in San Bernardino County.

Baca walked into a buzz saw of controversy on April 6, 2021 when at the conclusion of the meeting at which the Chandi

project was approved, he blasted past some dozen of his constituents, most of them Bloomington residents who were there to oppose the Chandi project, so he could rush out to the parking lot and speak with Nachhattar Chandi.

Baca did not anticipate the adverse publicity that would come his way when he voted to approve the Chandi project. Nor did he anticipate the even deeper resentment he would be subjected to when it was learned that he had accepted \$16,700 from Nachhattar Chandi and his family members/business associates.

Baca was elected to the position of Fifth District supervisor representing what was then eastern Fontana, Rialto, Colton, western San Bernardino, Muscoy, Rosena Ranch and Bloomington in 2020. The Fifth District has now been altered as a consequence of last year's redistricting based on the 2020 Census to include Rialto, Colton, Western San Bernardino, Rosena Ranch, Muscoy and Bloomington. Though he will not need to stand for election again until 2024, Baca and his political advisors have mild concern that his having abandoned his constituents in Bloomington in favor of the money to be provided to his electioneering fund by Chandi could haunt him in less than three years if a capable political adversary materializes who chooses to exploit the perception that is now afoot that he is willing to betray those he represents in exchange for cash.

Both Weiner and Beard have demonstrated themselves as being willing and able to show generosity to politicians if they are convinced it will do them some good.

The *Sentinel* was able to track and fully document \$131,050 provided by Wiener and Beard and their related enterprises and associates to supervisors Curt Hagman, Janice Rutherford, Dawn Rowe, Paul Cook and Joe Baca, Jr. going back for slightly over a decade. That figure is likely less than the actual amount, as there are gaps in the reporting of the amounts of money deposited into the supervisors' various accounts, most notably Hagman's.

Hagman has received

\$16,350 from Wiener, either directly or from Wiener's son, Michael Wiener, the Wiener Family Revocable Trust or what is referred to as the Survivor's Trust Under The Wiener Family Revocable Trust. Hagman has also received \$1,000 from Scott Beard Enterprises, LLC and another \$1,000 from Gerald Beard Realty, which Scott Beard controls.

Up until the end of 2020, at which point she had been a member of the board of supervisors for a full decade, Rutherford had received \$54,400 from Wiener, his son Michael Wiener, the Wiener Family Revocable Trust and the Survivor's Trust Under The Wiener Family Revocable Trust. It is unknown how much money Rutherford received from Wiener and the individuals and entities associated with him while she was a member of the city council in Fontana prior to her election to the board of supervisors in 2010. For nearly four decades, Wiener has been a major contributor to elected officials in Fontana. Rutherford has also received \$2,500 from Scott Beard.

Prior to this year, Supervisor Dawn Rowe's political fund had been endowed with \$9,400 from David Wiener and \$9,400 from Michael Wiener, for a total of \$18,800. She had also received a \$1,000 political contribution from Scott Beard.

David Wiener had, through 2020, provided Supervisor Cook's electioneering fund with \$2,500.

During the 2020 election cycle, Baca's political war chest was the recipient of \$4,700 from Bonnie Beard, Scott Beard's wife, and another \$4,700 from Scott Beard Enterprises, LLC, a total of \$9,400.

Of note is that Baca, whose Fifth Supervisorial District includes Bloomington, did not receive any money from Wiener or his associated entities. Baca was elected to the supervisor's post in the November 2020 election. That race had been a match between Baca, then a Rialto city councilman, and Jesse Armendarez, then a Fontana city councilman. Wiener has been active as a developer in Fontana since 1980, when with Herb Lundin, he developed the Vineyard

Valley Shopping Center at the southeast corner of Sierra Avenue and Valley Boulevard. He has proven over the last four decades to be, with Reggie King, the Ten Ninety Corporation and Phil Cothran, Sr., the major patron of Fontana's politicians. When the 2020 race for Fifth District county supervisor evolved into a head-to-head battle between Baca and Armendarez, Wiener by default sided with Armendarez, as he personally provided Armendarez with \$7,200 during the 2020 election season and his son, Michael, gave Armendarez \$4,700.

In the aftermath of the race, as Armendarez had been struggling to retire a substantial debt he accumulated in that failed run, Wiener, in April 2021, swooped in to give Armendarez another \$4,700. Beard, the previous month, in March 2021, gave Armendarez \$1,000 to erase a portion of the failed candidate's 2020 electoral campaign arrearage.

On September 17, 2021, Beard provided Dawn Rowe with \$2,500.

On October 4, 2021, Beard provided Baca with \$1,500.

On October 4, 2021 David Weiner gave Dawn Rowe \$4,900 and his son, Michael Wiener, gave Rowe another \$4,900.

On November 17, 2021, the Survivor's Trust Under The Wiener Family Revocable Trust provided Supervisor Janice Rutherford with \$4,900.

Baca is the lone Democrat on the board of supervisors. A question stands as to whether Baca wants to live up to the mythos embraced by the Democrats, which holds that theirs is the party representing society's downtrodden. While it is not San Bernardino's absolutely most impoverished community, Bloomington has a collective population that falls within the lowest ten percent of the county's residents economically. The median household income in Bloomington in recent years stood at \$34,106 annually and the median family income is \$35,936. Men living there had a yearly median income of \$30,680 versus \$20,606 for females. The per capita income for

*Continued on Page 11*

## Redlands-Based Historical Sleuth Traced Out That Arrowhead In 1930 Illicitly Substituted Water Rights At The Top Of The San Bernardino Mountains For Water Previously Drawn In The Foothills *from page 2*

Victor Vasquez, who has worked within the Division of Water Rights of the State Water Resources Control Board; Anthony Serrano, a resident of Highland and water user in the Bunker Hill Basin, where water originating in Strawberry Canyon eventually flows; and Tomas Eggers, a water resources control engineer employed by the State of California.

Despite the earlier insistence of One Rock/Metropoulos/BlueTriton corporate officials that they were knowledgeable about the disputes over the water rights in Strawberry Canyon, when Donlan and his law firm were faced with the prospect that many of those who had been raising that issue, in some cases as early as 2014, were intent on participating in the hearing, Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan filed a motion with the administrative law judge who was to be the hearing officer, Alan Lilly, seeking to prevent Vasquez, Loe, Frye, Eggers and Bialecki as well as Rachel Doughty, an attorney representing the *Story of Stuff Project*, from testifying or participating in the hearing, claiming they did not qualify as expert witnesses and any information they would bring to the discussion was irrelevant.

Lilly denied that motion.

When the hearing began in early January, the primary witness for BlueTriton was Larry Lawrence, the natural resources manager with BlueTriton Brands. Lawrence held a similar position with Nestlé Waters North America.

A mechanical engineer by training, Lawrence offered an overview of the water collection and diversion facilities in use by BlueTriton Brands at the confluence of the east and west forks of Strawberry Creek.

Lawrence said that prior to 2021, the excess water collected by Nestlé from Strawberry Creek had been deposited in Wa-

terman Canyon, two watersheds over from Strawberry Canyon, where the cisterns that Nestlé had for the collection of the water ultimately used in the Arrowhead Spring Water bottling operation are located. Since 2021, Lawrence said, Nestlé and now BlueTriton had in large measure been complying with the Forest Service's instructions to discharge the excess water in lower Strawberry Canyon, although roughly 20 percent of the diverted Strawberry Creek water is sent to the mountain base grounds of the historic Arrowhead Hotel now owned by the San Manuel Mission Indian Tribe.

Lawrence was cross examined by multiple parties.

The hearing resumed this week and was conducted in an electronic format, with those participating doing so remotely, using Zoom videoconferencing.

Amanda Frye testified on January 31.

Frye, a resident of Redlands, is a nutritional scientist and author. She previously worked in a survey office and is well-versed in map reading, surveying and legal property descriptions. Among the publications that have published her work is the *Sentinel*.

In her non-sworn opening statement, Frye said she had conducted unpaid independent research investigating the matters in this case regarding the water rights, the history, the springs and what she characterized as the unauthorized water diversions in Strawberry Canyon by BlueTriton Brands, Inc. and its corporate predecessors. She said she had hiked through Strawberry Canyon on numerous occasions, "observing the dewatered Strawberry Creek and BlueTriton's pipeline and spring diversion sites."

Frye said that "any claims within the forest boundaries had to be made in

1893," at the time of the founding of the San

Bernardino National Forest. "Neither BlueTriton nor their predecessors have owned land nor water rights in the San Bernardino National Forest Strawberry Creek headwaters," Frye asserted. "In 1930, BlueTriton's predecessor, California Consolidated Water Company, encroached into the forest's Strawberry Creek headwaters and started diverting spring water from Strawberry Canyon with neither a valid water right nor state appropriation/diversion permit. This encroachment occurred before the Del Rosa judgment."

The Del Rosa lawsuit was a lawsuit over appropriative water rights brought in the early 1930s by the plaintiff Del Rosa Mutual Water Company, represented by attorney Ralph Swing, against D.J. Carpenter, Isabel Turner, George Mason, J.B. Jeffers, L.R. McKesson, the National Thrift Corporation of America, the National Thrift Corporation, California Consolidated Water Company and California Consumers Company, the Arrowhead Springs Company and Arrowhead Springs Corporation. The lawsuit was settled by a stipulation of those rights on October 19, 1931.

The Del Rosa lawsuit, Frye said, "did not state that the Strawberry Creek headwaters, located within Township 2 North, Range 3 West were in the San Bernardino National Forest. Neither the United States Forest Service nor the State Water Board were parties to the case."

Frye said, "BlueTriton's predecessors continued diverting Strawberry Creek spring water, expanding the water take from one spring in 1930 to building three spring adits/tunnels and using 10 borehole horizontal wells to tap spring aquifers in Strawberry Canyon carrying billions of gallons of the forest water down the mountain to be trucked to a bottling facility and sold back to the public as 'Arrowhead® Mountain Spring Water.'"

An adit is a horizontal passage bored into earth, stone, a boulder or a hillside for drainage purposes.

Frye said, "Location is

essential to understanding this case. The Public Land Survey System is used to identify location in the historic records, withdrawal sites and property boundaries. BlueTriton takes and diverts the public's forest water from the mountain top Township 2 North, [starting at 5,600 feet above sea level] then pipes the water to the mountain base about 2000 feet above sea level at Township 1 North [where the water is then dispatched by truck to a bottling facility]. The true Arrowhead Springs are located on private land below the landmark Arrowhead at the mountain base. The first Arrowhead bottled water came from Coldwater Creek near the landmark Arrowhead at the mountain base which was a different watershed and not downstream from BlueTriton's water withdrawal from unnamed springs in the Strawberry Creek headwaters. The Strawberry Creek headwaters spring numbers are from BlueTriton's predecessor, and are not the true Arrowhead Springs."

Frye said that "Historic records show that prior to diversion, Strawberry Creek was a perennial stream that flowed even during dry months, with headwater springs feeding a vibrant flowing creek lined with scrub oak, chamise, alder, dogwood, cedar, sycamore, willow, ferns, bay laurel and thimbleberry. Prior to diversion, Strawberry Creek was used for recreational trout fishing. Today, Strawberry Creek has diminished flow and a dry creek bed with impoverished fauna and flora that no longer can support trout since fish need water to survive."

In bringing her opening statement to a close Frye implied that Nestlé had hoodwinked One Rock/Metropoulos by selling it non-existent rights to Strawberry Canyon water, noting that "The evidence reflects that BlueTriton has neither valid water rights nor authorized diversion permits in the Strawberry Creek headwaters, including no evidence to pre-1914 rights. The business name 'Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company' was a name used in the 1990s on printed letterhead, permits, invoices,

and newspaper articles for the Strawberry Canyon spring water diversion; yet, this name does not appear in BlueTriton's chain of title; thus, the chain of title was broken."

Frye said a principle in law is that "a seller cannot legally sell, transfer or deed what he does not own; therefore, the purchaser of such fraudulent transactions can claim no ownership title. Records reflect that BlueTriton predecessors did not have a valid water right in Strawberry Creek headwaters and gave away any possible pre-1914 water rights in the 1930s. Thus, it appears that BlueTriton purchased only a water bottling operation. It is the purchaser who has the burden of due diligence to understand what he is buying."

In California, a water right obtained prior to 1914 is given special status as a "pre-1914 appropriative water right." A water user with a pre-1914 right, on non-federal land, needs no water right permit unless the use of the water increases beyond the amount of water used prior to 1914, in which case the user must obtain a permit for the new amount unless it can be established that there was a plan in place before 1914 to use the additional water after 1914.

In her sworn testimony, Frye said her research had shown that the "Arrowhead Drinking Water Company was surrendered in 1987 and was no longer an active California business entity in 2015." She said the water tapping systems in Strawberry Canyon "were registered nonetheless to the Arrowhead Drinking Water Company. The business name Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company is handwritten on the 1978 expired permit and was in the 1990s US Forest Service record, documents, letterhead, in correspondence, invoices and even found in newspaper articles showing the exportation of water to Japan."

BlueTriton during the hearing was represented in the main by Robert Donlan and another attorney with the water law practice group of Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan, Shawnda Grady.

Over the course of Frye's testimony, as well as before it began, Grady lodged multiple objections to both the rationale for Frye's testimony, the basis for her testimony, the foundation for her testimony, Frye's lack of qualifications and expertise as well as the substance of her statements and the statements themselves.

At one point, Lilly responded to Grady's objection with regard to Frye's alleged lack of expertise and qualifications, which included an assertion that Frye was proffering inexperienced opinions.

"Based on her extensive research, she is entitled to give these opinions," Lilly said. "As far as what weight I or the State Water Board will give them, that is another question. Since she's apparently not qualified as a lawyer with requisite knowledge for legal opinions, [it] might not have a large amount of weight, but I'm going to allow her to testify because I believe she has some knowledge sufficient to testify."

Frye related that she had made an extensive survey of the area on her own by hiking there, which had given her the opportunity to compare and contrast the condition of Strawberry Canyon in recent years with an account of its water resources described by W. P. "Penn" Rowe, a civil engineer who had made extensive field notes of the springs in Strawberry Canyon in 1930, preparatory to those springs being tapped and diverted.

"The headwaters appear basically as a dry creek," she said, with "no continual creek flow and no visible natural springs." In comparison, Rowe's field's notes, Frye said, referenced a stream that was "flowing."

At that point, Grady raised an objection to Frye's characterization of Rowe's observations as "relying on hearsay" evidence.

Lilly overruled the objection.

What she had observed in recent years in Strawberry Canyon, Frye said, was vastly different from what was described in Rowe's 1930 field notes and reports.

Frye dated the initiation of the effort by the Consol-

*Continued on Page 6*

## West Mojave Water Conservation Requirements Could Put Trona-Based Chemical Mining Firm Out Of Business *from front page*

acting the overdraft of the aquifer underlying Indian Wells Valley.

Based upon a survey of water usage patterns undertaken by an engineering consultant, Carlsbad-based Stetson Engineers, the authority and the Indian Wells Valley Water District sought to derive a strategy for both reducing water use in the valley and increasing groundwater recharge to reach a balance of both that will end the overdraft. Several different plans, or models, were contemplated. Basically, the concept was to decrease the drafting of water from the regional aquifer through conservation, increased recycling of water and perhaps the minimization of evaporation, augmented by the importation of water from outside the valley to achieve, no later than 2040, a balance of water coming in with the amount of water usage, such that the depletion of the aquifer will end.

Stetson Engineers was designated the water resources manager for Indian Wells Valley, and the authority's board in January 2020 passed a tentative proposed groundwater sustainability plan and voted to submit it to the state. Thereafter it made adjustments to the plan, which contained water use limitation elements and water replenishment measures. The plan incorporated a farmland fallowing option as well as an increase in the monthly assessment or fee that was imposed on the extraction of water by major pumpers. That fee had been previously collected to cover the costs associated with the administrative activity of the groundwater authority.

After a survey of water use by well owners both collectively and individually was made, the authority assigned water use allowances to the region's well owners. Excess use fees, referred to as augmentation fees, were formulated for application to those well owners who pump above their allowances as well as on any farmer whose use exceeds his respective share of the water supply set aside for

agricultural usage. Money generated in this way is used to purchase imported water and pay for the eventual provision of infrastructure needed to bring in the imported water.

Even before the California Department of Water Resources had fully examined the proposed groundwater sustainability plan for the Indian Wells Valley, a number of farms and operations in the region raised protests over the limitations being imposed on them. Among those were Searles Valley Minerals, Mojave Pistachios and Sierra Shadows Ranch, along with John Thomas Conaway and the Nugent Family Trust. Ultimately, those four entities sued the groundwater authority and the Indian Wells Valley Water District as the lead agency in that joint authority, claiming the conservation efforts being undertaken imposed not only an unacceptable financial burden on them but were abrogating their long-established water use rights altogether. The legal actions have created paradoxes, as some private sector entities which are allies in their lawsuits against the district and the authority have also filed separate actions against one another.

Meanwhile, the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority and the Indian Wells Valley Water District pushed ahead with the effort to refine the groundwater sustainability plan and garner state authorization to apply it.

Growing out of the litigation brought by Searles Valley Minerals, Mojave Pistachios and Sierra Shadows Ranch, along with John Thomas Conaway and the Nugent Family Trust was a cross complaint from the Indian Wells Valley Water District in the form of *Indian Wells Valley Water District v. All Persons Who Claim a Right to Extract Groundwater in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin*. Essentially, that suit calls for a survey of water usage among all water users and purveyors in the region, data from which will ultimately form the basis of water use allotments being apportioned

to those users. Those users will be afforded the opportunity to object to or provide input regarding those allotments, which will ultimately be determined by an Orange County Superior Court judge.

The disputes over water in the Indian Wells Valley Region have been assigned to the Orange County Superior Court to avoid bias that might manifest if the hearings were held in a court in Kern, Inyo or San Bernardino counties.

Last month, the California Department of Water Resources released its findings and written assessments for dozens of water sustainability plans submitted for review from various groundwater authorities and collectives from around the state, the one for the Indian Wells Valley among them.

What is today known as Searles Valley Minerals has been in existence since 1873, when John Wemple Searles, a gold and silver miner who had arrived in the area in the 1860s, founded the San Bernardino Boarx Mining Company to extract borax, a white crystalline powder from the dry Searles Lakebed near present day Trona. Initially long mule teams were used to haul borax in wagons to San Pedro, which was thereafter shipped by train when the Southern Pacific Railroad reached the western Mojave in 1876. The company passed into the possession of Francis Smith, who shuttered the operation in 1896. Subsequently, in 1913, British investors revived the mining operation at Searles Lake, and in 1914, the American Trona Corporation established the company-owned town of Trona, at which point the Trona Railway was constructed, connecting the town with what was then the Southern Pacific line at Searles. The America Trona Corporation proved highly profitable during World War I, when Trona was the only reliable American source of potash, an important element used in the production of gunpowder. By the 1930s, the town's population peaked at around 7,000, making it what was at the time the ninth largest community in the county. Workers at the company plant were paid in company scrip, which

was every bit as negotiable in Trona's commercial establishments of the time as greenbacks. Talk of incorporating Trona as a city was kiboshed, since it was not in the American Trona Corporation's interest to surrender control over the townsite. The American Trona Corporation gave way to the American Potash & Chemical Corporation in 1926, at which time its major products were borax, soda ash and sodium sulfate. Productions of these chemicals continued to expand throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> Century and the company experienced a resurgence during World War II.

In 1962 the company received nationwide recognition and an award for its innovative solvent extraction process to recover boric acid and potassium sulfate from weak brines.

In 1967, Kerr-McGee Corporation (now a subsidiary of Anadarko Petroleum Corporation) acquired American Potash and Chemical Corporation and it operated the Searles Valley facilities until 1990. That year the operations were purchased from capital investors D. George Harris and Associates, resulting in the formation of the North American Chemical Company. Ownership changed yet again in 1998 when IMC Global Incorporation acquired the North American Chemical Company.

In 2004 Sun Capital Partners purchased IMC Global Incorporation and renamed it Searles Valley Minerals, Inc. In November 2007, Nirma, based in Ahmedabad, India purchased the company from Sun Capital Partners.

The current population of Trona stands at around 1,950.

Searles Valley Minerals uses solution mining, which involves soaking portions of Searles Lake in San Bernardino County with water to precipitate brine which is then extracted and processed to produce boric acid, sodium carbonate, sodium sulfate, several specialty forms of borax, and salt.

Searles Valley Minerals is represented by Eric Garner, Jeffrey Dunn and Maya Mouawad with the law firm of Best Best & Krieger. The groundwater replenishment fee, Garner, Dunn and Mouawad

maintain, is unprecedented and exorbitant, and will increase the company's water costs by 7,000 percent or \$6 million per year – pushing Searles Valley Minerals out of business after more than 140 years of operation, thereby threatening the livelihood of the company's 700 employees. The groundwater replenishment fee ignores and violates Searles Valley Minerals' 94-year-old adjudicated water rights, the most senior in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin, according to the lawsuit brought on behalf of the company by Garner, Dunn and Mouawad.

As the successor to the America Trona Corporation, Searles Valley Minerals continues to supply domestic water to the town of Trona.

According to Searles Valley Minerals, "The groundwater sustainability plan submitted for the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin clearly violates a key tenet of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, which prohibits a groundwater management agency from determining water rights." According to Searles Valley Minerals, approval of the plan was given "despite the California Department of Water Resources acknowledging that implementation of the ground water sustainability plan means agricultural water use would be eliminated, and groundwater use would predominantly be for municipal and domestic uses and the U.S. Navy."

Searles Valley Minerals maintains it is "impossible" for the California Department of Water Resources to assess the feasibility of the authority's eventual water importation project due to "uncertainty regarding financing and other project elements. This outrageous fee could ultimately lead to the closure of Searles Valley Minerals, triggering significant job loss in an area that is already described by the federal government as economically disadvantaged."

According to Burnell Blanchard, the vice president of operations for Searles Valley Minerals, "It is illogical that the Department of Water Resources would approve a deficient groundwater sustainabili-

ty plan that will not end the over-drafting of the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin. The plan underestimates the basin yield and ignores historic water rights, including those of Searles Valley Minerals, which are the oldest in the basin. The Department of Water Resources itself acknowledged the plan's serious deficiencies, and expressed doubts regarding the water import projects identified in the groundwater sustainability plan, and that even a full implementation won't be enough to bring the basin into balance within the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act statutory period. Searles Valley Minerals cannot afford the water replenishment fee that accompanies this plan and is at risk of closing its doors and eliminating hundreds of local jobs. Hundreds of residential households in the town of Trona and surrounding communities will also lose access to affordable drinking if Searles Valley Minerals is deprived of its water rights."

According to Searles Valley Minerals, it, rather than the Indian Wells Valley Water District is the driving force toward a comprehensive adjudication of groundwater rights in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin, as it intends to protect its "historic, prior and paramount groundwater rights, which are necessary for its continued business operations and the continued provision of domestic water to the Trona communities."

One issue complicating the matter is that both the Bureau of Land Management and the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, as federal entities, are exempt from the groundwater sustainability plan and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, and therefore not subject to the restrictions that will be imposed in the groundwater sustainability plan. The China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station encompasses two ranges and totals over 1,100,000 acres or 1,719 square miles, much of that within Indian Wells Valley. While the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station has made strides in recent years in reducing

*Continued on Page 11*

## Civil Engineer Made Exacting Documentation Of Water Flows In The Late 1920s And Into The 1930s from page 4

dated Water Company, a BlueTriton, corporate predecessor, to remove water from Strawberry Canyon as August 1930.

She then referenced Rowe's field notes corresponding to the springs in Strawberry Canyon which today have been supplanted by the facilities BlueTriton is using to divert the Strawberry Creek water.

She said Rowe's July 3, 1930 field notes "describe the natural spring site and how much water was in Strawberry Creek's headwaters, the ecosystem prior to diversion. On July 3, 1930, Rowe described the highway spring. This spring was described as being developed by digging into rock. The highway spring flow was described by Rowe on July 3, 1930: 'Water runs down the top of bedrock and comes out under boulders.' He recorded the flow at that point as five gallons in 74 seconds, making note that in May [1930] it was five gallons in 60 seconds."

She compared what Rowe had encountered nearly 92 years ago with what is presently the case in Strawberry Canyon.

"Now, this headwater springs is barely wet, and now the diversion pipe dribbles water to a creek a few feet away from the natural spring site. The flow was small, enough to fill some water to Strawberry Creek for a few yards," she said, adding, "In October 2016, I sent a Freedom of Information Act request to the U.S. Forest Service for documents relating to this highway springs. The original appropriation permit was obtained in 1928 to divert water for use along the highway and a drinking fountain along the Red Rock Wall Overlook. The diversion permit was for 6.25 gallons per minute or 9,000 gallons per day. U.S. Forest Service reports indicate that a minimum 6.25 gallons per day from this highway springs, 6108,

was going to be required, otherwise water extractions could be shut off or reduced. Based on the site, it is questionable this minimum flow monitoring and water shut-off is occurring. The U.S. Forest Service Highway Springs no longer expresses under the described boulders. Now there is just a dry creek bed. Below that dry creek bed and boulders is a spring box that myself and others have seen referenced as Spring 1. This sits below the highway spring and the boulders. I have also seen this referred to as Spring Box 8 or 1-8 Complex. I have never seen any natural flowing water at this sight, only a dry creek bed."

Frye said that "Prior to diversion, Rowe notes on July 3, 1930, Spring 1 output was five gallons in 27.2 seconds. Rowe's notes describe Spring 1 as in a hollow below the highway springs. Spring 1 was not diverted until 1948, and prior to diversion in April 1948, Spring 1 output was recorded at 10.5 gallons a minute."

At present, Frye said, based on her own observation, just down from Spring Box 1, there is "no natural spring expression."

With regard to the discharge pipe near that location, Frye said, "Sometimes when I've been up there, there's water expressing from the discharge pipe, usually not."

In making her presentation relating to her observations of the condition of Strawberry Canyon in recent years, Frye presented photographic evidence taken during hikes in the area.

Frye continued, saying, "July 3, 1930, Rowe describes Spring 2 site flow as five gallons in 5.1 seconds. Rowe describes Spring 2 as coming out of bedrock through small crevices west of [Spring] Number 1 and 500 feet lower in elevation. Now there's just a vault, no natural stream of spring flow, and it's just a birdbath filled with a discharge pipe dribbling water."

Frye went on.

"On July 3, 1930, Rowe recorded Spring 3 output at five gallons in 15.4 seconds," Frye testified. "He described the spring as water from a lot of bedrock and the headwaters

of Strawberry Creek."

She contrasted the 1930 circumstance to the condition today.

"All that is at the vault," Frye said, is a "pipeline, dry creek bed."

Frye said she had first gone to Spring 4 on December 4, 2021. The situation at Spring 4, which is not diverted or developed, is a natural spring flow and extends a few yards downstream and then stops.

According to Frye, "Rowe on July 3, 1930, describes Spring 4 as 'big springs. Five gallons in 4.5 seconds. Water from one big crevice.' Rowe noted that Spring 2 and 3 formed streams that flowed into Spring 4."

In contrast, Frye said, "Now there are no streams flowing from Spring 2 or 3 into Spring 4."

Frye further testified, "The first spring I ever visited was Spring Site 7. When I hiked to Spring 7, all that was visible was a vault, pipes and a dry spring bed. In October 2017, I hiked up Strawberry Creek from City Creek Road to the Strawberry Creek east-west confluence below BlueTriton Springs 10, 11, 12. The contrast between the east and west branch was striking. BlueTriton takes water above the west Strawberry Creek branch. The west branch above the confluence was more like a stagnant wet marsh that was easy to walk through versus the untapped east branch, which was rapidly flowing with several inches of water deep, even in October. The differences between the impoverished west branch and the vibrant east branch of Strawberry Creek was visibly noticeable. Nestle's take above the west branch appears to have negative impact on the creek."

Grady objected, suggesting Frye had not signaled in advance that she was going to make reference to Spring 7 in making her application to participate in the hearing.

Rachel Doughty, the attorney for the *Story of Stuff Project*, found a reference to Spring 7 in the preview of the evidence Frye had provided to the State Water Resources Control Board in preparation for her appearance. Lilly overruled Grady's objection.

"This testimony is relevant to the base flows that Mr. Rowe observed in 1930," Lilly said.

In distinguishing between the locations where BlueTriton's pre-1930 corporate predecessors had their water drafting facilities and the springs in Strawberry Canyon that are now being diverted, Frye in her testimony strove to demonstrate that the Arrowhead water bottling operation associated with the Arrowhead Springs Hotel in the first decade of the 1900s, the 1910s and the 1920s drew its water in the foothills of the San Bernardino Mountains just above the City of San Bernardino and outside the confines of the San Bernardino National Forest. Strawberry Creek in Strawberry Canyon is located higher up in the San Bernardino Mountains, within the national forest. Two key and separate locations, Frye said, were San Bernardino Township 1 and San Bernardino Township 2.

She said the original source for the bottled Arrowhead water was in Township 1 North, where the springs and hot springs associated with the hotel are located.

"That was located at Township 1 North," she said. "The hot springs was well known to Indian tribes and early settlers."

Her geographical references, she said were "based upon the Public Land Survey System," which specifies townships, which consist of six-mile by six-mile squares containing 36 one-mile by one-mile sections. Within those townships are east and west ranges.

In the relevant area, the two townships Frye referenced – Township 1 North and Township 2 North – are oriented relative to the San Bernardino Meridian, which runs along the south end of Township 1 North.

"Township 1 North," Frye said, covers the "mountain base, the Arrowhead Landmark, the hot springs, Coldwater Canyon, the Arrowhead Springs Hotel and Indian Springs."

Frye said that Township 2 North covers land that is "beneath the Rim of the World" along with Highway 18 and BlueTriton's water withdrawal

sites "within the San Bernardino National Forest."

She stated, "The early withdrawal sites were at Township 1 North Range 4 West based on records I found at the San Bernardino County historical archives."

Strawberry Canyon, in contrast, lies within Township 2 North Range 3 West.

Further proof that the original water supply for water bottled using Arrowhead in its brand name came from low in the San Bernardino Mountains south of the national forest consists of San Bernardino Superior Court case records, Frye testified.

"There were two court cases," she said. "In 1912-1913, Arrowhead Hot Springs versus Arrowhead Cold Springs Company, Case 12532 San Bernardino County Superior Court. It gives the Arrowhead Hot Springs property legal description in the complaint, Township 1 North Range 4 West-Range 3 West. This is at the base of the mountain in Township 1. This describes the original source for Arrowhead water bottling was from Coldwater Creek from springs coming off the rock of Arrowhead Mountain in Coldwater Canyon. There's repeated testimony describing what that looked like. So, we know that the original site for withdrawal was at the base of the mountain and from Coldwater Creek."

Further indication that water bottled under the Arrowhead brand did not come from Strawberry Canyon until after 1930 is provided by, she said, "the Del Rosa judgment. Consolidated Water Company tried to obtain water rights at the current site location. The case never mentioned that the land was in Township 2 North Range 3 West [nor] was located in the San Bernardino National Forest. Neither the U.S. Forest Service nor the State of California were involved in the cases. Adverse possession does not apply to federal land."

Yet more evidence that BlueTriton has no claim to the water in Strawberry Canyon consists of a line contained in San Bernardino National Forest historic records kept in an archive in Riverside County, Frye said.

A document she located dated April 28, 1966 is a memorandum concerning all of the applications to appropriate water within the boundaries of the San Bernardino National Forest up until that time. On page 10 of that memorandum is reference to the highway spring that Rowe had described in his July 3, 1930 field notes. The fifth line on page 10 in the April 28, 1966 memorandum places the highway spring within Township 2 North Range 3 West and gives the California Division of Highways jurisdiction over the spring, which was used to provide motorists with a drinking fountain, with that jurisdiction being granted to or claimed by the California Division of Highways on October 31, 1928. The jurisdiction over the highway spring was later transferred to the U.S. Forest Service, Frye noted.

"There are no other applications in the San Bernardino National Forest for any of BlueTriton's predecessors," she said.

Within the San Bernardino County Hall of Records are multiple references to the appurtenances for the Arrowhead bottled water operations in the first three decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Included in these, Frye said, were a "1929 pipeline survey and easements," as well as a licensed land surveyor's map. "The first thing to notice is the maps are in Township 1 North," she said. "These maps show that the pipeline in 1929 was only at the mountain base."

Frye said, "The early history of the Arrowhead bottled water is tightly intertwined with the Hot Springs Hotel, especially since the Coldwater Creek fed by springs off of Arrowhead Mountain was the source of the first water for bottling. The history of the Arrowhead Springs Hotel, the recorded deeds, give the location of this hotel and the Arrowhead Springs property at the base of the mountain Township 1 North."

Any legitimate claim to water that BlueTriton may have in the area pertains to a source in an area outside Strawberry Canyon, Frye said, "since BlueTriton's interest is derived from the property and the

*Continued on Page 10*

Public Notices

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210008935 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: CERTIFIED SELECTIONS, 951 FEATHER HOLLOW COURT, CHINO HILLS, CA 91709, ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); Z&S ENTERPRISES INC, 951 FEATHER HOLLOW COURT, CHINO HILLS, CA 91709 Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ SIDDIQUE RAHMAN, OWNER/PRESIDENT This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/27/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: N/A County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO2021000897 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: SG METAL WORKS LLC, 522 W. 1ST STREET, SUIT F, RIALTO, CA 92376, ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO);[Mailing Address: 8034 ALDER AVE, FONTANA, CA 92336]; SG METAL WORKS LLC, 8034 ALDER AVE, FONTANA, CA 92336 Business is Conducted By: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ANGELICA ARELLANO, MANAGER This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 08/26/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 02/26/21 County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210009057 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: XSA INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES, 1535 N THIRD AVE, UPLAND, CA 91786, ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO);[Mailing Address: 154 W. FOOTHILL BLVD, STE A355, UPLAND, CA 91786]; KURT DONHAM, 1535 N THIRD AVE, UPLAND, CA 91786 Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ KURT DUNHAM, OWNER/CEO This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/01/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 08/30/21 County Clerk, s/ D5511 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/17/21, 09/24/21, 10/01/21,

Public Notices

10/08/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210009661 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ETE SOLAR, 1155 S. MILLIKEN AVE, SUITE E, ONTARIO, CA 91761, ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); EARTHTECH ENTERPRISE INC, 3400 COTTAGE WAY, STE G2 3450, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825 Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ VANESSA PAN, PRESIDENT This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/23/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: N/A County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 10/15/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

AMENDED FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO20210009528 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ANOKI, 12824 CORIANDER CT, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739, ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO); NATIVELY INC, 12824 CORIANDER CT, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739 Business is Conducted By: A CORPORATION Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ DANA GREEN, CEO This statement was filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 09/20/21 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 08/30/21 County Clerk, s/ 11327 NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 09/24/21, 10/01/21, 10/08/21, 10/15/21, 01/21/22, 01/28/22, 02/04/22, 02/11/22

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2200137 TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: Natalie Lai-Ying Hui filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:  
Natalie Lai-Ying Hui to Natalie Lai-Ying Chuk  
THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.  
Notice of Hearing:  
Date: 02/22/2022  
Time: 09:00 AM  
Department: S17  
Room:  
The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District-Civil Division  
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.  
Dated: 01/07/2022  
John M. Pacheco  
Judge of the Superior Court.  
Published in the San Bernardino

Public Notices

no County Sentinel on 01/13/2022, 01/20/2022, 01/27/2022, 02/03/2022

NOTICE OF SALE OF AUTOMOBILE  
Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sections 3071 of the Civil Code of the State of California the undersigned will sell the following vehicle(s) at lien sale at said address below on: 01/28/2022 09:00 AM  
Year of Car / Make of Car / Vehicle ID No. / License No. (State) 04 HUMMER/ 5GRGN23U94H116023 7GYF397 CA  
To be sold by AIR EXPRESSWAY TOWING 17435 CATALPA ST HESPERIA CA 92345  
Said sale is for the purpose of satisfying lien for together with costs of advertising and expenses of sale.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210012736  
The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: CAMP SPOT NOW, 8780 19TH ST #134, ALTA LOMA, CA 91701  
SAN BERNARDINO Mailing Address:  
Business is Conducted By: AN LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/Melillo This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/29/2021  
I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.  
Began Transacting Business: N/A  
County Clerk,  
NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).  
01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/27/2022, 02/04/2022

FBN FBN20220000359  
The following person is doing business as: EPITOME PROPERTY MANAGEMENT [and] EPITOME LENDING [and] EPITOME REAL ESTATE 1632 WILSON AVE UPLAND,CA 91784: GEO COE LLC 1632 WILSON AVE UPLAND,CA 91784  
The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A  
By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
s/ GEOFFERY T HUANG  
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 01/21/2022  
I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By: Deputy D5511  
Notice- This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et. Seq. Business and Professions Code).  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 1/21, 1/28, 2/04 & 2/11, 2022.

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220000225  
The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: THE ALLEY, 152 N 2ND AVE, UPLAND, CA 91786.  
SAN BERNARDINO Mailing Address: 152 N 2ND AVE, UPLAND, CA 91786, RONALD B ZAPATA, 152 N 2ND AVE, UPLAND, CA, 91786  
Business is Conducted By: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP  
Signed: BY SIGNING BE-

Public Notices

LOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/RONALD B ZAPATA  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 1/14/2022  
I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.  
Began Transacting Business: 1/1/2022  
County Clerk,  
NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).  
1/21/2022, 1/28/2022, 2/4/2022, 2/11/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20210012646  
The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: MR. KEBAB RESTAURANT, 11201 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE A, REDLANDS, CALIF. 92373, SAN BERNARDINO Mailing Address: HANAA DAOUD, 13805 RODERICK DRIVE, MORENO VALLEY, CALIF. 92555  
Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL  
Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/HANNA DAOUD  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 12/27/2021  
I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.  
Began Transacting Business: 6/10/2010  
County Clerk,  
NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).  
1/21/2022, 1/28/2022, 2/4/2022, 2/11/2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: THOMAS EMERSON HAWES CASE NO. PROSB2200040  
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of THOMAS EMERSON HAWES has been filed by VICKIE JO GARCIA in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ANTHONY SUMNER be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held FEBRUARY 17, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.  
Filed: December 21, 2021  
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk  
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or

file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: December 8, 2021 Attorney for Vickie Jo Garcia: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 28, and February 4 & 11, 2022.

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: EVAMARIE D. SUMNER CASE NO. PROSB2100635  
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of EVAMARIE D. SUMNER has been filed by ANTHONY SUMNER in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that ANTHONY SUMNER be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held FEBRUARY 23, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.  
Filed: December 21, 2021  
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk  
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or

file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: December 8, 2021 Attorney for Anthony Sumner: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 28, and February 4 & 11, 2022.

Public Notices

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO-FBN20220000403  
The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: ABC JANITORIAL SOLUTIONS 11579 MT. RAINIER CT., RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737  
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Mailing Address: 11579 MT. RAINIER CT., RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA.91737 , ANTHONY J GARCIA 11579 MT. RAINIER CT. RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA. 91737  
Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.  
s/ANTHONY J GARCIA  
This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 01/25/2022  
I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office.  
Began Transacting Business: N/A  
County Clerk,  
NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see section 14400 et. Seq. Business & Professions Code).  
01/28/2022, 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: JOYCE ELAINE WALLINGFORD NO. PROSB2200092  
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of JOYCE ELAINE WALLINGFORD: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JASON EDWARD WALLINGFORD in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that RUTH LANG be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held FEBRUARY 23, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.  
Filed: December 21, 2021  
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk  
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or

Public Notices

representatives to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on MARCH 2, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Filed: December 8, 2021 Attorney for Anthony Sumner: R. SAM PRICE SBN 208603 PRICE LAW FIRM, APC 300 E STATE STREET SUITE 620 REDLANDS, CA 92373 (909) 475 8800 sam@pricelawfirm.com  
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on January 28, and February 4 & 11, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: FANNIE MAE LANG-SANDERS NO. PROSB2200132  
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of FANNIE MAE LANG-SANDERS: A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by RUTH LANG in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that RUTH LANG be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held FEBRUARY 23, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Dept. No. S36 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino District.  
Filed: December 21, 2021  
Brittney Spears, Deputy Court Clerk  
IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or

Public Notices

to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority. A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. No. S-35 at 9:00 a.m. on MARCH 23, 2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, San Bernardino District. IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 58 of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery of the notice to you under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are interested in the estate, you may request special notice of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for the Petitioner: MICHAEL C. MADDUX, ESQ. 1894 COMMERCIAL CENTER WEST, SUITE 108 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92408 Telephone No: (909) 890-2350 Fax No: (909) 890-0106 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 4, 11 & 18, 2022.

AMENDED NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF FRED TROY WILLIS, CASE NO. PROSB 2100817

To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, and contingent creditors of FRED TROY WILLIS, and persons who may be otherwise interested in the will or estate, or both: A petition has been filed by LEHANNA LESHAN GRIMALDI in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO, requesting that LEHANNA LESHAN GRIMALDI be appointed administrator to administer the estate of the decedent.

The petition requests that the decedent's will and codicils, if any, be admitted to probate. The will and any codicils are available for examination in the file kept by the court.

The petition requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority.

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S36 at 9:00 a.m. on 03/02/2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St. San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, San Bernardino District - Central

Public Notices

why the court should not grant the authority. The petition is set for hearing in Dept. No. S37 at SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT - PROBATE DIVISION 247 W. 3rd STREET SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0212 on FEBRUARY 28, 2022 at 09:00 AM IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or by your attorney.

IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the deceased, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 58 of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery of the notice to you under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are interested in the estate, you may request special notice of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250 of the California Probate Code. Filed: February 3, 2022 Jennifer Saldana, Deputy Attorney for the Petitioner: MARY M. BADER 9227 HAVEN AVENUE, SUITE 368 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 Telephone: (909) 945-2775 Fax: (909) 945-2778 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on February 4, 11 & 18, 2022.

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF: Karen Sue Marting-Febus Case NO. PROSB2200090 To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of Karen Sue Marting-Febus

A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by David Lee Marting in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that David Lee Marting be appointed as personal representative to administer the estate of the decedent. THE PETITION requests authority to administer the estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act. (This authority will allow the personal representative to take many actions without obtaining court approval. Before taking certain very important actions, however, the personal representative will be required to give notice to interested persons unless they have waived notice or consented to the proposed action.) The independent administration authority will be granted unless an interested person files an objection to the petition and shows good cause why the court should not grant the authority.

A hearing on the petition will be held in Dept. S36 at 9:00 a.m. on 03/02/2022 at Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino, 247 West 3rd St. San Bernardino, CA 92415-0212, San Bernardino District - Central

IF YOU OBJECT to the granting of the petition, you should appear at the hearing and state your objections or file written objections with the court before the hearing. Your appearance may be in person or

Public Notices

by your attorney. IF YOU ARE A CREDITOR or a contingent creditor of the decedent, you must file your claim with the court and mail a copy to the personal representative appointed by the court within the later of either (1) four months from the date of first issuance of letters to a general personal representative, as defined in section 58(b) of the California Probate Code, or (2) 60 days from the date of mailing or personal delivery to you of a notice under Section 9052 of the California Probate Code. Other California statutes and legal authority may affect your rights as a creditor. You may want to consult with an attorney knowledgeable in California law. YOU MAY EXAMINE the file kept by the court. If you are a person interested in the estate, you may file with the court a Request for Special Notice (form DE-154) of the filing of an inventory and appraisal of estate assets or of any petition or account as provided in Probate Code section 1250. A Request for Special Notice form is available from the court clerk. Attorney for Petitioner: Mark W. Regus II (279653) Law Office of Mark W. Regus II 1365 W. Foothill Blvd., Suite 2 Upland, CA 91786 Telephone No: 909-938-2289 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on: 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) William C. Kennedy, Esq., SBN: 076992 Law Office of Kennedy and Associates 3576 Arlington Avenue, Suite 304 Riverside, CA 92506 Telephone: (951) 784-8920 Facsimile: (951) 784-8930 Email: info@lawyerswho-fight.com Case No: CVMV2000661 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL KINCAID DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jaslaya Ebony Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) William C. Kennedy, Esq., SBN: 076992 Law Office of Kennedy and Associates 3576 Arlington Avenue, Suite 304 Riverside, CA 92506 Telephone: (951) 784-8920 Facsimile: (951) 784-8930 Email: info@lawyerswho-fight.com Case No: CVMV2000661 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL KINCAID DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jaslaya Ebony Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) William C. Kennedy, Esq., SBN: 076992 Law Office of Kennedy and Associates 3576 Arlington Avenue, Suite 304 Riverside, CA 92506 Telephone: (951) 784-8920 Facsimile: (951) 784-8930 Email: info@lawyerswho-fight.com Case No: CVMV2000661 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL KINCAID DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jaslaya Ebony Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) William C. Kennedy, Esq., SBN: 076992 Law Office of Kennedy and Associates 3576 Arlington Avenue, Suite 304 Riverside, CA 92506 Telephone: (951) 784-8920 Facsimile: (951) 784-8930 Email: info@lawyerswho-fight.com Case No: CVMV2000661 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL KINCAID DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jaslaya Ebony Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) William C. Kennedy, Esq., SBN: 076992 Law Office of Kennedy and Associates 3576 Arlington Avenue, Suite 304 Riverside, CA 92506 Telephone: (951) 784-8920 Facsimile: (951) 784-8930 Email: info@lawyerswho-fight.com Case No: CVMV2000661 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL KINCAID DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jaslaya Ebony Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) William C. Kennedy, Esq., SBN: 076992 Law Office of Kennedy and Associates 3576 Arlington Avenue, Suite 304 Riverside, CA 92506 Telephone: (951) 784-8920 Facsimile: (951) 784-8930 Email: info@lawyerswho-fight.com Case No: CVMV2000661 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL KINCAID DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jaslaya Ebony Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES (Personal Injury or Wrongful Death) William C. Kennedy, Esq., SBN: 076992 Law Office of Kennedy and Associates 3576 Arlington Avenue, Suite 304 Riverside, CA 92506 Telephone: (951) 784-8920 Facsimile: (951) 784-8930 Email: info@lawyerswho-fight.com Case No: CVMV2000661 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE Attorney for Plaintiff, DANIEL KINCAID DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jaslaya Ebony Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

Public Notices

DANIEL KINCAID Plaintiff vs. Jaslaya Ebony Walker, Jessica Walker & DOES 1-10 Defendants. Statement of Damages Defendant: Jessica Walker Plaintiff: Daniel Kincaid seeks damages in the above-entitled action, as follows Pain, Suffering and Inconvenience, \$50,000.00 Emotional distress \$5,000.00 Medical Expenses (to date) \$14,525.00 Future medical expenses (present value) \$15,000.00 Property Damage \$5,000.00 Dated: January 7, 2021 David E. Gregory JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

FICTITIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT FILE NO: FBN2022000641 The following person(s) is(are) doing business as: OUTSTANDING CONSULTING SERVICES, 8561 FOOTHILL BLVD SPC 106, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Mailing Address: TAMMO WILKENS, 8651 FOOTHILL BLVD SPC 106, RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730 Business is Conducted By: AN INDIVIDUAL Signed: BY SIGNING BELOW, I DECLARE THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THIS STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT. A registrant who declares as true information, which he or she knows to be false, is guilty of a crime. (B&P Code 17913) I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/TAMMO WILKENS This statement was filed with the County Clerk of SAN BERNARDINO on: 01/31/2022 I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office. Began Transacting Business: 01/02/2022 County Clerk, NOTICE- This fictitious business name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022

FBN 20210012451 The following person is doing business as: RC TRANSPORTATION. 5446 N E ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); RAUL CARDENAS 5466 N E ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RAUL CARDENAS, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/20/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022081R

FBN 20210012748 The following person is doing business as: SEWER TECH HYDRO JETTING. 1468 W BANYON ST RIALTO, CA 92377; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); MIGUEL MARTINEZ 1468 W BANYON ST RIALTO, CA 92377. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ MIGUEL MARTINEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022071R

FBN 20210012694 The following person is doing business as: ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION. 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION, INC. 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ AMADOR GARCIA, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022051R

FBN 20210012694 The following person is doing business as: ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION. 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION, INC. 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ AMADOR GARCIA, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022051R

FBN 20220000186 The following person is doing business as: EQUITY SUPPORT SERVICES. 1660 KENDALL DR. APT 46 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); ISRAEL S OROZCO 1660 KENDALL DR. APT 46 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ISRAEL S OROZCO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B32022041R

Public Notices

business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ MIGUEL MARTINEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022071R

FBN 20210012762 The following person is doing business as: SEWER TECH PLUMBING. 3229 N. E. ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); MIGUEL MARTINEZ JR 3229 N. E. ST. SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ MIGUEL MARTINEZ JR, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022061R

FBN 20210012743 The following person is doing business as: REOL HELP. 8305 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); SEAN D CALHOUN 8305 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ SEAN D CALHOUN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/29/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022061R

FBN 20210012524 The following person is doing business as: SHAKE IT UP. TEAM 1 RIALTO. 638 WEST BASELINE RD RIALTO, CA 92376; [ MAILING ADDRESS 13183 YELLOWWOOD ST MORENO VALLEY, CA 92553 ]; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); JULIO CESAR MORENO 638 WEST BASELINE RD RIALTO, CA 92376. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ LETTY G. MUNOZ, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 13, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B32022031R

FBN 20210012694 The following person is doing business as: ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION. 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); ROSE GENERAL CONSTRUCTION, INC. 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346; 26772 UNION ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ AMADOR GARCIA, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B22022051R

FBN 20220000186 The following person is doing business as: EQUITY SUPPORT SERVICES. 1660 KENDALL DR. APT 46 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); ISRAEL S OROZCO 1660 KENDALL DR. APT 46 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ISRAEL S OROZCO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B32022041R

FBN 20220000186 The following person is doing business as: EQUITY SUPPORT SERVICES. 1660 KENDALL DR. APT 46 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); ISRAEL S OROZCO 1660 KENDALL DR. APT 46 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ISRAEL S OROZCO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B32022041R

Public Notices

of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B32022041R

FBN 20210012689 The following person is doing business as: SANTIAGO'S APPLIANCE. 273 WEST E ST COLTON, CA 92324; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); FILIBERTO RODRIGUEZ 273 WEST E ST COLTON, CA 92324; AGUSTIN RODRIGUEZ JIMENEZ 273 WEST E ST COLTON, CA 92324. The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ FILIBERTO RODRIGUEZ, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/28/2021 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 01/14/2022, 01/21/2022, 01/28/2022, 02/04/2022 CNB-B32022011R

FBN 20220000048 The following person is doing business as: SCHOLARSHIP OF OVERSEAS SUPPORT ASSOCIATION 25827 MARIPOSA ST LOMA LINDA, CA 92354; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); MISSION FOR TOMORROW 25827 MARIPOSA ST LOMA LINDA, CA 92354; . The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 17913). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RICHARD C LEE, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 01/10/2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code



Public Notices

rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CNB-BB5202209IR

FBN 20220000566  
The following person is doing business as: ITADEV CO., LTD. 1461 N VISTA AVE APT #1 RIALTO, CA 92376 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO SHATOYA D. HARRISON 1461 N VISTA AVE APT #1 RIALTO, CA 92376. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ SHATOYA D. HARRISON, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 28, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CN-BB5202208MT

Public Notices

FBN 20220000485  
The following person is doing business as: CALIFORNIA NEW BUSINESS BUREAU, INC.. 228 W HOSPITALITY LANE STE F SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92804 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO CALIFORNIA NEW BUSINESS BUREAU, INC. 12501 E IMPERIAL HWY STE 130 NORWALK, CA 90650; 228 W HOSPITALITY LANE STE F SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92804; . The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 26, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CN-BB5202207SD

FBN 20220000490  
The following person is doing business as: OMOSOR VENTURES. 29011

Public Notices

HORNERLNHIGHLAND,CA92346 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO VALIANT S OMOSOR 29011 HORNER LN HIGHLAND, CA 92346. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ VALIANT S OMOSOR, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 26, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CN-BB5202206MT

FBN 20220000461  
The following person is doing business as: VANNYS FLOWER SHOP. 1292 W MILL ST SUITE #104 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO VANESSA TORRES-PENA 1292 W MILL ST SUITE #104 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact

Public Notices

business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ VANESSA TORRES-PENA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 25, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CN-BB5202205MT

FBN 20220000308  
The following person is doing business as: VYARA CONSTRUCTION. 7496 MCKINLEY AVE SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410 PO BOX 90670 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92427 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO GEMA Y PENA 7496 MCKINLEY AVESANBERNARDINO,CA92410. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime

Public Notices

(B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ GEMA Y PENA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 20, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CN-BB5202204MT

FBN 20220000311  
The following person is doing business as: EZ LASH & HAIR STUDIO. 152 S RIVERSIDE AVE RIALTO, CA 92376 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ELIZABETH ZAMORA 152 S RIVERSIDE AVE RIALTO, CA 92376. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ELIZABETH ZAMORA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 20, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Ber-

Public Notices

nardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CN-BB5202203MT

FBN 20220000328  
The following person is doing business as: RRR TRANSPORT. 7421 VALARIA DR HIGHLAND, CA 922346 PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO RUBENRODRIGUEZRUIZ7421VALARIA DR HIGHLAND, CA 92346. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RUBEN RODRIGUEZ RUIZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 20, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the

Public Notices

rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CN-BB5202202MT

FBN 20210012259  
The following person is doing business as: 13137 COZZENS AVECHINO, CA 91710 ; MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701 ; ( PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS SAN BERNARDINO ); ALEJANDRO DIAZ 1313 COZZENS AVE CHINO, CA 91710 The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ALEJANDRO DIAZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JANUARY 20, 2022 I hereby certify that this copy is a correct copy of the original statement on file in my office San Bernardino County Clerk By:/Deputy Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 02/04/2022, 02/11/2022, 02/18/2022, 02/25/2022 CNB-B5202201CV

BlueTriton’s Lawyers Fought To Keep Citizens From Testifying During Water Diversion Restriction Hearing from page 6

water bottling was first located at the base of the mountain.” She said this is backed by “property deeds recorded between 1915 to 1925 on the Arrowhead Springs real property. If you notice in those deeds, it only contains real property at the base of the mountain in Township 1 North. The associated water rights go with the real property.” Frye noted that from 1920 to 1924, while the Arrowhead Springs Hotel was being used as an asylum for shellshocked and gassed veterans of World War I, documents were generated which demonstrate the water at the hotel was being obtained from Indian Springs located in Township 1 North. “In 1925, the hotel and water business were sold, and used as collateral for the issuance of a gold bond,” Frye stated. “Documents for the bond issuance give the hotel property and the associated water rights as being in Township 1 North Range 4 and 3 West.” Frye further located documentation for a series of agreements involving Charles Anthony, the wa-

ter bottling manager and the vice president of the Arrowhead Springs Corporation. Some of those documents show Anthony was approached by the California Consumers Company to sell off the water bottling company. The title insurance policy describing what was to be conveyed in the sale excludes any surface rights, the hot springs and anything reserved by the U.S. Government, which would include water rights in the forest, Frye pointed out. “Thus, there was nothing ever in Strawberry Creek and Canyon, even up through 1929,” she said. “It was always at the base of the mountain.” According to Frye, the notice of intended sale included certain water rights and easements relating to the sale of the hotel property. “We know that those are in Township 1 North Range 4 West based on deeds,” she said. Byron Waters, the attorney who drew up the documents for the sale, wrote that all water rights in the possession of the hotel would be transferred, Frye said, and in the title insurance policy there are exclu-

sions and exceptions. Excluded, she said, are water reservations in the San Bernardino National Forest, and anything involving adverse possession, surface streams and hot springs belonging to the Arrowhead Springs Corporation. “So, the clause alone would have excluded anything in Strawberry Creek in the upper canyons in Township 2 Range 3 West in the San Bernardino National Forest,” she said. “It also would have excluded Indian Springs, because actually that was located, based on the 1929 Survey map, in the San Bernardino National Forest. The terms ‘belonging to grantor’ are key. The grantor, Arrowhead Springs Corp., only owned property in Township 1 North, and that did not include anything in the Strawberry Creek headwaters, Township 2 North.” Also testifying this week was Hugh Bialecki, a Lake Arrowhead-based dentist who is the president of the *Save Our Forest Association*. Bialecki stated that as early as September 2014, he had expressed concern about water depletion in Strawberry Canyon and wanted to have an informational exchange with U.S. Forest Service representatives on the subject,

but was not able to get them to schedule such a meeting. In a March 2015 letter to then-Regional Forester Randy Morris, Bialecki proposed a National Environmental Protection Act study of the situation in Strawberry Creek and objected to continued water diversions there, which he asked to be halted until there was a thorough review of all aspects surrounding the special use permit for the water pipeline that had been issued to Arrowhead Puritas/Beatrice Foods in 1978 and which had expired in 1987, and was being automatically renewed on an annual basis. Bialecki said he had also sought to address the issue of what he said were Nestlé’s illegally-claimed water rights, specifically the lack of recorded claims at the water withdrawal sites in Strawberry Canyon and Indian Springs. He made, he said, multiple attempts to communicate with the United States Forest Service regarding what he called “this previously wrong expired permit” to draw water from Strawberry Creek. Bialecki also presented photographs he had taken that documented the circumstances relevant to his testimony. Grady objected to Bialecki’s testimony and pre-

sentation of evidence on technical grounds, arguing that Bialecki was permitted to participate and make statements pertaining to policy rather than on evidentiary grounds, and that this had been changed abruptly just before his appearance as a witness. Grady said Bialecki’s exhibits and testimony in writing were not provided sufficiently in advance of his appearance, that is, by the December 17 deadline Lilly had set for such submissions. Grady further suggested that Bialecki’s statements had no relevance to the issue being considered by the State Water Resources Control Board. Lilly overruled the objection, and offered Grady an assurance that only the information deemed relevant to the question of whether the cease-and-desist order should be granted would be considered in his final ruling. “Certainly, at the end of the day we will only consider evidence that is relevant to the hearing issues as we prepare our post order,” Lilly said. Lilly said he was indulging all members of the public who wanted to participate in the hearing process, insofar as they had input, information or evidence that had a bearing on the matter. He said the State

Water Resources Control Board had a policy of allowing interested parties who are not represented by attorneys to participate in the hearings. Anthony Serrano, a Highland resident, gave brief testimony. Highland draws some of its water from the Bunker Hill Basin. Serrano submitted exhibits, stating “From a local resident’s standpoint in the city of Highland, it is clear to us who have worked on water diversion projects in our community over the years, the Bunker Hill Basin was affected by the diversion of water.” Grady objected to Serrano’s testimony and offerings as lacking a proper foundation. Lilly overruled the objection, stating, “At least parts of each document are relevant to the hearing issues,” and he said what is not relevant will be omitted from the final report and will not be used or relied upon in the drafting of the proposed order. Testifying this week as well was Steve Loe, a retired U.S. Forest Service biologist who had 30-years’ experience working within the San Bernardino National Forest as well as for the forest service in Prescott Arizona for four years, Eureka, *Continued on Page 12*

## Overdraft Is Necessitating Water Use Cutbacks & Steep Replenishment Fees, Water District Manager Says *from page 11*

its water use, it still drafts some 1,600 acre-feet of water from the aquifer annually.

Don Zbeda is now the general manager of the Indian Wells Valley Water District. From 1990 until 2012 he was employed by Searles Valley Minerals' corporate predecessors, the North American Chemical Company and IMC Global Incorporation, and then, after Sun Capital Partners' purchase of IMC Global Incorporation, Searles Valley Minerals. According to

Zbeda, the Indian Wells Valley Water District and the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority are merely complying with the State of California's mandates in seeking to implement the groundwater sustainability plan.

"The landmark Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014 requires local groundwater sustainability agencies to be formed for all high and medium priority basins in the state," Zbeda said. "These groundwater sustainability agencies must develop and implement groundwater sustainability plans for managing and using groundwater without causing undesirable results. High priority, critical condition basins, including the Indian Wells Valley Basin, must

achieve groundwater sustainability by January 31, 2040. All other high and medium priority basins must achieve groundwater sustainability by January 31, 2042. The groundwater sustainability plan for the Indian Wells Valley Basin was submitted on behalf of the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority January 31, 2020. The Department of Water Resources committed to completing their review within two years."

Zbeda continued, "The water conservation legislation of 2018, Senate Bill 606 and Assembly Bill 1668, established a new foundation for long-term improvements in urban water supplier conservation and drought planning. The legislation applies to urban retail water suppli-

ers but does not set any standards or rules for individual customer water use. The legislation requires the Department of Water Resources, in coordination with the water board, to perform the necessary studies and investigations to set both indoor and outdoor residential water use standards as well as standards for commercial, institutional, and industrial customers. Though yet to be finalized, targets for indoor residential use per current statute are 55 gallons per person per day in 2020, 52.5 gallons per person per day in 2025, and 50 gallons per person per day in 2030. Legislation also provides for appropriate variances for unique uses that have a significant effect on water use. A variance for use in evapo-

native coolers is one under consideration. These standards, variances, and methodologies will become effective after June 2022, following the water board's adoption of recommendations following a lengthy public process during 2021."

"As for litigation, there are multiple lawsuits filed with the court," Zbeda said. "Mojave Pistachios and Searles Valley Minerals have filed separate but similar lawsuits referred to as reverse validation actions against the authority challenging the groundwater sustainability plan and related implementation actions, including the replenishment fee. These lawsuits are currently pending in Orange County. The water District is a party to the reverse valida-

tion actions. In addition to the two reverse validation actions, Mojave Pistachios filed a complaint against the water district, Searles Valley Minerals, and Meadowbrook Dairy requesting a 'limited physical solution' between only these four major water producers. The Navy was not named in the lawsuit."

Zbeda said, "Most recently, the water district's board of directors voted to file a comprehensive adjudication that does include Navy participation and allows all those who may claim a right to pump or store water in the basin to participate, assert and prove any rights they may claim. A case management conference has been set by the court for March 15, 2022."

*-Mark Gutglueck*

## County Planning Staff, Anticipating Supervisors Favor Generous Political Donors Wieners' & Beards' Truck Terminal Proposal, Readied The Project For Approval Without An Environmental Impact Report *from page 3*

Bloomington came in at \$10,953. About 19.8 percent of families in Bloomington and 25.3 percent of its population subsist below the poverty line, including 30.5 percent of those under age 18 and 10.8 percent of those age 65 or over.

Given that both Beard and Wiener have committed themselves to backing Republican as opposed to Democratic candidates and were major sources of campaign cash for his opponent, Armendarez, in 2020, Baca has multiple incentives to oppose the Wiener/Beard truck terminal. Indeed, at the July 22, 2021 San Bernardino County Planning Commission meeting when the project was considered, Commissioner Kareem Gongora, the representative of the Fifth Supervisorial District who was appointed by Baca, was the lone vote recommending against the approval of the project. Commissioners Jonathan Weldy, Michael Stoffel and Tom Haughey prevailed in calling upon the full board of supervisors to allow the project to proceed, with Commissioner Raymond Allard recusing himself. Allard said he was not voting because he had previously done engineering

work for both Wiener and Beard.

At the planning commission meeting on July 22, 14 Bloomington residents spoke before the commission in opposition to the project. Prior to the meeting, the county's land use services department had received 126 letters of concern or opposition to allowing the truck terminal to be located on the property previously intended for commercial rather than logistics/industrial/service/repair use. That Gongora, who serves on the planning commission at the pleasure of Baca, went on record against the project is telling, an indication Baca is going to oppose the project. In contrast, when the Chandi project was considered by the planning commission, Gongora abstained rather than stand against it, protecting Baca from the charge that he had acted in defiance of an instance of officially-expressed sentiment against the Chandi project reflective of the attitude of his constituents.

The proposed facility at 10746 Cedar Avenue being considered next week was initially described by the county and San Bernardino County Senior Planner Anthony DeLuca,

who is serving as the lead staff assignee on the project, as a "truck terminal." The county is now referring to the facility as a trailer storage yard.

The project upon completion would provide storage for trailers during delivery off-seasons and/or between deliveries, and would run seven days a week and 24 hours a day, with an average of more than 700 truck trips into or out of the terminal daily. The facility is to include 275 parking spaces in total, 260 spaces of which will be 12 feet by 55 feet. The proposed project includes a 2,400 square-foot building for office use and storage, an approximate 250 square-foot guard shack, and a 4,800 square-foot maintenance shop with four repair bays.

In considering the project, the board of supervisors has been presented with the option of making a mitigated negative declaration to provide it with its environmental certification.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, most development projects are subjected to an environmental certification process. Some types of environmental certification are more intensive than others, ranging from an environmental impact report to an environmental assessment to an environmental examination to a mitigated negative declaration to a negative declaration.

An environmental impact report, the most involved type of environmental analysis and certification there is, consists of a thorough study of the project site, the project proposal, the potential and actual impacts the project will have on the site and surrounding area in terms of all conceivable issues, including land use, water use, air quality, potential contamination, noise, traffic, and biological and cultural resources. An environmental impact report specifies in detail what measures can, will and must be carried out to offset those impacts. A mitigated negative declaration falls near the other end of the scale, and exists as a far less exacting size-up of the impacts of a project, by which the panel entrusted with ultimate land use authority, as in this case the board of supervisors, issues a declaration that all adverse environmental impacts from the project will be mitigated, or offset, by the conditions of approval of the project imposed upon the developer.

A mitigated negative declaration is a statement that a full-blown environmental impact report with regard to a project in question need not be completed because the project itself incorporates revisions and/or mitigation measures that will avoid or mitigate impacts to a point where no significant impacts on the environment will occur and that there is no substantial evidence

in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised and/or approved, will have a significant impact on the environment.

An argument could be made that a project as involved as the Wiener/Beard truck terminal, by which 760 truck trips per day are to occur accompanied by the presence of repair and servicing facilities at which petroleum and lubricants, brake fluid, solvents and degreasing agents as well as other chemicals and asbestos will be present and in use, should be subject to a comprehensive environmental analysis.

Were Baca willing to do so, he could make an issue of the county land use division's failure to require that Wiener and Beard complete an environmental impact report for the undertaking. He could argue that by utilizing a mitigated negative declaration, the county is running the risk of a lawsuit filed on behalf of Bloomington residents by an enterprising attorney. A comprehensive environmental impact report on the project would very likely reveal there will be unmitigated impacts from the project, requiring a declaration of overriding considerations, one that holds the benefit to the community will outweigh the drawbacks. This would trigger the need for a community benefits agreement, one which might commit Wie-

ner and Beard to making concessions to carry out public improvements that could cost them hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars over the life of the terminal.

One area in particular in which the county land use services division, Wiener and Beard are legally vulnerable to activists in the Bloomington community and a lawyer potentially representing them is with regard to the general commercial zoning on the subject property, which the county sought to get around by redesignating as commercial service. A pointed challenge of that in court would likely turn up that the truck terminal is more accurately cataloged as an industrial use.

The pertinent question, many Bloomington and other Fifth District residents maintain, is whether Baca will make an early and strong showing of his opposition to the project within his district that will serve as an appeal to his board colleagues that they should unite with him in turning Wiener and Beard down or whether he will simply engage in a wan and empty gesture by opposing the project with a quiet vote against it late in – that is, at the very end of – the process that will do nothing to dissuade supervisors Rutherford, Hagman, Rowe and Cook from siding with their campaign contributors Wiener and Beard over

*Continued on Page 12*

## BlueTriton Legal Team Suggests State Water Board Hearing Officer Is Biased Against Its Client

*from page 10*

California for three years and Tucson, Arizona for three years.

Water diversion from Strawberry Creek by BlueTriton, Nestlé and their predecessors, Loe said, “has completely stopped any flows from reaching the main stem of Strawberry Creek. Strawberry Creek used to have over a hundred gallons per minute and the headwaters springs, just 1, 2, 3 and 4, that’s now down to a half of a gallon per minute.”

Rachel Doughty, representing the *Story of Stuff Project*, asked, “To what degree has BlueTriton’s diversion impacted the natural spring flows and base flows near the diversions?”

“They’ve completely eliminated them,” Loe said.

Loe identified W.P. Rowe as “an engineer hired in ‘29, ‘28 maybe, to start working on the Strawberry Springs and determining what the flows were and whether or not they could be diverted, and if they were diverted, what the outputs would be so that BlueTriton’s predecessors could make decisions along with the hotel property on development of those springs.”

Loe said Rowe used methods and techniques in his measurements that were accurate and consistent with what is still used by engineers, and that Rowe’s measurements were credible, detailed and meticulous.

Based upon Rowe’s recorded findings, the riparian landscape of Strawberry Canyon in 1929 and 1930 was far superior compared to what exists there now, Loe testified.

“It was much more lush at that time,” Loe said. “There’s whole sections of stream a half-mile long that no longer have surface flows. That’s a major, major loss.”

Chris Sanders of Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan cross examined Loe on behalf of BlueTriton, and wrung from him that he is not a licensed civil engineer, is not a licensed hydrologist, is not

a registered hydrologist, is not a licensed geologist, not a trained or certified historian and is not an attorney.

Lilly took it upon himself to question Loe.

In response to a question from Lilly, Loe said that the junction of flow from all of the upper springs at the head of Strawberry Creek is at Station 123+00 or 12,300 feet upstream from the old intake to the 4-inch pipe from Strawberry Creek to the Arrowhead Hotel which was laid in 1929.

Lilly asked Loe about his understanding of who built the water intakes and pipelines in Strawberry Canyon.

“The Arrowhead Springs Hotel and Consolidated Water had a deal,” Loe responded. “I’m not sure if Consolidated had any money in that original 1929 pipe to the hotel pick-up, but then from there it went up the west fork of Strawberry Creek and Consolidated Water paid for that. Consolidated Water paid for the pipeline from the springs down to connect to the Consolidated Water link to the Arrowhead Springs. It was an in-stream diversion, from what I can tell, so they connected pipeline together is what happened.”

Lilly referenced Weir 3 Station 1 in Strawberry Canyon, and asked Loe if it had been laid in 1929.

Grady objected that Lilly was asking questions without providing the basis for the foundation of Loe’s statements in response.

“You’re asking questions of a witness, and asking him to speak as if what he says is necessarily fact, without asking the basis of any of these opinions, the documents that lay the foundation for those opinions,” Grady said.

Lilly sustained the objection to his own question and then restated the question to ask Loe, based on his review of all of the Rowe papers and other historical documents, what his understanding was as to the date the pipeline from the weir at Station 0 or Station 1 to the Arrowhead Hotel was established.

“Based on your reading of historical documents, who installed the pipeline?” Lilly asked.

“Arrowhead Springs Hotel as far as I know,” Loe responded. “There may have been a contribution from Consolidated Water. Arrowhead Springs Hotel in collaboration with Consolidated Water.”

Lilly then posed one more question regarding diversions from Strawberry Creek to the Arrowhead Springs Hotel crucial to whether BlueTriton could establish water rights in Strawberry Canyon dating from before the 1893 founding of the San Bernardino National Forest.

“Based on your review of all the historical documents, do you have any information or understanding that there were any diversions from Strawberry Creek to the Arrowhead Springs Hotel any time before 1929?” Lilly asked.

“It appears that there may have been a pipeline that predated the one that we just looked at by maybe six months to a year into the bottom of Strawberry Creek about a half a mile up from the hotel, but it looks like that was quickly abandoned, I think,” Loe said. “My opinion is because of several factors: 1) There wasn’t a whole lot of water getting there and 2) it appeared to cross the creek, which would have been very hard to maintain with the flows we get in that area with floodwaters. I think at some point very quickly... and it may have just been blueprints is all that they had. I think they very quickly then decided to go up the way they went all the way to where the hotel pick-up is and did that in 1929. I think all that happened in 1929.”

Lilly then asked if he was aware of any diversions from Strawberry Creek before 1929.

“No,” Loe said.

Lilly asked about the Cold Creek pipeline and when it was built.

“I think it was about the same time. It may have been earlier. So, it may have started earlier in 1929, maybe even ‘28, but it was basically at the same time, from my understanding.”

Lilly asked who built it “I have a feeling it was probably a joint thing again,” Loe said. “For sure, the hotel was getting water from Coldwater

[Canyon], so I know they were involved. Rowe did some of the work. So, I don’t know. It could have been a cooperative deal again or it could have all just been the hotel.”

Lilly asked for a conversion of one miner’s inch flow under a four-inch head.

“It said 11 inches in some spots [of the documentation he consulted] and then it said nine inches in others,” Loe said. “It said nine inches was southern California versus Northern California. So, I tried both figures to see what correlates to what Rowe was coming up with in gallons per minute, and determined that consistently throughout he used nine gallons per minute.”

Grady asserted that BlueTriton was not being given a fair shake during the hearing and that Lilly was tailoring his rulings and allowing testimony that was prejudicial to her client. Alluding to questions Lilly had himself asked of Loe, she further suggested that Lilly is siding with the State Water Resources Control Board and the various other participants in the hearing against BlueTriton.

“I want to note for the record that we object to the fact that we are layering what’s being deemed cross examination and redirect where we have aligned parties all versus BlueTriton, and so what we instead seem to be having is a multiple-layer direct tag-team approach to this proceeding,” Grady said. “We’re just feeling a little bit like old television wrestling instead of an actual proceeding.”

Lilly responded, saying, “I don’t know what your analogy is, but just to clarify, number one, I do not represent any party and I’m not taking any position. I have no idea where I am going to come out on any of these issues, so I disagree with your characterization, your words suggesting that my questions were aligned with any party. Secondly, beyond that I think that rules and Government Code 11513 subdivision b allow for that. I don’t think that there’s any provision there [to disallow seeking clarification from a witness], whether cross examination is friendly or neutral. They appear to al-

low for redirect within the scope of cross examination. So, for those reasons I overrule your objection.”

Grady, said she respectfully disagreed and that “This proceeding has lost track. We have absolutely no indication of the scope of what’s being presented in this parallel prosecution.”

As part of the hearing process, Lilly has called for a “site visit,” that is, a walking tour of Strawberry Canyon in which he and those wishing to participate can survey the canyon and Blue Triton’s water diversion, along with a helicopter flyover of the site involving himself and attorneys willing to participate as well as a yet-to-be-arranged tour of the Arrowhead Springs Hotel and the springs at the base of the mountains from which the hotel and associated water bottling operations historically derived their water. The hotel is now owned by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, which yet must consent to the tour.

Robert Donlan, as the lead legal representative of BlueTriton, made a strategic decision to have his legal team hold back on presenting certain testimony and evidence in the early stage of the hearing, instead opting to present that during the hearing’s rebuttal phase, which has yet to come. Donlan wanted Lilly to delay the site visit until after the rebuttal evidence is presented because, he said, “We think our rebuttal testimony will be very helpful to your understanding of the watershed. To take that rebuttal testimony before you go out into the field, we think, will lead to a much more informed site visit for the hearing officer.”

Lilly, however, ex-

pressed his intention of making the site visit at the earliest opportunity, tentatively set for February 16 and 17. He said he would be willing to sojourn from Sacramento to Strawberry Canyon a second time if some ground is covered during BlueTriton’s rebuttal that encourages him to make a second tour.

In response, Donlan, came across as being himself reluctant, reflecting the attitude of BlueTriton, to have the site visit take place.

“I do not think it’s an efficient use of the state’s resources to go down there twice, perhaps not even once,” Donlan said. “There are some concerns with my client about the expanding scope of this site visit, and I do want to state now, early, that we’ve talked about indemnification and waivers in the past. We haven’t heard anything from you about that. There’s some work that needs to be done before my client will let me and my colleagues participate in a site visit with the potential exposure to liability. If there is an injury – and there will be with the group you are talking about some level of injury; hopefully there’s no serious injuries – I think it’s reasonable to assume there’s some exposure to liability that BlueTriton Brands has. Whether it’s on federal land or not, you are visiting facilities that are controlled by BlueTriton, a private party. You have folks that are participating in this hearing that could get hurt. So, I’m telling you what our limitations are. You can do with that what you want. There may be some limitations on BlueTriton and its team’s ability to participate without some liability protections.”

against the approval of the truck terminal project.

“I hope that Supervisor Baca will take a vigorous stand against what is a terrible project with tremendously negative implications for our community, and that he does it in such a way that he encourages his board colleagues to oppose it, rather than just showing token opposition, which would carry with it very little prospect of changing the outcome of the vote,” Young said.

-Mark Gutglueck

## Bloomington Residents Call Upon Baca To Come Out Swinging Against Truck Terminal Proposal

*from page 11*

Bloomington’s residents.

Greg Young, an elected member of the West Valley Water District Board of Directors and as such one of Bloomington’s most prominent political figures, said he has been given to understand that Baca intends to vote