

Latest Ramos Legislative Success Raises Further Ethical & Legal Questions

By Mark Gutglueck

For at least the third time, official action engaged in by Assembly James Ramos in his role as a legislator has raised moral and legal questions that have yet to be resolved.

Those questions are an outgrowth of his ability and apparent willingness to use his legislative authority to enhance his already considerable financial advantage as a

prominent member of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, which is now officially known as the Yuhaaviatam Nation.

This week, legislation introduced by Ramos, Assembly Bill 341, was passed by an overwhelming margin of the California Legislature with bipartisan support and signed into law by Governor Gavin Newsom.

Assembly Bill 341 re-

instates provisions sponsored by the cardroom industry in the 1997 Gambling Control Act, which prohibited California from issuing new cardroom licenses. That moratorium was periodically extended by the legislature for 25 years before it expired on January 1, 2023 due to timing constraints.

Under AB 341, no new cardrooms can open before January 1, 2043, but

existing cardrooms with fewer than 20 gambling tables can add up to 10 new tables over the next 20 years. Cardrooms operating 20 tables or more at present are allowed to continue to operate, adding up to two tables in the first year after the law takes effect, and up to two more tables every four years thereafter.

Assemblyman Ramos is a member of the Yuhaaviatam Nation, which

while previously known as the San Manuel Tribe of Mission Indians first established a high stakes Indian Bingo Parlor in the 1980s, which was transformed in the 1990s into what is now a highly lucrative casino on the tribe's reservation near the City of Highland. This was achieved as a consequence of federal law which allows Native American tribes to operate gam- **See P 2**

Elimination Of Pay-To-Play Dealing Strips SBC Politicians Of Their 1st Class Tickets Aboard The Gravy Train

A ruling by a Sacramento County Superior Court judge upholding Senate Bill 1439 and its anti-pay-to-play provisions is likely to be as or more impactful in San Bernardino County than anywhere else in the Golden State.

Yesterday, May 25, Judge Richard K. Suyeoshi held that the law, which was signed by Governor Gavin Newsom in November and went into effect in January but was challenged by a series of plaintiffs in February, does not run afoul of either the U.S. or the California constitutions.

Senate Bill 1439 amended the Political Reform Act of 1974, which prohibits an elected official with or officer of an agency from accepting, soliciting, or directing a contribution of more than \$250 from any party while a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use is pending before the agency. Previously, the Political Reform Act restricted appointed officials, such as members of a planning commission, from receiving the \$250 threshold amount or more in the form of a political contribution and then voting on any item or issue impacting that donor. Senate Bill 1439 broadens that provision of the Political Reform Act to cover local elected officials.

In the past, a member of a city council could take \$250 or any amount of money from a donor and vote on approving that donor's **See P 2**

City Manager Firing Has Transformed Traditionally Stable Yucaipa Into Factional Bedlam

In the normally staid hamlet of Yucaipa, where for the better part of a century life has progressed at a steady pace and the intensive political bickering that has from time to time surfaced in many of San Bernardino County's other municipalities even as creeping urbanization has made its presence felt, the veneer of civility has been vitiated.

While there is little

dispute over what the ingredients of the social and institutional donnybrook that has beset the city are, both sides are intensely contesting – some say manufacturing – a narrative of what it was precisely that triggered the now deeply apparent cultural divide.

The fight, essentially, is over which side represents the establishment – the true establishment –

and which constitutes the outsiders. In prehistory, the Yucaipa Valley with its fertile soil watered by springs and creeks running out of the San Bernardino Mountains, supported a large population of Serrano Native Americans. Spanish settlers were likewise attracted to it and after Mexico obtained independence from Spain, it became part of the 35,509-acre

Rancho San Bernardino land grant to José del Carmen Lugo and José María Lugo, Vicente Lugo, and their cousin, Diego Sepulveda. The latter established the Yucaipa Rancheria in 1842, which began the area's long history as a series of cattle ranches, some of which were maintained by San Bernardino County historical figures John Brown Sr., James W. Wa-

ters, and the Dunlap family after the Rancho was sold to Mormon Settlers in 1851. Thereafter, in the nearby Oak Glen heights of the San Bernardino Mountain foothills, the Parrish, Wilshire, Rivers, and Law families established apple orchards, most of which survive to this day.

Until the middle of the 20th Century, Yucaipa's cattle ranches **See P 3**

BlueTriton Has No Forest H²O Rights, Cal Water Board To Confirm

The State Water Resources Control Board and the California Environmental Protection Agency have given a penultimate indication that the Arrowhead brand spring water bottling operation will no longer be able to draft water from ten of its thirteen spring water sources in Strawberry Canyon at the roughly

4,200-foot-to-5,400-foot elevation in the San Bernardino National Forest. The order left open the possibility that the three remaining sources of water in Strawberry Canyon from which BlueTriton Brands draws the water it bottles as Arrowhead Spring Water, consisting of three boreholes, could also be shut off if the company's **See P 6**

56-Year-Old Inmate Slain By 56-Year-Old Cellmate With A Head Slam To Their Cell's Concrete Floor

A tough-talking 56-year-old man from Upland ended up dead on Sunday after he was put in a jail cell with a man 30 years his junior.

Adam Preston Adams and Marco Antonio Lopez-Hernandez were both Upland residents. It is not clear whether they were acquainted through the street culture both took part in while living

in the 79,838-population city. Adams is now dead at Lopez-Hernandez's hands, according to the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department.

Lopez-Hernandez, 26, had been in sheriff's department custody since his March 29 arrest by the Upland Police Department on Penal Code 484(A) petty theft charges. In the course of his

arrest, according to the Upland Police Department, he grew combative and attempted to take the arresting police officer's gun away from him. As a consequence of the two additional charges – Penal Code 69 obstructing a police officer/resisting arrest and Penal Code 148(D) attempting to remove a firearm from a police officer – **See P 4**

Murder Among The Homeless As One Man In Victorville Torched & Killed Another

A homeless denizen of Victorville has been arrested in the aftermath of an incident a week ago in which he is believed to have killed another homeless man by setting him on fire.

On May 19 at around 5:30 a.m., Victorville Sheriff's Station deputies were summoned to the parking lot of a vacant building in the 16700 block of D Street

by the report of a man on fire.

When deputies arrived, they found Christopher U. Fields dead. He had been lit on fire and succumbed to his injury.

Fields was described as a 54-year-old negro whose last known actual established residence was in Carson.

Based on information provided and a speedy preliminary investiga-

tion by deputies who within a half hour coordinated with sheriff's specialized investigations division detectives who were shortly thereafter accompanied by members of both the department's homicide and arson details, Robert Doyle Patty, a 53-year-old transient, was identified as the suspected killer.

Patty was located at

16797 D Street in Victorville at 4:28 p.m and taken into custody on suspicion of violating Penal Code 187(A) murder and violating Penal Code 69 obstructing/resisting an executive officer on May 19 of this year, Penal Code 647.6(A)(1) annoying or molesting a victim under the age of 18 and Penal Code 314(1) indecent exposure that allegedly occurred on Hal-

loeven 2020. He is being held in lieu of \$1 million bail.

The San Bernardino County District Attorney's office charged him with murder on May 23, at which time he waived arraignment.

He is due to appear in Department V-1 at the Victorville Courthouse to answer the murder charge on May 30 at 9:30 a.m. **See P 6**

Assemblyman Ramos Has Likely Run Afoul Of State Conflict Of Interest Law By Authoring And Voting On Legislation That Specifically Benefits The Tribe Of Which He Is A Member *from front page*

ing establishments upon meeting certain conditions. More recently, the Yuhaaviatam Nation has established next to the casino a 432-room resort hotel, which has made the casino operation even more financially successful. The hotel, at 17 floors, is the tallest building in San Bernardino County.

Assemblyman Ramos was, formerly, the San Manuel tribal chairman and as such had tremendous sway over the distribution of the revenue the tribe realizes from the operation of the casino. Some members of the tribe make more money than other members of the tribe. Ramos is among the highest remunerated Yuhaaviatam Nation members, and is reportedly paid roughly \$18,000 per day taken from the tribe's gambling and resort revenues. He parlayed his wealth into a successful run for the San Bernardino Community College Board in 2005, the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors in 2012

and, in 2018, the California Assembly. Whatever the merits of Assembly Bill 342, some people believe that Assemblyman Ramos's authorship and sponsorship of that particular piece of legislation is unseemly, given that it locks in an existing advantage that the San Manuel Tribe has vis-à-vis its casino and that Assemblyman Ramos draws a considerable amount of money from the casino's operations.

Some have gone so far as to allege that Assemblyman Ramos's sponsorship of Assembly Bill 342 is a violation of both the California Fair Political Practices rules and California Government Code Section 87100.

According to the California Fair Political Practices Commission, "Under the California Political Reform Act, a public official has a disqualifying conflict of interest in a governmental decision if it is foreseeable that the decision will have a financial impact on his or her personal finances or other financial interests. In such cases, there is a risk of biased decision-making that could sacrifice the public's interest in favor of the official's private financial interests. To avoid actual bias or the appearance of possible improprieties, the public official is prohibited from participating in the decision."

Government Codes Section 87100 states, "A public official at any level of state or local government shall not make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use the public official's official position to influence a governmental decision in which the official knows or has reason to know the official has a financial interest."

The authoring, introducing and voting to approve Assembly Bill 342 has not been the only example of Assemblyman Ramos authoring legislation or engaging in official action as a legislator that provided, or was aimed at providing, the San Manuel Tribe/Yuhaaviatam Nation a benefit that was specialized in nature, that is, an advantage that benefited the tribe specifically along with a relative handful of other entities rather than the general public.

Last month Assemblyman Ramos outmaneuvered a fellow Democrat, Eloise Gómez Reyes, with regard to competing assembly bills relating to warehouses. Assemblywoman Reyes had authored Assembly Bill 1000, which called for restricting warehouses, if they are 100,000 square feet or larger, from being built within 1,000 feet of homes, hotels, schools, churches, medical facilities or any other places where people live, frequent or congregate for

any length of time. Assemblyman Ramos wrote and sponsored Assembly Bill 2840, which set the threshold for the size of warehouses to be regulated at 400,000 square feet and restricted them from being built any closer than 300 feet from homes, hotels, schools, churches, medical facilities and the like. Assemblyman Ramos is a member of the Assembly Local Government Committee, which in April took up dual consideration of AB 1000 and the less restrictive AB 1748. Ultimately, the Assembly Local Government Committee slammed the door shut on AB 1000 and allowed AB 1748 to progress to consideration by the full Assembly, where it now appears to be headed for passage.

The San Manuel Tribe owns warehouses and property slated for uses as warehouses in the area around Highland and San Bernardino, including ones that are proximate to homes and businesses closer than the 1,000-foot distance specified in Assemblywoman Gómez Reyes' Assembly Bill 1000. One of those warehouses encompasses 1.1 million square feet.

Additionally, the California Department of Water Resources and the United States Forest Service are mulling a proposal by the San Manuel Indian Tribe to trade 1,533.92 acres at various altitudes ranging 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 951 567 1936

Message Line 951-567 1936

approximately 5,200 feet to 7,000 feet in the San Bernardino Mountains owned by the tribe to the United States Forest Service for two parcels of federal land consisting of 1,475.90 acres located near the Arrowhead Springs Hotel at the approximate 2,000 foot elevation in the San Bernardino Mountain foothills. If that land trade goes through, it will provide the San Manuel Tribe with land across which and under which a substantial amount of water that originates in the San Bernardino Mountains flows into the Bunker Hill Basin water table, which supplies water to the East Valley Water District, the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District and the San Bernardino Municipal Water Department and more than 600,000 downstream users in the Santa Ana

River watershed. By taking control of the land in question, the tribe, which is considered a sovereign nation that is not subject to overriding U.S. law, California law and California water law, could dam or otherwise divert water with a future value running into the hundreds of millions of dollars and use it for its own purposes, while simultaneously denying those downstream users in the watershed access to that water.

On January 24, 2023, Assemblyman Ramos sent a letter in his capacity as a member of the California Assembly on his Assembly office stationery to the U.S. Forest Service in support of the proposed land swap.

There are people, including Assemblyman Ramos's constituents, who are troubled by what they say is a pattern of

Continued on Page 7

Over The Last 50 To 60 Years, San Bernardino County Politicians Have Refined The Art Of Taking Donations In Exchange For Governmental Action Into A Science *from front page*

project or contract. With the advent of Senate Bill 1439, that is no longer the case if the donation to the office holder exceeds \$249.99. In such a circumstance, the officeholder will have the option of returning the money to the donor and voting on the project in question or keeping the money and being unable to vote on any issue impacting that donor for a full year from the time of receiving the donation. Senate Bill 1439 was backed by multiple government reform and governmental transparency

supporters. California Common Cause Executive Director Jonathan Mehta Stein referred to the law as "an obvious pay-to-play limitation."

Indeed, over the last fifty to sixty years, California has become a so-called pay-to-play state in which it is expected that government employee unions, developers, real estate interests, land speculators, government contractors and suppliers are expected to provide political donations to the state's elected decision-makers, from the gover-

nor to state senators to members of the Assembly to members of county boards of supervisors to city and town council members to school board members to water district board members and fire district board members. That expectation in many cases goes beyond a simple anticipation that the money will be provided to a virtual requirement, such that approval of project applications, contracts and franchises are unlikely to occur in those cases where the developer, service or goods provider or franchisee making the application has not contributed to the powers that be. For decades government critics have pointed to this circum-

stance, decrying it as an ubiquitous demonstration of ongoing quid pro quos while they have accused the politicians benefiting by these donations of receiving bribes. Those seeking reform have pointed out that an appointed member of a planning commission who has run for office and in so doing received donations from a developer or landowner who then voted as a planning commissioner to approve a project proposed by that developer or on property owned by that landowner would be deemed to have broken the law. It is nonsensical, those reformists argue, to allow elected officials to engage in taking money from an individual or

company or corporation and permit the recipient to then vote on a matter in which that donor had a stake in the outcome of the vote.

Senate Bill 1439 is serving as the first step toward adjusting the perception that California's politicians can be bought.

While many reformers hailed the new law, nevertheless some reformers and critics find fault with certain of its elements and provisions. Many of those say it is unbalanced and incomplete. Senate Bill 1439 is applicable to neither members of the state legislature as recipients nor to unions as donors. Exceptions to both were cut out in the language of

Senate Bill 1439.

Perhaps because of the former of those two exceptions, Senate Bill 1439, touted as bipartisan in that it was co-authored by State Senator Steve Glazer, Democrat-Orinda, and State Senator Scott Wilk, Republican-Victorville, passed unanimously in the legislature in 2022 without any real expression of opposition.

The law went into effect on January 1, 2023, but in February, the Family Business Association of California, the California Restaurant Association, the California Retailers Association, the California Building Industry Association, the California

Continued on Page 8

Yucaipa Had Cruised Along For Generations As A Rustic Cattle Town That Was Gradually Acclimating Itself First To The 20th And Then The 21st Centuries, Balancing The Old With The New *from front page*

flourished, and the operators of one of those were the Jewish industrialist brothers Ruben and Lester Finkelstein. Over the years, the town of Yucaipa came into existence with the commercial district confining itself to a relatively narrow corridor around Yucaipa Boulevard as it wound its way toward the San Bernardino Mountains, with most of the rest of the city remaining as a rustic agricultural district or residential neighborhoods. It also became something of a retirement community, as a good number of older residents flocked to live in a host of mobile home parks that came to dot the landscape.

In 1972, while Yucaipa was still an unincorporated community, Crafton Hills College, built on 484 acres of ground donated by the Finkelstein Brothers opened. In this way, Yucaipa had become something of a combination of Old West, worldly, agricultural, mercantile, semi-rural and urban influences. In 1989, the city incorporated, the 22nd of the county's current 24 municipalities to do so.

Throughout its first 33 years of existence, the city's political leadership, for the most part, strove to keep the city's Old West, worldly, agricultural, mercantile, semi-rural and urban influences in balance. City officials – the city council and city staff – maintained a degree of stability throughout that time, demonstrated in the relatively low turnover on the city council and among employees at City Hall. For example, Dick Riddell, who was elected to the city council in 1994, remained on that panel until 2020, when he was defeated by Jon Thorp in his effort at being elected to the council representing District 5 upon the city transforming to council districts. Just before he left office, Riddell was then the second-longest serving elected official in

San Bernardino County.

From the outset and as is yet the case, Yucaipa did not and does not directly elect a mayor, but rather entrusts to the city council to choose from among its five members the individual who will be given that honorific. Such an arrangement had held in check, if not limiting entirely, any overt and accentuated show of egotism among the council members, as all, it seemed, evinced a show of cooperation and protocol by which the mayoralty would be shifted or rotated among the team in a cordial fashion as each member of the council remained in place long enough to master parliamentary procedure and Robert's Rules of Order.

With only a few rare exceptions, those elected to the council remained in place generally for as long as they sought to, with most electing to leave after two to three four-year terms, as the city's voters generally approved of the direction the council has taken the city in during the now third-of-a-century existence of the city government. Thus, with the exception of a few individuals, such as Riddell, city council members did not grow into institutions themselves but did become Yucaipa stalwarts who were nearly universally looked up to.

At the city staff level, as well, there has been relative stability. Typifying this was Ray Casey, the immediate past city manager.

A 1981 graduate of Princeton University, where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering, Casey worked in the private sector as a project manager for a construction company for three years and then from 1985 until 1991 was employed by Manitou Engineering in Escondido as a consulting engineer. In 1991, he began his career in the public sector as the principal engineer in the City

of Temecula's land development department. He departed California to go to work for the Isabella County Road Commission in Michigan as that entity's highway engineer and road commission manager. He was lured back to California, where he was employed as the development services deputy director and city engineer with the City of San Bernardino. In 2003, he left San Bernardino to become the public works director and city engineer with Yucaipa. In 2008, Casey was promoted to city manager.

Throughout his tenure in Yucaipa up until his last few weeks there, Casey was highly thought of by the majority of his political masters on the city council, and for the most part, he managed to steer the city around any major areas of controversy. Indeed, any missteps the city took during his tenure, to the degree such were made, were largely ones by members of the council rather than city staff. He was generally perceived as being competent, and his training and experience as an engineer heightened his value to the city.

Casey served on the League of California Cities' Inland Empire Executive Committee for three years, the League of California Cities' Housing, Community and Economic Development Committee for three years and he was the chairman of the City/County Manager Technical Advisory Committee for two years.

In October 2022, the city council consisted of Greg Bogh, who had been in office since 2010; Bobby Duncan, who had been on the city council since 2012; David Avila, who was first elected in 2014; and Jason Beaver and Jon Thorp, who had been on the council since 2020. Bogh and Avila had opted out of running for reelection and were not on the following month's ballot. There was, though it was not apparent to the public, uncertainty within the city council over how the attitude on the council as a whole might change with the election of two new members.

As it stood, there had been an excellent working relationship between Casey and Bogh, Avila and Thorp and seeming cooperativeness between Casey and Duncan and Beaver. With the November 2022 election approaching and the uncertainty over how that voting might go, Bogh and Avila felt it would be in the city's best interest to ensure the retention of Casey's services and at the last meeting in October they pushed to have the council as it was then composed consider giving Casey a bit more job security. The council unanimously voted to extend Casey's contract at least until June 30, 2024 and provide him with a 3 percent salary increase that would jump his annual salary to \$299,420, such that he would be making, when his benefits and perquisites were considered, \$422,901.50 in total annual compensation, putting him among the 25 highest-paid city managers in California.

To all appearances, it seemed, based on that vote, that Beaver and Duncan were wholeheartedly in favor of keeping Casey at the head of Yucaipa's management team. In actuality, however, both Beaver and Duncan had gone along with Bogh, Avila and Thorp on the issue because they recognized that even if they dissented, they would not prevail. So, rather than antagonizing Casey, they made a show of unanimity.

In the November 8, 2022 election, Matt Garner managed to finish first in the race to represent Yucaipa's First District, just ahead of second place finisher Sherilyn Long and well ahead of Mark Taylor and Erik Sahakian, who captured third and fourth place. Chris Venable captured first place in the Second District contest, defeating Nena Drago by a comfortable margin. In this way, Garner replaced Avila on the council and Venable supplanted Bogh when they were sworn into office in December.

Just a month after the newly composed council had been seated, on

Monday night, January 9, 2023, more than two dozen alarmed and agitated residents showed up for that night's council meeting because they were concerned that Casey and City Attorney David Snow were about to be axed, having been alerted by two items on the agenda for that evening's city council meeting relating to the performance evaluations of both.

Despite efforts by multiple anxious members of the crowd to talk the council out of the action those residents were led to believe its members were going to take, they were met with the assertion that Casey had tendered his resignation, that in that evening's closed session Beaver, Duncan and Garner had accepted that resignation and the entire city council had voted to give Snow the heave-ho.

During that closed session, the council was accompanied not by Snow but by another attorney, Stephen Graham. In the course of that closed session, the council voted to 5-to-0 to hire Graham as city attorney, effective immediately, and voted 4-to-1, with Thorp dissenting, to hire Chris Mann, the chairman of the Yucaipa Valley Water District Board of Directors to serve as city manager, effective March 1.

Mann and Graham were at that point the city manager and city attorney with the municipality of Canyon Lake. With Graham on hand for the meeting and Mann in the City Hall parking lot during the meeting, there were immediate accusations of a violation of The Ralph M. Brown Act, California's open public meeting law. The Brown Act prohibits a quorum of an elected governmental body or an appointed governmental body with decision-making authority from meeting, discussing any matter to be decided or voted upon or coming to a consensus in any way about a matter to be voted upon outside of a public forum. The Brown Act allows less than a quorum of an elected body – as in the case of the five-member Yucaipa City Council, two members – to meet

and discuss some contemplated action to be voted upon, but it prohibits either of those two members from engaging in a "serial" meeting of a quorum, whereby one of those members then separately meets with another member to discuss the upcoming action or vote.

Residents who were opposed to what they saw as Casey's forced departure reasoned that a Brown Act violation had to have taken place, as Graham was on hand for the meeting before he was hired as city attorney and, likewise, Mann was on the civic center grounds, in anticipation of the action the council ultimately took.

If Beaver, Duncan and Garner anticipated no or only mild objections among the public to jettisoning Casey, they grossly miscalculated. A press release they put out in which they justified the action the council majority took and beamed about the talents of Mann and Graham rang hollow for a large number of Yucaipa residents, particularly given that the release referenced the November election in which Beaver and Duncan noted that "the voters of Yucaipa elected two new members to the city council" and that "the council is taking decisive action to move Yucaipa forward" by "making changes to the city's executive leadership team." One of those newly elected council members, Chris Venable, had not gone along with sacking Casey, residents noted, and less than three months previously, Beaver and Duncan had voted to keep Casey in place for another year-and-a-half.

The intensity of outrage at Casey's firing did not, as Beaver, Duncan and Garner hoped, abate over the next several weeks. Rather, it appeared to intensify.

One public relations misstep followed another as the three members of the council sought to evade the growing wrath of their constituents.

In seeking to explain why the trio had settled on Mann as city manager

Continued on Page 5

Repeated Drug Offenses Led Adams Into A Jail Cell Where He Met His Killer *from front page*

Lopez was not granted release on his own recognizance, as might otherwise have occurred. Rather, he was held in lieu of \$80,000 bond, an amount neither he nor his family was able to arrange.

On May 11, Adams was arrested on suspicion of making criminal threats of inflicting great bodily injury and resisting arrest, based on a March 16 incident. Both Adams and Hernandez-Lopez have extensive arrest records and criminal histories that involve violence and threats of serious violence. Both were subjected to psychological evaluations at one point or other during their multiple incarcerations, with Adams' mental capacity at one point having been determined to put himself and others at risk. Despite those considerations, jailers at the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department's West Valley Detention Center in Rancho Cucamonga housed them in the same jail cell.

A deputy found Adams lying unresponsive on the floor of his cell at about 4:54 a.m. May 21. Emergency medical staff who were on standby at the jail were unable to revive him and he was pronounced dead on the spot.

Adams has a highly repetitive criminal record consisting of over 35 mostly drug-related arrests, intersticed with occasional acts of violence or theft, and a string of failures to appear in court with regard to previous arrests and/or citations.

On May 11, 2023, he was picked up with regard to a misdemeanor contempt of court/disobeying a court order charge dated March 16 of this year, at which point he engaged in misdemeanor obstructing a police officer and resisting arrest, which was compounded by a felony, what the arresting Upland Police Department officers characterized as

making criminal threats which if fulfilled would lead to great bodily injury or death. On May 12 he entered a plea on that matter and was awaiting a final disposition.

Adams' criminal activity extends back two decades but in the last two years had intensified as his use of controlled substances increased.

On August 22, 2003, he was arrested for misdemeanor being in possession of a controlled substance. He pleaded guilty to that charge on September 9, 2003.

On May 23, 2015, he was charged with misdemeanor being drunk in public. That charge was later dismissed.

On February 28, 2016, he was arrested for misdemeanor making criminal threats. That case was dismissed on March 10, 2016, subject to a guilty plea to a charge of having engaged in misdemeanor battery on February 28, 2016. For that, he was sentenced to 12 days in jail.

He was charged with felonious false imprisonment and making threats of great bodily injury in an incident that occurred on August 27, 2016. On June 1, 2017 he pleaded guilty to false imprisonment and the other charge was dropped.

Adams was accused of having engaged in misdemeanor battery on November 2, 2020, along with misdemeanor battery against a police officer and felony assault with a deadly weapon other than a firearm likely to cause great bodily injury. On November 18, 2020, he pleaded guilty to the felony and the misdemeanors were dismissed.

On February 18, 2022, he was arrested in Upland for being in possession of a controlled substance. That case was later dismissed.

On February 21, 2022, Adams was arrested for being under the influence of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

On April 4, 2022, Adams was arrested for being in possession of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1,

2022.

On May 30, 2022, he was arrested for being in the possession of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

On July 15, 2022, he was arrested for being under the influence of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on November 17, 2022.

On August 7, 2022, he was arrested in Ontario for being drunk in public. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

On August 9, Adams was arrested for being under the influence of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

On August 14, 2022, Adams was arrested for being under the influence of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

On August 18, 2022, Adams was arrested for being under the influence of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

He was charged with obstructing or resisting a police officer on August 19, 2022. That charge was yet pending against him at the time of his death.

On August 25, 2022, Adams was arrested for being under the influence of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

On September 2, 2022, he was arrested in Rialto for misdemeanor being drunk in public. On December 1, that charge was dismissed.

On September 24, 2022, he was arrested in Upland for misdemeanor being under the influence of a controlled substance. The charge was dismissed on December 1, 2022.

He was arrested for being under the influence of a controlled substance on November 3, 2022 and again on November 6, 2022. Those charges were dismissed on February 7 of this year.

He was arrested in Upland for engaging in misdemeanor obstructing/resisting a police of-

ficer on November 27, 2022. He pleaded guilty to that charge on December 1, 2022 and was given 30 days in jail.

Typically, what would happen with Adams is he was charged with drug-related offenses, would fail to appear, and eventually be arrested and go to court, at which time he would enter a guilty plea to one charge or another and the remainder of charges outstanding against him would be dismissed, in the court's parlance, "in the interest of justice."

He was arrested for being under the influence on February 23, 2022; February 25, 2022; February 3, 2022; February 17, 2020; February 2, 2020; November 2, 2019; June 14, 2019; November 4, 2018; June 15, 2018; May 19, 2018; April 15, 2016; June 6, 2007; January 6, 2015 and June 1, 2012.

Adams was arrested for being in possession of a controlled substance or paraphernalia on April 9, 2022; February 2, 2022, May 24, 2020, September 28, 2018 and August 10, 2016.

On October 29, 2020, he was arrested for theft of personal property. That charge was later dismissed.

Some of those dealing with Adams, including those in the court system, recognized Adams was not right in the head.

At one point during his incarceration and prosecution, doubt about his mental health was declared and the proceedings were suspended so that a medical commission could look into the matter. Adams was ushered to Dr. David Walsh, a psychiatrist for an examination.

Despite that declaration, during the incarceration that led to Adams' death, the sheriff's department housed him with another violent offender about whose mental competency the court had similar misgivings.

Lopez-Hernandez, who was less than half Adams' age, had fewer arrests than Adams, though in Lopez-Hernandez's case, there was a similarity to the type of charges that had been lodged against Adams.

With Lopez-Hernandez, the numeric ratio of violent offenses to drug offenses was greater than with Adams.

It was alleged that on February 29, 2016, the then 19-year-old engaged in vandalism and creating a disturbance by means of loud and excessive noise. He appeared in court on the matter one day less than a year later, on February 28, 2017, where he pleaded not guilty. On April 11, 2017, he accepted a guilty plea on a disturbance of the peace offense and was given probation. The vandalism charge was dismissed.

On February 4, 2017, Lopez-Hernandez was arrested in Upland for felony making criminal threats likely to result in great bodily injury or death and using a deadly weapon. On February 9, 2017, he pleaded not guilty to the charges. On April 11, 2017, the charges were dismissed.

On July 13, 2017, Lopez-Hernandez was arrested for being in possession of a controlled substance while armed with a loaded firearm, making a purchase of a salable amount of narcotics and being in possession of narcotics for sale. On March 13, 2019, he pleaded no contest to all three charges.

On August 26, 2019, Lopez-Hernandez was arrested for being drunk in public. On December 18, 2019, he entered a guilty plea to that charge.

On January 31, 2021, he was arrested in Upland for misdemeanor tampering with a vehicle, misdemeanor vandalism and resisting arrest when he was taken into custody. On February 9, 2021, he entered no contest pleas to the vandalism and resisting arrest charges, and was given a 32-day jail sentence.

September 26, 2021, he was arrested for burglary and three counts of obstructing or resisting police officers as he was taken into custody. On September 29, 2021, he pleaded not guilty to all four charges but on May 26, 2022 he entered a guilty plea on the burglary charge and was sentenced to 488 days in jail, including the nearly

8 months he had already been incarcerated.

On March 29, 2023, according to court records, Lopez-Hernandez was engaged in the theft of personal property when he was confronted by an Upland police officer. In the course of his arrest, it is alleged he engaged in felony resistance and obstruction of a police officer and a felony attempt to remove a firearm from the police officer.

Lopez-Hernandez is charged with killing Adams on May 21. He was formally charged with murder on May 24. He is scheduled for a pre-preliminary hearing before Judge Richard Peel V on May 31 in Department R15 and for a preliminary hearing on June 5, also in Department R15.

During the course of his prosecution on the burglary and three resisting arrest charges stemming from the September 26, 2021 incident in Montclair, the court subjected Lopez-Hernandez to a medical evaluation by a psychiatrist.

The sheriff's department has not offered, nor is it likely to offer, an explanation of why Lopez-Hernandez and Adams were housed in the same cell.

The department has long struggled with just how to deal with recurrent inmate-on-inmate violence within its jail system.

Through happenstance and trial and error, the department learned that chemical sedation of a percentage of the jail population most prone to violence offered at least a partial solution to this dilemma.

By the late 1980s, it was recognized that relatively low dosages of a combination of methamphetamine and heroin, variously referred to as a speedball or screwball, rendered individuals using it complacent. By the early 1990s, the denizens of San Bernardino County's jails could purchase through the holding institutions' concession machines a methamphetamine-heroin blend, known as "jailhouse mix." As the means to inject the sub-

Continued on Page 6

Lulling The Community Into Thinking They Had Accepted Casey As Yucaipa's Guide Into The Future, Beaver & Duncan Joined With Council Newcomer Garner To Hand Him His Walking Papers At the First Opportunity *from page 3*

to replace Casey, Beaver alluded to Mann's status as the president of the Yucaipa Valley Water District Board of Directors, referenced Mann's knowledge of the community based upon his residence in the city and asserted Mann "has the right relationships to help our city work collaboratively throughout the region for the benefit of Yucaipa residents."

Almost simultaneously, it was pointed out that Mann is the principal in Mann Communications, which according to the company's own website functions in the main as a representative of developers and development interests seeking to move building proposals past the planning process and get them approved. Mann Communications specializes in, according to the firm's website, making sure that "elected officials are... provided the political cover they need in order to support good projects" to "provide our clients with a wealth of knowledge and experience and a winning approach to land use entitlement. Mann Communications Principal Chris Mann has been an active partner in numerous development projects in California, Nevada and Arizona. Having worked both as an elected official and as a developer, he uniquely understands the development process from both the public and private perspectives. Understanding the practices and motivations of each side better than most, he is able to provide tremendous value to the entire development process, making Mann Communications an invaluable member of any project team."

Highly troubling to many Yucaipa residents was that Mann, even as he was working as the city manager of Canyon Lake, overseeing the regulatory process of that city's land use decision-making and plan-

ning functions, he was simultaneously working for and accepting money from developmental interests, the very entities he was supposed to be regulating. Yucaipa residents needed to go no further than Mann Communications' website to glimpse those development interests – residential developers Lennar, Pardee, Meritage Homes and Richmond American, builders Holland Development, Jacobsen Family Holdings, Turner Dale, Rotkin Real Estate Group, Carlton Properties and AES Corporation, Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse, Inc., Clear Channel Outdoor, BrightSource, Preferred Business Properties Real Estate Services, Beaumont Garden Center, Passantino Andersen, Robertson's Cement, Oakmont Industrial Group, The Golshan Group and Desmond & Louis Incorporated.

It was not lost on a wide cross section of Yucaipa residents that Duncan was a real estate agent. Previously, on a city council made up of individuals embodying a variety professional classes, allowing the real estate industry a seat at the table was not perceived as being problematic. What it looked like at that point, however, was that Duncan had put Mann in place to boost the prospect of more and more development in Yucaipa, in turn increasing his ability to sell houses and make money.

It was widely recognized that Casey had an intense and intimate understanding of the need for matching any incoming development with adequate infrastructure, the cost for which had to be defrayed either by the developer or the city's taxpayers and that he was capable of serving as not only an honest broker between pro-development and anti-development forces and sentiments within the community

but advocating for and insisting that project proponents be financially responsible for the infrastructure and off-site improvements that must accompany their development efforts. Casey, it seemed, had gotten into somebody's, or several somebodies', way. With his forced exit, there arose an instantaneous perception that Beaver, Duncan and Garner had ditched him in favor of Mann, who would have the city adopt an absolute open-door planning and development process by which the city's largely rural nature would come under increasing threat and the balance that had long been maintained between its Old West, worldly, agricultural, mercantile, semi-rural and urban influences was to be discarded and replaced by subdivision after subdivision that would make Yucaipa indistinguishable from scores or even hundreds of other cities in Southern California that are now composed, practically, of wall-to-wall houses.

Uncharitable word spread to the effect that Beaver, Duncan and Garner were in the pocket of the development industry and that they were on the take.

Throughout February and into March and then April, a core group of Yucaipa residents who were caught flatfooted in January when Casey's resignation materialized as a fait accompli, began coordinating a response that they were hopeful might reverse the momentum that was threatening to slide the entirety of the city into what was for them a deep and dark abyss.

On April 17, the first major test of what developmental standards the City of Yucaipa will live up to under Mann's guidance as city manager took place when the city council held a special public hearing to consider the Serrano Estates Project, to be located in the area referred to as the North Bench, along the east side of Yucaipa Ridge Road, north of Ivy Avenue, directly adjacent to Quartz Street and Crystal Street. The project site, consisting

of undeveloped property, bears Rural Living or RL-1 zoning, which calls for single family homes on lot sizes of at least one acre. The property falls within Yucaipa's Custom Home (CH) Overlay District, in which cookie-cutter subdivisions typical of urban areas are discouraged. The area is likewise surrounded by low density zones.

Some residents have suggested that the official proponent of the project, Premium Land Development, and Premium Land's principal, Craig Heaps, have not lived up to either the spirit or the letter of the one-acre lot minimum inherent in RL-1 zoning with the way the Serrano Estates proposal calls for containing twelve of the acres on the project's "Lot 52" and designating another 13 acres as "permanent open space" on which vineyards and other landscaping will be set. In this way, the critics said, the 51 developed lots will actually be compressed on 27 acres, such that the lots now being developed will be more like 23,061.17 square feet or 0.529 of an acre. This leaves open the possibility that in the future, when memories have faded and there have been personnel changes on the city council, Premium Land and Heaps will come in with another proposal to develop the 12-acre Lot 52 or perhaps the combined 25 acres consisting of Lot 52 and the area's open space.

The overwhelming majority of the public speakers at the April 17 special meeting went on record against the project, including former Planning Commission Chairwoman Denise Work and former Planning Commissioner Dennis Miller. Only two public speakers expressed support of the proposal.

The city council, nonetheless, found persuasive Heaps' insistence that "This is not a high-density project. This is 51 homes on 52 acres, no matter the size of the lots. It is not high density."

Beaver, perhaps mindful that he was already on thin ice because of the Casey sacking, joined with Councilman

Jon Thorp in opposing the project. Duncan and Garner joined with Venable in giving the project a thumbs up.

Some suggested that Beaver was in support of the project as well, but that he voted against it in the knowledge that it had three votes without his support.

On April 24, Sheryl Long, representing residents in District 1, Steve Maurer, representing residents in District 3, and George Sardeson, representing residents in District 4, came to Yucaipa Hall, where they filed a notice of intention to circulate recall petitions against Garner, Duncan and Beaver, respectively.

To the extent that Beaver, Duncan and Garner now represent the current establishment in Yucaipa, the establishment has hit back at the recall proponents with uncommon virulence.

Generally speaking, recall efforts in California are rarely successful. That is because the bar to qualify a recall question against officeholders in the Golden State is very high. Under California law, to qualify a recall against a city council member wherein the number of registered voters eligible to vote for that position total between 1,000 and 10,000, as is the case in all of Yucaipa's council districts, the valid signatures of 25 percent of the current registered voters must be obtained. The consideration that Yucaipa switched from an at-large voting system to a by-district system in 2016 makes qualifying a recall effort against a councilmember in that city one-fifth as formidable as it was previously. Recall proponents, nevertheless, face a daunting task.

Given that District 1 in Yucaipa has 7,300 registered voters, to qualify a vote on recalling Garner, recall proponents must gather the signatures of at least 1,825 registered voters in District 1.

Given that there are 5,913 registered voters in District 3, to qualify a vote on recalling Duncan, recall proponents must gather the signatures of at least 1,479

registered voters in District 3.

Given that District 4 has 6,489 voters, to qualify a vote on recalling Beaver, recall proponents must gather the signatures of at least 1,623 registered voters in District 4.

Even as the pro-recall group is arraying its forces, those seeking to prevent Beaver, Duncan and Garner from being removed from office have undertaken action designed to deflate the recall effort. That is notable from the standpoint that in most cases, recall efforts burn out on their own. Oftentimes, the intensity of initial outrage or motivation that leads to a recall effort fades with time, and such efforts die from a lack of steam. Even where sufficient animus toward a particular officeholder exists to bounce him or her from office, doing so within the six-month or 180-day deadline for gathering those signatures by a relatively small number of signature gatherers proves to be an insurmountable task.

Historically, in both California generally and San Bernardino County specifically, fewer than one fourth of the recall efforts that are initiated make it onto the ballot and fewer than one fifth of such efforts succeed in actually removing the individual targeted from office. In the last decade, recall efforts that were initiated in San Bernardino County included ones in Upland, Fontana, Victorville and Hesperia. All came to naught.

Initially upon the filing of the intent to circulate recall petitions in Yucaipa, those aligned with Beaver, Duncan and Garner circulated an open letter ostensibly addressed to those who signed the intent to circulate the recall petitions but which were distributed to voters throughout the city, making the point that "Your personal information was obtained from the Yucaipa/Calimesa News Mirror [Yucaipa's local newspaper]. This information was published by the Save Yucaipa Coalition after you signed

Continued on Page 7

Byron Waters Used Sleight Of Hand To Get BlueTriton's Corporate Predecessor Clearance To Divert Forest Water from front page

water rights at those facilities is challenged.

For more than 80 years, several companies bottling water under brands incorporating the Arrowhead name, including 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, took water out

of Strawberry Canyon without any validly established rights to that water. While there had been a water bottling operation using the Arrowhead name prior to 1930 that drew 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 the 2,000-foot elevation below the San Bernardino National Forest, Charles Anthony, general manager of the bottling operation and vice president of Arrowhead Springs Corporation and acting president of the Arrowhead Springs resort property in the

1920s and 1930s, through sleight of hand made what has through an exhaustive search of historic records been determined to have been an illegal shift by which his company began taking water higher up the mountain in the National Forest. That diversion has continued, and formed the basis by which BlueTriton Brands, by purchasing the Arrowhead Bottling Water operation from Nestlé, was as recently as last year drafting up to 196 acre-feet of water from Strawberry Canyon.

In 1928, Anthony entered into talks with California Consumers Co., parent of California Consolidated Waters Co., regarding the sale of the Arrowhead water bottling operations. In exchange for a \$100,000 commission, Anthony executed the deal, in so

doing providing a warranty title of water rights.

The water rights conveyed in this transaction consisted of nothing more than an unsupported assertion of those rights made up by Anthony's lawyer on the spot.

Arrowhead was required to provide a warranty title of water rights. Arrowhead Springs attorney and former California Assemblyman Byron Water wrote a letter in which these "water rights" were manufactured. In a letter dated February 14, 1929, Byron Waters, as the legal representative for the Arrowhead Hot Springs property, asserted that water rights "belonging to the company" were to be sold as part of the deal, without providing any documentary proof to the effect that Arrowhead Hot Springs Resort

owned the rights.

The California Consolidated Waters Company was formed in 1929 for the purpose of purchasing the Arrowhead Water bottling operation from the Arrowhead Springs Hotel. The purchase merged three Los Angeles-based companies that bottled and distributed "Arrowhead Water," "Puritas Water" and "Liquid Steam." The property, bottling operations, water distribution and administration of Arrowhead Springs Company, Arrowhead Puritas and the water bottling division of Merchants Ice and Storage were all administered by California Consolidated Waters Company, which was owned by the California Consumers Com-

pany. California Consolidated Waters, on the basis of

a single pipeline permit that was not based on any water rights and without having obtained a diversion permit, in August 1930 started diverting spring water from a single "bedrock crevice" spring in the San Bernardino National Forest along Strawberry Creek at an elevation of 5,600 feet. Subsequently, in 1933 and 1934, the company put in place tunnels, ultimately accompanied by holes and horizontal wells at or near the headwaters of Strawberry Creek in Strawberry Canyon. Strawberry Creek was noted in maps and springs studies prior to diversion to be a perennial stream which was fed by abundant flowing headwaters springs.

It was the seller Arrowhead Springs Corporation, not the United *Continued on Page 8*

Somewhat Negligently, The Sheriff's Department Put A Trash-Talking Middle Aged Man Whose Heavy Drug Use Had Left Him Vulnerable Into A Confined Cell With A Violent Offender 30 Years His Junior from page 4

stance was not available inside the sheriff's detention facilities, inmates could either snort or smoke it, although snorting, or inhaling, it was discouraged because that was considered too conspicuous. Also available from the jails' concession machines at that time were cigarettes. Inmates would remove a portion of the tobacco, sprinkle into it the jailhouse mix, and then repack the methamphetamine-and-heroin-saturated tobacco into the cigarettes before smoking the re-rolls. Almost instantly and for several hours, the smoker would be rendered into a docile, non-confrontational state.

That approach toward controlling the behavior of the inmate population elapsed later in the 1990s when smoking in the jails was banned.

The modern method of reducing violence in its jails used by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department consists of relying on the administration of prescribed psychoactive drugs to render problematic elements of the inmate population within the jail system manageable. San Ber-

nardino County's jailers dole out a host of psychoactive drugs to inmates, including sedatives, tranquilizers or anti-psychotic agents.

The inmates commonly refer to these drugs as Skittles, because of their coloration and visual similarity to the fruit-flavored candy produced by the William Wrigley Jr. Candy Company. Not all of the inmates are amenable to being administered these drugs, which leave those taking them in a zombie-like or near catatonic state.

The *Sentinel* has been told by inmates at the West Valley Detention Center that it is a common practice for jailers to monitor those housed in their units for any signs of aggression or hostility. If inmates fight or engage merely in the exchange of angry words with one another, they will be sent for counseling by one of the jail's psychiatrists. Commonly, the psychiatrist prescribes for the inmates one of several drugs, including Thorazine. Inmates who prove uncooperative and refuse to take the medication prescribed to them are then routinely confronted

by the jail guards who let it be known that if the inmate refuses to take the prescribed medication, privileges for all inmates in that dormitory – phone access, day room, yard access, exercise facilities and television – will be cut off. This inevitably results in the intransigent inmate being confronted by his fellow prisoners who insist that he simply relent and take his Skittles. Those who yet refuse will be met with threats of violence or actual violence, which the guards overlook. In this way, administration of the behavior-modifying medication in the jail is achieved.

Though the intensity and full range of effect of the various types of drugs used in this fashion can vary individual to

individual, they generally achieve the desired results from the department's standpoint. Inmates have told the *Sentinel* that they have both willingly and reluctantly complied with taking the drugs they were supplied while incarcerated at the West Valley Detention Center and other county jails and holding facilities. One inmate told the *Sentinel* that he found the side effects of Thorazine particularly objectionable.

He said the drug left "me basically in a tongue-tied, slobbering, invalid state."

The *Sentinel* is aware of at least some circumstances involving inmates whose psychiatric case files kept by the department contain no documentation or certification indicating that

the dosages of drugs they were prescribed were indicated by their condition or appropriate. For that reason, the county, the department, the San Bernardino County Department of Behavioral Health, the psychiatrists the sheriff's department contracts with and the healthcare corporations which employ those psychiatrists have steadfastly refused over the last seven years to discuss the practice of administering psychoactive drugs to inmates in the jails either with those inmates' consent or against their will.

Given the affinity that Lopez-Hernandez and Adams both had for drugs, it may not have been advisable to prescribe either of them the sedatives, tranquilizers or anti-psychotic agents

the department normally relies upon. It is not actually known whether or not Lopez-Hernandez and Adams were being medicated during their recent incarceration and the days leading up to and the day of Adams' death.

What is known is that the department chose to house the 5-foot 11-inch 190 pound 26-year-old Lopez-Hernandez, who has a history of making threats of killing or doing great bodily injury to some of those he encounters, with Adams, who has himself threatened others with similar acts of violence. The *Sentinel* is told that Lopez-Hernandez got the drop on Adams and slammed him to the concrete floor of their cell, killing him.

–Mark Gutglueck

Homeless Man Who Lit Another On Fire Had A Criminal Record from front page

Previously, on May 24, 2021, Patty denied and pleaded not guilty to felony use of a deadly weapon and engaging in felony criminal threats that would potentially result in great bodily injury or death stemming from the same incident that occurred on May 20, 2021. Both charges were dismissed in the inter-

est of justice on May 20, 2022.

On September 30, 2009, Patty pleaded no contest to reckless driving, stemming from an incident on November 11, 2007 for which he had been charged with driving under the influence, being in possession of a controlled substance and reckless driving in an unincorporated county area. The possession and being under the influence charges were dropped.

On September 20, 2012, charges against Patty of being under the

influence of a controlled substance and being under the influence while driving in an unincorporated county area, stemming from a June 10, 2012 incident, were dropped.

On July 1, 2016 charges of theft of personal property and burglary against Patty based on his action on April 24, 2015 in Barstow were dismissed.

On July 1, 2016, he entered a guilty plea to driving under the influence in the unincorporated area of the county

on May 29, 2014, another charge of driving under the influence in Victorville on October 27, 2014, and a third charge of driving under the influence on Christmas Day 2015. On July 1, 2016, a charge against Patty of being drunk in public in Barstow on July 4, 2016 was dismissed in the interest of justice. On November 3, 2016, a charge of being drunk in public that stemmed from an incident on June 1, 2016 was dismissed in the interest of justice.

–Mark Gutglueck

Ramos Is So Politically & Financially Powerful He Can Do Just About Anything He Wants

from page 2

the assemblyman authoring, introducing or sponsoring legislation and otherwise taking action in his capacity as a state legislator which benefits himself, either directly or indirectly, as a member of the San Manuel Indian Tribe.

Ramos was elected to the Assembly in 2018. While the structure of California's term limits for state legislators previously limited an individual to three two-year terms or six years in the Assembly and two four-year terms or eight years in the State Senate, changes put in place more than a decade ago now impose a 12-year total limit on state legislators, such that an officeholder can serve all twelve years in the Assembly, all twelve years in the State Senate or a combination of four or eight years in one body and four or eight years in the other house. Ramos thus has the option of remaining in the Assembly through 2030 if he so chooses and his constituents cooperate by re-electing him. It appears that may be his goal, since in doing so, he has an outside chance at ac-

ceding to the ultimate position in the California Legislature, that of speaker of the Assembly. He is a Democrat in the Democrat-dominated atmosphere of Sacramento. At present, as the chairman of the Assembly Rules Committee and a member of the powerful Assembly Local Government Committee, he is the fifth-ranking member of California's lower legislative house. There are four members of the Assembly, Democrats all, who outrank him: Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, Speaker Pro Tem Christopher Ward, Assistant Speaker Pro Tem Stephanie Nguyen and Assembly Majority Leader Eloise Gómez Reyes.

Gómez Reyes represents no obstacle to him in his potential climb into the speaker's position, as she is to leave the Assembly at the end of her current term, since she will be vying for the State Senate in 2024.

Likewise, Nguyen is not likely to stand in Ramos's way. She is certainly an up-and-comer in the Democratic Party and the Assembly. She was first elected to the Assembly in 2022 and therefore will likely be around for a while. Her placement into the assistant speaker pro tem position, however, is a function of her close association with Rendon

rather than across-the-board strength among the state's Democratic Party.

The two true challenges to Ramos's prospects for seizing the brass ring of the speakership consist of Rendon and Ward. Rendon came into the Assembly two years prior to Ramos, in 2016, which means he can remain in the Assembly, if he chooses, through 2028. If he does, he has the inside track on remaining the speaker until 2028, and that would pretty much prevent Ramos from getting to that post until, at best, his last two years in office. He then would need to climb over Ward, who was first elected to the Assembly in 2020 and would be, by at least some calculations, the heir apparent after having served as speaker pro tem for so long.

There is a possibility, however, that Rendon will leave the Assembly in 2024 to make a run for the State Senate, just as Ward might do the same. If both Rendon and Ward depart the Assembly next year, that would set Ramos up as the odds-on favorite to become speaker. If Rendon leaves the Assembly and Ward remains, Ramos might have to duke it out with Ward to take ultimate control of the Democratic Party in the legislature. With his wealth and that of

his tribal allies, however, Ramos has the reach to endow tens or dozens of other Democrats in the Assembly with campaign donations, which might leave them more inclined to support him rather than Ward as speaker.

Ramos's actual power and prospect toward achieving more power makes it highly unlikely that anyone – other politicians or prosecutors in the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office or the California Attorney General's Office – will challenge him over his carrying legislation or voting on legislation that has the effect of benefiting his tribe or himself personally.

In the aftermath of the January 24, 2023 letter Ramos sent to the U.S. Forest Service in support of the proposed land swap between the Yuhaaviatam Nation and the Forest Service, some local citizens on February 28 lodged a complaint pertaining to Ramos with the Special Committee on Legislative Ethics and its chief counsel, Adam Silver. That complaint alleged the January 24 letter represented violations of California Government Code Sections 87100 and 87103, specifically that he had used his position as a California Assemblyman to support the land exchange while he is a member of

the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation, which will profit by the trade.

So far, at least, there has been no action taken as a result of that complaint.

Assemblyman Ramos's substantial personal wealth, the wealth of other members of the tribe, the influence of the tribe with public officials, particularly within the context of San Bernardino County, and Ramos's status as a member of the California Legislature leave those who have objections to the way in which he is using the power in his possession to his advantage reluctant to confront him publicly. Since the passage of Assembly Bill 342, the Sentinel has spoken with four individuals of substance in the San Bernardino County establishment, including former elected officials and a senior governmental official, all of whom expressed disapproval of way in which Ramos was using his legislative reach to enrich himself and his fellow tribe members. One of those called what Ramos is doing "blatantly illegal." Another agreed but said that San Bernardino County District Attorney Jason Anderson lacked the character or the fortitude to make an issue of it. One of the other two opined that what the assemblyman is doing is

"unethical as hell."

None of the four, however, was willing to speak on the record.

The Sentinel sought from Ramos and his official spokeswoman, Maria Lopez, input on the controversy his sponsorship of Assembly Bill 342 and the benefit it confers on the Yuhaaviatam Nation has stirred up. The Sentinel received no response by press time.

A defense of Ramos's sponsorship of Assembly Bill 341 came from an unlikely source: his Republican opponent in the 2018 Assembly race, Henry Nickel, who was then a San Bernardino City Councilman.

Nickel noted that Ramos and the rest of the California legislature are working within the context of the "regulatory framework over gambling in general. The reality is that casino gambling is more manageable than on-line gambling. On-line gambling is a big issue," he said, noting that the casino industry is being threatened by the opportunity for people to place bets over the internet.

Nickel said Indian tribes had been granted a national gambling franchise to make up for centuries of oppression.

"I believe we have a responsibility to make good on the promises we made to the tribal com-

Continued on Page 15

Three Council Targets & Current Top Staff Are Using City Hall's Gravitas To Fight Recall

from page 5

a petition of 'Notice of Intent to Recall' for one of our councilmen. Your name and signature is now available to anyone anywhere this newspaper is distributed. It also means your information can be shared with others on the internet who may not have your best interest in mind. You should have been advised of this legal requirement before you signed the petition. Were you?"

The letter's intent, it appears, is to dissuade any of the city's voters in the Garner's District 1,

Duncan's District 3 and Beaver's District 4 from signing the petition lest they, too, have their personal information compromised.

"Protect yourself," the letter states. "Don't allow your personal information to be made public. Don't trust your personal information to a group of people who are misleading the citizens of Yucaipa and appear to be negligent with the security of the information they collect. There is no basis in truth to any of the accusations being made against our city councilmen. There are a lot of embellishments and opinions, but no truth to them. The statement on the petition you signed is false. When you placed your signature on the petition you endorsed

a false statement on an official document."

The letter further states, "Save Yucaipa Coalition is using the services of Chris Robles, a far-left political operative. Mr. Robles has served as the San Bernardino County Democratic Party Central Committee chair [i.e., chairman]. He was removed from this office for violating his own party's rules."

Connecting the recall effort with a Democrat follows from the consideration that Yucaipa overall is one of the most heavily Republican areas in San Bernardino County in terms of voter registration. Of the city's 33,967 voters, 16,154 or 47.6 percent are Republicans and 8,757 or 25.8 percent are Democrats.

Another 6,001 voters or 17.7 percent have no party affiliation, while 8.9 percent of the city's electorate are members of the American Independent, Green Libertarian, Peace & Freedom or other more obscure parties.

In District 1, 3,741 or 51.2 percent of 7,300 voters there are registered Republicans, with 1,704 or 23.3 percent registered as Democrats. In District 3, 2,382 or 40.3 percent of 5,913 voters are Republicans and 1,790 or 30.3 are Democrats. In District 4, 3,065 or 47.2 percent of 6,489 voters identify with the Party of Lincoln and 1,688 or 26.0 percent affiliate with the Democrats.

More recently, the supporters of the three members of the city council under attack co-

opted the support of Ana Sauseda, who in March was promoted to the position of city clerk under Mann, replacing Kimberly Metzler, who had been the city clerk under Casey.

In her capacity as city clerk, Sauseda, represented by the Los Angeles-based Sutton Law Firm and its attorneys Bradley W. Hertz and Eli B. Love, filed suit in the form of a writ of mandate in San Bernardino County Superior Court against George Sardeson, Cheryl Sardeson, Frances Fields, Frances Finely Fields, Debra Wilson, Robert Otto, Daniel Wilson, Bonnie Farris, Edwin Morgan, William Cooper, Sara Cooper, Debra Studley, Dennis Studley, April Klein, William Klein, Jean

Kielhold, Jamie Peterson, Kenneth D. Rolf Jr., Janis Waltman, Lori S. Waltman, Jimmy Distler, Jennece Distler, Rickey Chanter, Lawrence Anderson, Helen Anderson, Kent Miller, Lloyd Reksstad, Patricia Smoll, Donald Saenz, Cheryl Saenz, Thomas Powell, Bonita Powell, Katina Mohler, Kristine Mohler, John Mohler, Robert Henderson, Sandra Henderson, Frank Jubala, Patricia Jubala, Thomas Ziech, Timothy Ryan, Elizabeth Grimes, Scott Smith, Lois Crosby, Gayle Crosby, Lyndi Norkin, Sergey Norkin, Valarie Peterson, Margaret Padron, Baltimore Padron Jr, Jim Peterson, Susan Wamsley, David Knopp, Brenda Knopp, Johanne Dyerly, Stephen Dyerly, Patricia

Continued on Page 9

Some Went To Prison When They Grew Too Comfortable & Presumptuous With The County's Pay-To-Play Ethos *from page 2*

Business Properties Association, the California Business Roundtable, the Sacramento Regional Builders Exchange, the California Manufacturers & Technology Association, Rancho Cordova City Councilman Garrett Gatewood and Sacramento County Supervisor Pat Hume filed suit in Sacramento Superior Court, seeking to stop the implementation of the law, alleging it improperly altered the California Political Reform Act, was overly broad and infringed on free speech protections related to the right to petition governments. According to the suit, the law discourages and prevents citizens, business interests, companies and employees of those companies from supporting those seeking local political office.

Simultaneously, criticism of the law was being registered elsewhere, particularly because of its lack of applicability to public employee unions.

The two largest categories of donors to local politicians consist of developers and public employee unions. Government reformers have long maintained that California's politicians have proven themselves

to be more sympathetic to developmental interests and public employees, who supply those officeholders with the lion's share of the money they need to influence voters to vote for them, than they are to their constituents who actually do the voting. This has resulted, those critics allege, in government watering down the regulation applied to the building industry and the runaway escalation in salaries and benefits provided to county and municipal employees throughout the state.

While Senate Bill 1439 carries with it the potential that it will check the influence of the development community, those critics maintain, it will do nothing to lessen, and in actuality will increase, the hold that public employee unions have over local politicians now that those unions will become the undisputed major source of donations to elected officials, such that the inflation of public employee salaries will continue unabated.

In his decision rendered yesterday, Judge Sueyoshi rejected the lawsuit's contention that Senate Bill 1439's provision prohibiting elected officials from voting on matters that impact donors to their campaigns was inconsistent with the rights of California citizens enumerated in the U.S. Constitution and the California Constitution.

"The United States Supreme Court has rec-

ognized that preventing quid pro quo corruption or its appearance is a compelling state interest," Sueyoshi wrote. "Defendants have provided sufficient evidence that SB 1439 sought to address this corruption by eliminating an exception for local elected officials in the legislative history."

If indeed, California's reputation as a pay-to-play jurisdiction is well deserved, San Bernardino County is at the epicenter of that culture.

So ingrained is the concept that those seeking action by, or redress of grievances from, their government in San Bernardino County must pay for it that in many City Halls those seeking project approval come armed with briefcases stuffed with cash. In more than a dozen cases stretching back for a generation, governmental figures, both elected and at the highest staff levels, had grown so accustomed to the practice of exchanging money for access to elected officials and official action in response to their requests that governmental officials – elected ones and top staffers who were facilitating what the elected officials were trying to accomplish – inadvertently ended up being prosecuted for bribery, graft or corruption by carrying on in ways in which they and their predecessors always had. Among those were San Bernardino County Supervisor Jerry Eaves,

San Bernardino County Supervisor Bill Postmus, Upland Mayor John Pomierski, Colton Mayor Carl Gaytan, Colton City Councilman Don Sanders, Colton City Councilman Abe Beltran, Colton City Councilman James Grimsby, San Bernardino City Councilwoman Valerie Pope-Ludlum, Adelanto Mayor Richard Kerr, Adelanto Councilman Jermaine Wright, San Bernardino County Treasurer Thomas O'Donnell, San Bernardino County Chief Administrative Officer Harry Mays, San Bernardino County Chief Administrator James Hlawek, San Bernardino County Chief Investment Officer Sol Levin and Upland City Manager Robert Quincey, all of whom were prosecuted and convicted. With the exceptions of Pope-Ludlum and Quincey, those prosecutions did not originate with local enforcement agencies or the San Bernardino County District Attorneys Office, with the lion's share being federal prosecutions in which the FBI and federal prosecutors were involved. In the matters involving Eaves and Postmus, the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office did act, but only in reaction to or in conjunction with the FBI, federal prosecutors or the California Attorney General's Office.

In far more cases than were ever prosecuted, county and municipal officials in San Bernardino

County entangled themselves in circumstances by which providing elected officials with monetary offerings in the form of campaign contributions was de rigeur for anyone who wanted to accomplish anything that involved government approval.

During what is referred to as San Bernardino County's "Golden Age of Corruption," county supervisors Robert Hammock, Cal McElwain and Robert Townsend freely indulged in accepting money, in the form of both campaign donations and largesse passed to them in other ways, from those whose projects and contracts they approved. Later, in the 1990s, Supervisor Marsha Turoci, and then in the 2000s, supervisors Gary Ovitt and Paul Bi-ane got in on the bonanza. Fontana Mayor Nat Simon, Fontana Councilman Don Day, San Bernardino Mayor John Valdivia, San Bernardino Councilman Ralph Hernandez, Rancho Cucamonga Councilman Chuck Buquet, Rancho Cucamonga Councilman Dick Dahl, Rancho Cucamonga Councilman Robert Dutton, Upland Councilman Frank Carpenter, Redlands Mayor Sven Larson, Apple Valley Councilman David Holman, Apple Valley Councilwoman Barbara Loux, Apple Valley Councilman Patrick Jacobo, Hesperia Mayor Bruce Kitchen, Hesperia Councilman George

Beardsley, Hesperia Mayor Percy Bakker, Hesperia Councilman Paul Russ and Hesperia Mayor Russ Blewett militated, in most cases mightily, on behalf of the developers and business interests that bankrolled their campaigns.

At present, the pay-to-play ethos lives on throughout the county, on the board of supervisors and on virtually every city or town council to one extent or another. In particular, the development industry and business interests, not to mention public employee unions, are continuing to purchase influence with the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors and on the city councils in Adelanto, in Barstow, in Big Bear Lake, in Redlands, in Fontana, in Ontario and in Upland.

An indication of the degree to which the pay-to-play mentality pervades San Bernardino County is that in no fewer than 18 of the county's 22 cities and two towns there is at least one entity which has made donations exceeding the \$250 threshold to either a quorum or all of that municipality's council. It is not clear, at this point, how those cities or towns will resolve the inability of their councils to vote on issues involving those companies or individuals, particularly where that involvement consists of the entity holding an existing service franchise.

-Mark Gutglueck

Prescriptive Rights Do Not Apply To National Forest Water *from page 6*

States Forest Service nor the State Water Resources Board, that granted California Consolidated Waters Co. the unwarranted right to develop the springs and divert the water from the Strawberry Creek headwaters. By 1934, California Consolidated Waters, had developed three springs using adits – horizontal passages bored into rock for drainage purposes – and then added 10 horizontal borehole wells to tap spring water acqui-

fers in the mountainside, thereby diverting the forest spring water through a pipeline down the mountain, giving twenty percent to half of the water thus obtained to the hotel and then bottling and selling the rest. This unauthorized twenty percent giveaway to the Arrowhead Springs owners is still going on today.

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 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 prescriptive 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.

In 1931, the Del Rosa Mutual Water Company, an appropriator of water on East Twin Creek downstream of the Arrowhead Springs Hotel (and downstream of the confluence of Strawberry Creek and East Twin Creek), filed a lawsuit to enjoin the taking of any water either by Arrowhead Springs Corporation or California Consolidated Water Company from East Twin Creek or Strawberry Creek.

The Del Rosa suit did not involve the San Ber-

nardino National Forest nor the State of California. A finding in that case was that neither Arrowhead Springs Corp nor California Consumers Co. had previous water rights which extended back to the founding of the San Bernardino National Forest on February 25, 1893.

The Arrowhead Water Bottling Company, under various names and corporate configurations, including divisions of Standard Oil of California and Rheem Manufacturing, continued to operate, drawing water from Strawberry Canyon throughout the 20th Century. In 1969,

it was acquired by the Coca Cola Bottling Company of Los Angeles and in 1978, Chicago-based Northwest Industries acquired Arrowhead Puritas when it bought Coca Cola Bottling. In 1982, Northwest Industries unloaded Coca-Cola Bottling to Beatrice Foods. BCI subsequently acquired Beatrice in a leveraged buyout. While under BCI's control, the Arrowhead Puritas water drafting permit in Strawberry Canyon expired, at which point the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company applied to extend the permit. In 1987, while that applica-

Continued on Page 15

Recall Proponents Run The Risk Of Arrest, City Spokesman Implies from page 7

Teeters, Kali Spillmann, Kent Spillmann, Marissa Ryan, Brynn Hoffman and Christopher Hoffman, in their capacities as the official proponents of the effort to recall Yucaipa City Councilmember Justin A. Beaver; and against Steven Maurer, Randy Bogh, Chelsey Lauren Bogh, Edmer Salazar, Mana Manasuk, Linda Simpson, Judith Fink, Nelson Fink, Carol Price, Robert Price, Garold Beecham, Robert Montee, Steve C. Martin, Steve A. Martin, Elizabeth Martinez, Telesforo Martinez, Virginia Flores, Willam Crosby Mecham, Quentin Ray Leenstra, Bryan Jovanny Acencio Munoz, Charles Howard Hopson, Patricia Alice Meads, Veronica Anne Carrillo, Vincent Mart Willingham, Lawrence Contla, Brittany Oosterbrock, David Oosterbrock, Joseph Foglio, Ashley Foglio, Marina Ortiz-Corral, Bonnie Hopson, Mark Allen, Gina Allen, Kevin O'Connor, Sabrina Mendel, Bradley Namil, George Ewan, Linda Ewan, Jorge Valenzuela, Elizabeth Corn, Mary Breslin, Robert Andrews Jr, Cheryl Nelson, Kimberly Juarez, Chuck Marrs, Kimberly Marrs, Diana Williams, Amy Gehrke, William Gehrke, Daniel Morales, Mary Sandoval, Nancy Bruins, Seth Bruins, Allison Proffitt, Catherine Proffitt, Kevin Allison, Robert Walker, Pamela Walker, Roberto Corral, Kristen Wheatley, Edward Wheatley, Joseph Phillips, Trevor Miller, Norma Salazar, Wayne Challis, Diane Elmore and Perry Thompson in their capacities as the official proponents of the effort to recall Yucaipa City Councilmember Bobby Dean Duncan; as well as against Sherilyn Long, David Long, Kathleen Sellers, William Sellers, Robert Huddleston, Wanda Huddleston, Jeanette McKovich, James McKovich, Jay Bogh, Kari Bogh, Brian Bleyenber, Jen-

nifer Bleyenber, Benjamin Bleyenber, Kenneth Jackson, Mark Etheredge, Ramona Etheredge, Jason Bender, Colleen Wang, Matthew Vanderwood, Lynda Underwood, Mary Marsh, George Marsh, Gwendolyn Waters, Travis Waters, Joshua Waters, Jeffrey Bohner, Barbara Bohner, Gillian Bohner, Gillian Skinner, Pierre Assaf, Ivelisse Assaf, Lynette Hirsch, Phillip Philson, Kendall Taylor, Jean Taylor, Katelyn Taylor, Teri Boon, Suzanne Eshleman, James Eshleman, Rebekah Pedersen, Joe Pedersen, Sherry Todd, Heather Dent, Dwayne Brinks, Lucinda Brinks, Patrick Aguirre, Marlin Feenstra, Victoria Feenstra, Nino Valmassoi, Valerie Aguirre, Ruben Aguirre, Denise Aguirre, Wesley Feenstra, Carol Griffin, Christy Garcia, Donice Griffin, Chris Griffin, Cristobal Garcia, Linda Witham, Douglas Witham, Jamie Hillwig, Alan Hillwig, Paul Bolock and Julie Bolock in their capacities as the official proponents of the effort to recall Yucaipa Councilmember Matthew Gabriel Garner.

The writ of mandate relies upon Assembly Bill 2584, which went into effect on January 1 and enables city clerks to combat what are alleged to be “abuses of the recall process and to ensure that voters are not misled by false and misleading statements on recall petitions.”

It is not entirely clear whether the intent of the writ is to obtain a ruling nullifying the recall effort altogether or merely remove what Sauseda and those behind her are alleging to be false and misleading statements contained in the recall petitions. The petition for writ of mandate and its accompanying complaint for injunctive relief has been assigned to Judge Michael A Sachs. A hearing on the matter is scheduled for July 24 at 8:30 a.m. in Department S28 in San Bernardino Superior Court.

“The recall petitions contain numerous statements that are factually inaccurate and would mislead voters,” Sauseda asserted in a prepared

statement. “As the city’s elections official, it is my duty to remain neutral, to apply current election law, and to protect voters by ensuring that they have accurate information.”

Assembly Bill 2584 subjects recall petitions to a 10-day public examination period during which the elections official or any voter may seek a writ of mandate/injunction requiring statements to be amended or deleted upon a showing, by clear and convincing proof, that the materials in question are false, misleading, or inconsistent with the state’s recall laws.

A press release put out by Joe Pradetto, the city’s spokesman who is answerable to Mann and must remain in the good graces of Beaver, Duncan and Garner to keep his job, states, “Proponents of the effort to recall Mayor Justin Beaver, Mayor Pro Tem Bobby Duncan, and Councilman Matt Garner submitted notices that included their reasons for seeking the recalls. After reviewing the notices, the city clerk, in her capacity as the city’s elections official, determined that many of the statements were objectively false, and others, while perhaps technically true, were clearly misleading.”

Pradetto quoted Sauseda as saying, “The legislative intent of AB 2584, as codified in Elections Code section 11042.5, is clear. Recall proponents have every right to outline their reasons for wanting to remove an elected official. This can include statements of fact, as well as opinions. However, recall petitions must not include false or misleading assertions presented as facts.”

According to Pradetto, “The California State Assembly’s analysis of AB 2584 states, ‘The practical effect of these provisions means that voters will be given the opportunity to address false, slanderous, or libelous material in the statement or answer, and potentially gives a court the opportunity to order changes to those materials before the recall proceeds.’”

Pradetto then upped the ante, stating, “In addition to the provisions of AB 2584, Sauseda also cautions recall proponents that, ‘Per Elections Code section 18600, it is a misdemeanor offense to circulate or obtain signatures on a recall petition that intentionally misrepresent or make false statements.’ Sauseda further points out, ‘Case law has established that petitions must provide information that is sufficient to enable voters to intelligently evaluate whether to sign them, and to avoid confusion.’”

Implying that those who signed the intent to recall notices were running the risk of going to jail for signing and filing a fraudulent and falsified public document, Pradetto offered recall proponents an exit from such a fate, if they merely recant the political heresies he said they had engaged in and clear the way for his political masters to remain in office unmo-
lested.

“State law allows petition signers to withdraw their names from petitions they’ve signed if they later change their minds, but the law is unclear as to whether it applies to notices of intention,” Pradetto said. “Consistent with other provisions of the state Elections Code, the city clerk will honor requests from proponents who seek to remove their names from a notice of intention, as they may have signed it based on its inaccurate and misleading information.”

Pradetto offered the recall proponents one last chance to save their hides.

“Written and signed requests to withdraw one’s signature from a notice of intention may be submitted to the city clerk’s office for processing,” he said.

The recall attempt against Beaver, Duncan and Garner is providing the first opportunity to test the reach of AB 2584, and Sauseda’s petition for a writ of mandate is the first legal action under the legislation.

Meanwhile members of another large interest group in the city, mobile home residents, many of

whom were not animated by the forced departure of Casey, have come to regard the council trio of Beaver, Duncan and Garner with suspicion.

The city council led by Beaver in the mayoral role has embarked on what has been variously described as a consolidation, reduction or outright elimination of citizen input and municipal oversight committees. One such “consolidation” was the elimination of the fire services committee, which city officials said would be offset by the establishment of a public safety committee. With the jury yet out on that change, the city council moved to shutter the Yucaipa Mobile Home Rent Control Board. That entity had long served as a hedge against the runaway escalation in the cost of leasing space in the city’s mobile home parks, which are largely populated by senior citizens, many of those living on fixed incomes. While the elimination of the board was undoubtedly popular with the mobile home park ownership and management, it was definitely not appreciated by the residents of the mobile home parks, who vote in percentages well above their actual numbers.

In recent weeks, there has been talk about what the actual implication of the closing out of the Yucaipa Mobile Home Rent Control Board is. Within the development industry and among real estate speculators, there is an appetite for acquiring the property upon which mobile home parks currently exist, inducing the mobile home owners residing there to move their trailers elsewhere so the property can be converted to single family or multifamily residential use, thereby yielding the landowners and developers a tidy profit. A real estate professional who previously did appraisals in Yucaipa, including those mobile home parks there, told the *Sentinel*, “It was always the case that those mobile home parks were never considered to be a permanent use but a way for the property owners to get a return on their invest-

ment until the property is actually developed. Those mobile home parks are not the highest and best use of that land.”

There is a growing perception that the elimination of the Yucaipa Mobile Home Rent Control Board, which is to be replaced by a “mobile-home rent stabilization hearing officer” who is to be hired by Mann and will serve at the pleasure of the city council, is a ploy to allow the rents and leases on mobile home space to inflate on a continuous basis until such time that those now residing in the city’s mobile home parks will no longer be able to afford to do so, at which point they will elect to move elsewhere, freeing the property to be developed by one of the companies or maybe more than one of the companies – Lennar, Pardee, Meritage Homes and Richmond American, Holland Development, Jacobsen Family Holdings, Turner Dale, Rotkin Real Estate Group, Carlton Properties, Preferred Business Properties Real Estate Services – which contracts with Mann for promotion.

There are some 4,200 mobile home spaces in the City of Yucaipa, which are home to more than 7,500 of the highest propensity voters in the city. If the recall proponents tap into that wellspring of voters who can easily be convinced, if they are not already, that City Hall as it is now controlled by Mann, Beaver, Duncan and Garner is seeking to facilitate real estate developers in their efforts to take over the mobile home parks where they now live to blow them off the property so real estate developers can turn a huge profit, the political survivability prospects for Beaver, Duncan and Garner will drop precipitously.

This week, Clifford Gericke, who ran against Duncan in 2020, told the *Sentinel* he was being threatened by Duncan. Gericke’s last name is similar, but not exactly the same as two of the signatories on the notice of intent to recall Duncan, Amy Gehrke and
Continued on Page 15

Public Notices

FBN 20230004342
The following entities are doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as
ARK REPTILES 1425 S CAMPUS AVE ONTARIO, CA 91761: PATRICK DAVID LIM
8543 HILLSIDE RD RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701
Mailing Address: 8543 HILLSIDE RD RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701
The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: March 5, 2023.

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/ PATRICK DAVID LIM
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 4/28/2023

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 J5065

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 May 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2023.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIVSB2307201

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner: Sayedeh Omideh Miri filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

Andrew Mehdi Dana Sloan to Andrew Mehdi Dana Miri, 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: 06/08/2023 Time: 08:30 AM Department: S24

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415

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: 02/07/2023 Judge of the Superior Court: Brian S. McCarville Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 5/5/2023, 5/12/2023, 5/19/2023, 5/26/2023

Trustee's Sale No. 23-100121

Attention recorder: The following reference to an attached summary is only applicable to notice(s) mailed to the trustor per civil code 2923.3(c) (1). Note: There is a summary of the information in this document attached Notice of Trustee's Sale You are in default under a deed of trust dated March 13, 2008. Unless you take action to protect your property,

Public Notices

it may be sold at a public sale. If you need an explanation of the nature of the proceedings against you, you should contact a lawyer. On June 2, 2023 at 1:00 p.m., C&H Trust Deed Service, as duly appointed or substituted Trustee, under the certain Deed of Trust executed by Wendy Moore as Trustor, to secure obligations in favor of Arrow Bail Bonds as Beneficiary, recorded on 05/02/08 as Instrument No. 2008-0198964, of Official Records in the office of the County Recorder of San Bernardino County, California, will sell at public auction to the highest bidder for cash, or cashier's check, (payable at the time of sale in lawful money of the United States by cash, a cashier's check drawn by a state or national bank, a state or federal credit union, or a state or federal savings and loan association, or savings bank specified in section 5102 of the Financial Code and authorized to business in this state) (Cashier's checks must be directly payable to "C&H Trust Deed Service"- Third party endorsed checks will not be accepted) At near the front steps leading to the City of Chino Civic Center located at 13220 Central Ave., Chino, California all right, title and interest conveyed to and now held by it under said Deed of Trust in and to the following described real property situated in the aforesaid County and State, to wit: As more fully described in said deed of trust The street address or other common designation of the above-described property is purported to be 12529 Churchill Drive Rancho Cucamonga, California 91739 Assessor's Parcel No. 0225-851-08 The undersigned Trustee disclaims any liability for any incorrectness of the street address and/ or other common designation, if any, shown hereinabove. Said sale will be made, but without covenant or warranty, express or implied, regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, to pay the remaining principal sum of the note(s) secured by said Deed of Trust, with interest thereon, as provided in said note(s), advances, if any, under the terms of the Deed of Trust, estimated fees, charges and expenses of the trustee and of the trusts created by said Deed of Trust, to wit: Said property is being sold for the express purpose of paying the obligations secured by said Deed of Trust, including fees and expenses of sale. The total amount of the unpaid principal balance, interest thereon, together with reasonable estimated costs, expenses and advances at the time of the initial publication of the Notice of Trustee's Sale is estimated to be \$23,721.62. The beneficiary under said Deed of Trust heretofore executed and delivered to the undersigned a written Declaration of Default and Demand for Sale, and a written Notice of Default and Election to Sell. The undersigned Trustee, or predecessor Trustee, has caused said Notice of Default and Election to Sell to be recorded in the county where the real property is located and more than three months have elapsed since such recordation. Notice to potential bidders: If you are considering bidding on this property lien, you should understand that there are risks involved in bidding at a trustee auction. You will be bidding on a lien, not on the property itself. Placing the highest bid at a trustee auction does not automatically entitle you to free and clear ownership of the property. You should also be aware that the lien being auctioned off may be a junior lien. If you are the highest bidder at the auction, you are or may be responsible for paying off all liens senior to the lien being auctioned off, before you can receive clear title to the property. You are encouraged to investigate the existence, priority, and size of outstanding liens that may exist on this property by contacting the county recorder's office or a title insurance company, either of which may charge you a fee for

Public Notices

this information. If you consult either of these resources, you should be aware that the same lender may hold more than one mortgage or deed of trust on the property. Notice to property owner: The sale date shown on this notice of sale may be postponed one or more times by the mortgagee, beneficiary, trustee, or a court, pursuant to Section 2924g of the California Civil Code. The law requires that information about trustee sale postponements be made available to you and to the public, as a courtesy to those not present at the sale. If you wish to learn whether your sale date has been postponed, and, if applicable, the rescheduled time and date for the sale of this property, you may call (949)860-9155 for information regarding the trustee's sale or visit this internet website, www.chtrustdeed.com for information regarding the sale of this property, using the file number assigned to this case 23-100121. Information about postponements that are very short in duration or that occur close in time to the scheduled sale may not immediately be reflected in the telephone information or on the Internet Web site. The best way to verify postponement information is to attend the scheduled sale. Notice to tenant: You may have a right to purchase this property after the trustee auction pursuant to Section 2924m of the California Civil Code. If you are an "eligible tenant buyer," you can purchase the property if you match the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. If you are an "eligible bidder," you may be able to purchase the property if you exceed the last and highest bid placed at the trustee auction. There are three steps to exercising this right of purchase. First, 48 hours after the date of the trustee sale, you can call (949) 305-8901, or visit this internet website, www.chtrustdeed.com, using the file number assigned to this case 23-100121 to find the date on which the trustee's sale was held, the amount of the last and highest bid, and the address of the trustee. Second, you must send a written notice of intent to place a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 15 days after the trustee's sale. Third, you must submit a bid so that the trustee receives it no more than 45 days after the trustee's sale. If you think you may qualify as an "eligible tenant buyer" or "eligible bidder," you should consider contacting an attorney or appropriate real estate professional immediately for advice regarding this potential right to purchase. Please take notice that if the Trustee is unable to convey title for any reason, the successful bidder's sole and exclusive remedy shall be return of monies paid to the Trustee, and the successful bidder shall have no further recourse. Further, if the foreclosure sale is set aside for any reason, the Purchaser at the sale shall be entitled only to a return of the deposit paid and shall have no further recourse or remedy against the Mortgagor, Mortgagee, or Trustee herein. If you have previously been discharged in bankruptcy, you may have been released of personal liability for this loan in which case this notice is intended to exercise the note holders rights against the real property only. As required by law, you are notified that a negative credit reporting may be submitted to a credit report agency if you fail to fulfill the terms of your credit obligation. For Trustee's sale dates, bids and postponement information, please call (949) 860-9155 or visit www.chtrustdeed.com. For any other inquiries, including litigation or bankruptcy matters, please call (949) 305-8901 or fax (949) 305-8406. C&H Trust Deed Service, as successor Trustee Dated: May 3, 2023 Coby Halavais Trustee's Sale Officer (IFS# 30659 Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on 05/12/2023, 05/19/2023, 05/26/2023

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF SCOT A. EATON Case No. PROSB2300538
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both, of SCOT A. EATON A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by Heather Carr in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION FOR PROBATE requests that Heather Carr 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 on June 14, 2023 at 9:00 AM in Dept. No. S37 located at 247 W. Third St., San Bernardino, CA 92415. 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.
s/ ANA MARIA DIAZ, General Partner
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 5/05/2023
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 J5473
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 May 12, 19, 26 and June 2, 2023.

Public Notices

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 4/24/2023
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 J5473
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 May 12, 19, 26 and June 2, 2023.

Public Notices

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on March 3, 10, 17 & 24, 2023. Corrected on April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023. Recorrected on May 12, 19, 26 and June 2, 2023.
FBN 20230003241
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as HYPERHIVE 8966 BENSON AVE SUITE A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763: HYPERHIVE INC. 8966 BENSON AVE SUITE A MONTCLAIR, CA 91763
The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California as number: 5598137.
The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: March 19, 2023.
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/ JUAN GARCIA, CEO
Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 3/30/2023
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 M4750
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 April 7, 14, 21 & 28, 2023. Corrected on May 12, 19, 26 and June 2, 2023.

Public Notices

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 Andrea Marie Hooten:
R. SAM PRICE
SBN 208603
PRICE LAW FIRM, APC
454 Cajon Street
REDLANDS, CA 92373
Phone (909) 328 7000
Fax (909) 475 9500
sam@pricelawfirm.com
Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on May 19, 26 and June 2, 2023.
NOTICE OF PETITION TO ADMINISTER ESTATE OF GRACE E. BRITTSCH NO. PROSB 2300616
To all heirs, beneficiaries, creditors, contingent creditors, and persons who may otherwise be interested in the will or estate, or both of GRACE E. BRITTSCH
A PETITION FOR PROBATE has been filed by JAMES L. WHITEHILL in the Superior Court of California, County of SAN BERNARDINO. THE PETITION requests the decedents wills 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 FOR PROBATE requests that JAMES L. WHITEHILL 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. No. S36 at 9 a.m. on JUNE 20, 2023 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)

Public Notices

FBN 20230005309
The following person is doing business as: JB MACHINE. 1656 W. 9TH ST UNIT D UPLAND, CA 917861656 W. 9TH ST UNIT D UPLAND, CA 91786 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO J. BADEAU MACHINE, INC. 1656 W 9TH ST UNIT D UPLAND, CA 91786 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JAN 01, 1995 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/ JEFFREY BADEAU, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 22, 2023 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 05/26/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/09/2023, 06/16/2023 CNBB22202307MT

Public Notices

The following person is doing business as: ALL SEASONS QUALITY CLEANING. 920 CLAY ST REDLANDS, CA 92374 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO STEVE J METS 920 CLAY ST REDLANDS, CA 92374; GLORIA E CISNEROS 920 CLAY ST REDLANDS, CA 92374. The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: APR 25, 2023 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/ STEVE J METS, GENERAL PARTNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 22, 2023 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 05/26/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/09/2023, 06/16/2023 CNBB22202306MT

Public Notices

FBN 20230005063
The following person is doing business as: TACOS LA PRIMA. 14767 OWNE ST FONTANA, CA 92355[MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO RICKY A GONZALEZ 14767 OWEN ST FONTANA, CA 92355. 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/ RICKY A GONZALEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 16, 2023 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 05/26/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/09/2023, 06/16/2023 CNBB22202305CV

Public Notices

The following person is doing business as: LC ACCESORIES & SUPPLIES; QUALITY MATTRESS DEPOT. 762 E 9TH ST UPLAND, CA 91786[MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR SANTA ANA, CA 92701]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO HIGHLINE LLC 762 E 9TH ST UPLAND, CA 91786; 762 E 9TH ST UPLAND, CA 91786 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ HERIBERTO SAN-CHEZ JR, MANAGER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 16, 2023 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 05/26/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/09/2023, 06/16/2023 CNBB22202304RC

Public Notices

FBN 20230005055
The following person is doing business as: JERRY'S SMOKEHOUSE BBQ. 6355 LILIC AVE RIALTO, CA 92377[MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR SANTA ANA, CA 92701]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GERARDO ALVAREZ 6355 LILAC AVE 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 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ GERARDO ALVAREZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 16, 2023 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 05/26/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/09/2023, 06/16/2023 CNBB22202303CV

Public Notices

FBN 20230005351
The following person is doing business as: RAMIREZ BOUNCERS AND RENTALS LLC. 15915 FOOTHILL BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO NORMA A RAMIREZ TRUJILLO 15915 FOOTHILL BLVD FONTANA, CA 92335. The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: SEP 01, 2022 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/ NORMA A RAMIREZ TRUJILLO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 23, 2023 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 05/26/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/09/2023, 06/16/2023 CNBB22202302MT

Public Notices

FBN 20230005413
The following person is doing business as: MORTGAGE BESTIE PROCESSING. 8047 DAY CREEK BLVD STE 200 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739[MAILING ADDRESS 1747 DALE RD GLENDORA, CA 91740]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO BRITTNIE NORTHEY 8047 DAY CREEK BLVD STE 200 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91739. 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/ BRITTNIE NORTHEY, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: MAY 24, 2023 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 05/26/2023, 06/02/2023, 06/09/2023, 06/16/2023 CNBB22202301MT

While Some Oppose Ramos’s Legislative Agenda, Even More Support It And He Appears To Be A Political Juggernaut Who Can’t Be Stopped from page 7

community,” Nickel stated. The former councilman said members of Congress and state legislators often involve themselves in drafting and voting upon legislation that has an impact on and relevancy to the industries or portions of the business sector in which they were in-

involved before they were legislators. “It is not unusual for lawmakers to call upon the expertise they had in their walk of life before they became elected officials while they are involved in creating laws or regulations in their roles as legislators,” Nickel said. “I don’t

think that as a member of the tribe James should be barred from weighing in on what sort of regulation is appropriate for the gaming industry. I understand there might be certain benefits to the tribe as an existing casino operator when the state gets down to regulating gambling and online gambling. “I do not have a problem with him supporting legislation that might prove to be beneficial to himself and the tribe of

which he is a part, as long as that legislation passes muster with the remainder of the Assembly and the State Senate,” Nickel continued. “The real question is whether the bill makes for a good law and good public policy or not. I have a lot of respect for James. He was duly elected, and he has the right and obligation to introduce legislation that he feels is relevant and important and of benefit to the community. If the voters don’t like the leg-

islation he is responsible for, they can always get rid of him at the ballot box.” Of note is that the Yuhaaviatam are considered, under federal law, to be a sovereign nation, independent of both the United States and the State of California. As such, there is an outstanding legal question as to whether Ramos, as a member of the Yuhaaviatam Nation, is subject to California law. That, however, prompts

a question as to whether, if Ramos is a citizen of a nation other than the United States and an entity other California, he is eligible to serve in the California Legislature. Since he has been seated in the Assembly and has been voting in that capacity for more than four years, such an inquiry is moot. The reality, it appears, is Ramos is a political juggernaut who is, at least at this point, able to cut his own path in any direction he chooses.

Mann Is A Splendid City Manager, Garner Insists from page 9

William Gehrke. The Sentinel sought to speak with Beaver, Duncan and Garner after the intent to recall documents against them were filed. Beaver and Duncan did not respond.

Garner told the Sentinel that reports the three engaged in a Brown Act violation by conspiring to fire Casey were way off the mark.

“What those guys are saying is completely false,” Garner said. “Everything they are saying is untrue. The situation has spun out of control. It’s all lies. They are slandering and defaming our names. There is no proof of us doing anything they are saying. They are saying we broke the law. They are accusing us of violating the Brown Act. I say, ‘Prove it.’ We never did anything, and

they can’t prove we did. Why? Because we never did what they are saying we did.”

Chris Mann, Garner said, “is a great city manager. I respect him and so do many others.”

That includes the rank and file at City Hall, Garner said.

“The lead union member of our city employees spoke highly of Chris Mann,” Garner said. “A lot of other employees came into the city chamber and supported Chris Mann. The morale among city employees is extremely high.”

Garner said, “We approved Ray Casey’s retirement contract and got rid of the city attorney and they didn’t like it. We made it happen pretty quickly, which is not a normal thing in Yucaipa. That sort of thing does happen in other cities. Yes, we voted for this change, but I think it was time for a change.”

-Mark Gutglueck

A Multiplicity Of Companies For 90 Years Pumped H2O Out Of The Mountains To Which They Had No Rights from page 8

tion was still pending, Perrier purchased the BCI-Arrowhead Drinking Water Company. Later the name “Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company” was handwritten on the permit. The name “Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company” is not in BlueTriton’s chain of title. Nevertheless, it was used during the 1990s in United States Forest Service correspondence, including on invoices and in spring site records for the water pipeline system in Strawberry Canyon. At that time, newspaper articles show the company using that name was bottling and shipping Ar-

rowhead water to Japan. This was water extracted from public land – Strawberry Canyon in the San Bernardino National Forest. The diversion of that water left a parched and dewatered forest canyon below, which burnt in the “Old Fire” in 2003.

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,” one that was never listed legally in corporate filings, but which operated under Nestlé Waters of North America, Inc. until it was acquired by BlueTriton Brands.

Nestlé’s intensive water-drafting activity, which was long been decried by environmentalists, came under increasing fire 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. Continued on Page 16

BlueTriton's Pumping Of Water, State Says, Is Limited To That Which Is Delivered To The Arrowhead Springs Hotel *from page 15*

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 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 di-

version 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 Board had revised the maximum amount of water to be diverted from 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 Resources Control 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.

The request for a hearing stated that BlueTriton is the "successor by name change" to Nestlé, is "the owner of the water rights and obligations subject to the notice, and is authorized to request a hearing in this matter."

BlueTriton, through Donlan and Ellison Schneider Harris & Donlan, on August 5, 2021 made a motion to dismiss the State Water Board prosecution team's draft cease-and-desist order.

In 2021, BlueTriton, under the aegis of the Arrowhead Spring Water Bottling Company, diverted 143 acre-feet of water from Strawberry Creek.

Also in 2021, the U.S. Forest Service granted BlueTriton a new pipeline permit, despite the ongoing water rights case and a change in ownership. The permit required a "valid proof of water rights." The draft cease and desist order, which has now been confirmed by the tentative State Water Resources Control Board and the California Environmental Protection Agency ruling, maintains that BlueTriton holds no valid water rights in the Canyon or anywhere in the forest.

Multiple parties made requests to add additional hearing issues. Those additional 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; 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 Thomas Eggers.

On November 4, 2021, the administrative hearing officer assigned to the case, Alan Lilly, rejected the motion to dismiss the prosecution team's draft cease and desist order, ruling that the public hearing to be conducted was to involve examining evidence and considering arguments relevant to whether BlueTriton was making unauthorized diversions of water and if a cease-and-desist order should be issued.

After extensive hearings held last year and more than seven months during which Lilly examined evidence and testimony presented and the issuance of a tentative draft order that was publicly reviewed in April and part of May 2023, Lilly has made a finding that BlueTriton's diversions of water through its Tunnels 2 and 3, and its Boreholes 1, 1A, 7, 7A, 7B, 7C and 8 in Strawberry Canyon for its beneficial uses are subject to the State Water Board's water-right permitting and enforcement authorities and that BlueTriton does not have any water rights that authorize such diversions or beneficial uses.

Lilly made a further finding that the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, which has come into possession of the Arrowhead Springs Hotel and its surrounding property, has riparian rights that authorize BlueTriton to divert water through its facilities for deliveries to the San Manuel Band for riparian uses on the Arrowhead Springs Hotel property.

Lilly ordered that BlueTriton is to limit its diversion of water through its Tunnels 2, 3 and 7, and Boreholes 1, 1A, 7, 7A, 7B, 7C and 8 to the amount of water BlueTriton delivers to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and that BlueTriton shall not divert into its water-conveyance pipeline any flow from the tunnel or borehole that exceeds the amount that BlueTriton is delivering to San Manuel.

Lilly imposed on BlueTriton a strict water use accounting mandate to be achieved by

BlueTriton establishing and maintaining totalizing flow meters and meter records sufficient to create daily records of diversions, deliveries and discharges from its boreholes and tunnels in Strawberry Canyon. The results of that monitoring, Lilly ordered, is to be provided to the State Water Board's Division of Water Rights Enforcement Section, including the daily amounts of diversions at each of the Strawberry Canyon facilities, the total daily amounts of diversions by all these facilities; the daily amounts of deliveries to the San Manuel Band for its riparian uses, the daily amounts of water diverted at each of Boreholes 10, 11 and 12; the daily amounts of the total diversions at Boreholes 10, 11 and 12; the daily amounts of water delivered to tank trucks from Boreholes 10, 11 and 12; the daily amounts of water discharged to Strawberry Creek through BlueTriton's discharge facility near Boreholes 10, 11 and 12; and the daily amounts of water discharged or delivered anywhere else, with a description of each point of discharge and each point of delivery. Those accountings of daily diversions, deliveries and discharges, Lilly said, "shall be sufficient to account for all diverted water. If there are any differences between the total amounts diverted on any day and the total amounts delivered and discharged on the same day, then BlueTriton shall explain the reason or reasons for the differences.

BlueTriton is required, under Lilly's order, to provide reasonable access to the State Water Board's enforcement section personnel to inspect BlueTriton's facilities and records.

BlueTriton's delivery of water from Tunnels 2 and 3 and Boreholes 1, 1A, 7, 7A, 7B, 7C and 8 for deliveries to the San Manuel Band are subject to BlueTriton's special use permit from the San Bernardino National Forest and all applicable laws, Lilly said, and he made clear the order does not adjudicate the San Manuel Band's land or riparian right claims, and

the order does not limit the State Water Resources Control Board or any other regulatory agency or court from taking future action regarding these claims.

The draft cease-and-desist order issued in April 2021 pertained only to Tunnels 2, 3 and 7, and Boreholes 1, 1A, 7, 7A, 7B, 7C and 8 in Strawberry Canyon. Lilly said that because the Division of Water Rights Enforcement Section's draft cease-and-desist order did not contain any provisions that would have prohibited BlueTriton from diverting water through its Boreholes 10, 11 and 12, the proposed order issued today, May 26, does not contain any prohibitions relating to boreholes 10, 11 and 12. Lilly noted that such restrictions may be put in place in the future.

"The enforcement section may investigate such diversions and, if it deems it appropriate, prepare a new draft cease-and-desist order regarding those diversions," he wrote in the proposed order.

Any interested party, meaning presumably any resident of California, may submit a written request to the clerk of the State Water Resources Control Board describing which actions the party requests the board to take, including an explanation of the reasons for the party's request. Any such request must be submitted within 31 days of the release of the proposed order, that is by Monday, June 26, 2023.

Any party submitting such a request is called upon to transmit it by U.S. Mail and e-mail to: Courtney Tyler, Acting Clerk of the Board

State Water Resources Control Board
P. O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812

EXEC-BoardClerk@Waterboards.ca.gov
and to Administrative Hearing Officer Lilly at adminhrgoffice@waterboards.ca.gov.

The State Water Resources Control Board is to consider finalizing and adopting the proposed order during the board's July 18, 2023 meeting.

-Mark Gutglueck