

Friday, July 19, 2024 A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with Countywide News Service 10808 Foothill Blvd. Suite 160-446 Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 (951) 567-1936

CVUSD Sues State To Allow Parental Notification Of Student Gender Reidentification

The Chino Valley Unified School District and the parents of eight students attending its schools and those in three other school districts in California have filed a lawsuit against Governor Gavin Newsom, California Attorney General Rob Bonta and California Superintendent of Public Instruction Tony Thurmond in an effort to prevent the enforcement of a recently passed state law prohibiting schools

from making a practice of notifying parents if their children are assuming a gender different from the one assigned them at birth.

The suit comes nearly a year after the Chino Valley Unified School District Board of Trustees instituted a parental notification policy that was in short order challenged by Bonta and his office and thereby blocked from being applied.

Representing the district and parents Oscar Avila, Monica Botts, Jason Craig, Kristi Hays, Cole Mann, Victor Romero, Gheorghe Rosca, Jr. and Leslie Sawyer are Austin, Texas-based Liberty Justice Center and attorney Emily Rae.

The lawsuit challenges AB 1955, which was signed by Governor Newsom on Monday, July 15 and is scheduled to take effect January 1, 2025. AB 1955,

authored by Assembly Member Chris Ward, D-San Diego, came in reaction to the passage of Chino Valley Unified's policy followed by similar actions by the Orange, Temecula Valley and Murrieta Valley school districts.

The Chino Unified School District Board of Education took up the issue of parental notification after Republican Assemblyman Bill Esayli in March 2023, in-

roduced Assembly Bill 1314, which would have required schools in California to notify parents in writing within three days if a student identified at school as a gender different from their assigned gender at birth. AB 1314 died a quiet legislative procedural death when Assemblyman Al Muratsuchi, a Democrat and the chairman of the Assembly Education Committee, declined to set a hearing **See P 2**

Six Local Measures So Far Set For November 5 Ballot In SBC

So far, six local voter initiatives have qualified to appear on the November 5 ballot corresponding to the Presidential General Election in San Bernardino County.

One of those will be a measure to increase the tax for short-term vacation rentals such as hotels, motels, inns and Airbnbs in the county's unincorporated areas.

In Grand Terrace, voters will consider a 1 cent per dollar sales tax override, what city officials are calling a 1 percent transactions and use tax.

The City of Needles is asking its voters to determine whether the city should impose a 10 percent tax on all marijuana related businesses.

The City of Rancho Cucamonga is turning to its residents this year to see if they will vote to approve a "transient occupancy tax," otherwise known as a bed tax or hotel/motel tax, of 12 percent.

The City of Yucaipa is asking its residents to approve a one cent per dollar sales tax.

The Morongo Unified School District is asking the residents who live within its boundaries to authorize the district to issue and sell up to \$88,300,000 in bonds, the proceeds from which are to be used for the specific school facilities projects.

The San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors on July 9 voted to place a measure on the ballot to change the tax rate currently imposed on short-term rentals from 7 percent to 11 percent. It must confirm that request at its meeting on July 23, one day **See P 3**

Latest SB Recall Effort A Tangle of Motivations, Cross Purposes & Contradictions

By Mark Gutglueck

The latest recall effort in San Bernardino presents the public with a confusing mélange of conflicting political and personal entanglements, leaving confusion as to who, precisely, wants to of the senior members of the city council removed from office.

This week, it was publicly announced that a group of city residents

living in both the First and Fourth wards want to force a recall question against Councilman Ted Sanchez and Councilman Fred Shorett.

Sanchez was first elected to the city council in 2018 and was re-elected in 2022. Shorett was elected to the council in 2009, reelected in 2013, reelected in 2018 and again in 2022.

Shorett's early ten-

ure in office was distinguished by his alliance with then-Mayor Patrick Morris, which was an unlikely pairing, given that Shorett is a Republican and Morris a Democrat. Nevertheless, the two were part of a narrow ruling majority on the council that formed when the city was under severe economic challenge, with consistent consecutive budget defi-

cits in which expenditures eclipsed revenue. Morris, who was himself a longtime public employee as both a prosecutor in the district attorneys office and then later a Superior Court judge, took what was for many a shocking stand against public employee unions, which for decades had effectively pressured previous mayors and city councils to grant them

salary and benefit increases, despite the city's shrinking income. Shorett joined with Morris in seeking to reduce city expenditures by freezing city employee pay levels and holding the line on benefits, which managed to stave off for a year or year-and-a-half an inevitable bankruptcy filing by the city in 2012. While Shorett found himself faced **See P 2**

Wife And Children Suing County And Sheriff's Department Over Husband/Father's Killing

The wife and five children of Keith Vinyard have filed a wrongful-death lawsuit against San Bernardino County, the sheriff's department, Sheriff Shannon Dicus and at least two unnamed deputies as a consequence of the unarmed 52-year-old's execution on March 23.

On March 23 at

roughly 9:50 p.m. in Hesperia, Vinyard was shot and killed after deputies, in apparent response to a domestic violence warrant for Vinyard's arrest, engaged in a vehicle chase in which he attempted to escape and was, according to the department, driving recklessly. The pursuit ended within

the vicinity of the 15400 block of Halinor Street, at which point Vinyard refused to comply with commands made by a deputy, according to the department. During that exchange, according to the department, Vinyard threatened to shoot the deputy. It was subsequently determined that Vinyard was **See P 3**

Ontario Airport Escapes The Brunt Of CrowdStrike Computer Outages

Through a fortuitous set of circumstances that have prevailed at least until late afternoon today, operations at Ontario International Airport have gone largely unaffected by a wide technology outage that began yesterday, grounding flights and forcing travel delays at selected aerodromes worldwide, in-

cluding those at Los Angeles International Airport, Burbank Airport and John Wayne Airport in Orange County.

While Ontario International did not go entirely unscathed, reporting a total of eight delays and ten cancellations, Los Angeles International in the same **See P 3**

Anticipating Trump Victory, SBC Secessionists Gunning For Empire Statehood By 2028

Top San Bernardino County officials and a network of their supporters and political donors are preparing now to officially initiate the secession process to excise the county's 20,105 square mile expanse from the State of California as early as January 2025.

If several political developments take place as anticipated and other arrangements take place, it is anticipated that the

51st State, Empire, will achieve its recognized status by some point in 2027, in time for it to achieve standing as the 36th largest state in terms of population, with five votes in the electoral college to be cast in the 2028 presidential election.

The odds-on favorite at this point to accede to the governor's position upon Empire's admission to the union is the

prime mover behind the San Bernardino secession movement, Jeff Burum.

Thus far, the 57-year-old Burum has himself steered clear of elective politics, preferring the role of kingmaker he has assumed by virtue of his hefty political donations rather than that of officeholder. Nevertheless, it is anticipated that by the time he reaches the age of 60 in 2026,

Burum will have made the transition into being an active politician, one whose ascendancy will be matched with the crowning achievement of his career, the founding of the first addition to the United States since Hawaii was admitted in 1959.

Burum's largesse to San Bernardino County's politicians going back for more than two decades has put him into

the vaunted position he holds today, San Bernardino County's shot caller. While he does not own every politician in county government and those on the various city councils in the at least eight cities in the county where he has real estate and developmental interests, those who are registered Republicans are safely in his pocket. With only limited exceptions, Burum does not **See P 3**

In July 2023, CVUSD Became The First School District In California To Mandate That Parents Be Informed If Their Children Were Deviating From Their Birth Gender While At School *from front page*

date for the bill before his committee, such that the bill was not given a chance to be considered by the entire Assembly. With the matter unable to advance at the state level, the Chino Valley Unified School Board took up consideration of utilizing a piecemeal strategy of instituting similar policies throughout the state school district by school district and then took the lead in doing so. Before a capacity crowd within the

At a meeting held within the auditorium at Don Lugo High School in anticipation of an oversized crowd, the Chino Unified School Board considered adopting a policy, which was well advertised in advance, that requires faculty at the district's

schools to inform parents if their child identifies as transgender or insists on using a name, pronoun or facilities other than those traditionally intended for an individual as identified on that student's birth certificate.

Thurmond sojourned from his office in Sacramento to Chino to address the school board and express his opposition to the policy change. In comments that were abbreviated because the school board had reduced the speaking time of those addressing it that evening from the normal three minutes to one minute to accommodate the sheer number of speakers, Thurmond made the point, that "nearly half of students who identify as being LBGTQ+ are considering suicide." Thurmond then moved on to make that point that some parents might react with either physical violence or engage in psychological or emotional abuse of their children if faced with a child altering his or her gender. "I ask you to consider this: The policy that you consider tonight not only might fall

outside the laws that respect privacy and safety for our students but may put our students at risk because they may not be in homes where they can be..." Thurmond said, at which point his microphone was cut off.

Ultimately, the board voted 4-to-1, with James Na, Andrew Cruz, Jon Monroe and Board President Sonja Shaw, prevailing and Board Member Don Bridge casting the sole dissenting vote, to put the parental notification mandate, technically referred to as Policy 5020.1, into place.

The actuation of notification requirement in the Chino Valley School District was something of a cultural milestone in California and elsewhere. A handful of other districts in the state, including Murrieta Valley Unified and Temecula Valley Unified in Riverside County and Anderson Union High School District in Shasta County adopted similar requirements. Viewpoints and opinions on the issue in large measure broke along ideological, partisan and sexual orientation lines.

Conservatives, Republicans. Fundamentalist Christians and, seemingly, a majority of heterosexuals favored keeping parents informed about the comportment of their children in an academic setting, while those considering themselves to be liberals or progressives, a majority of Democrats and an overwhelming number of those within the lesbian gay bisexual queer transsexual community believed that students of have privacy rights that allow them to prevent their parents from knowing the identity they assume in a public school setting. In this way, Shaw, Monroe, Na and Cruz, all of whom are Republicans, found themselves at the forefront of a movement challenging the social dictates of the dominant political force in the state: the Democratic Party, with its supermajorities in both houses of the California Legislature, the Assembly and the State Senate; the California Congressional delegation, which numbers 40 Democrats and 12 Republicans and all of the state's constitutional

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

offices from governor to lieutenant governor to attorney general to secretary of state to state controller to superintendent of public instruction to state treasurer to insurance commissioner all being Democrats.

The board majority's success in passing the parental notification strategy was short-lived. Miffed at the fashion in which he had been cut off a mere 60 seconds into his presentation on July 20 after having traveled nearly half the length of the Golden State to attend the school board meeting that night

as well as the school board's adoption of the policy, Thurmond networked with like-minded Democrats in an effort to block not just the Chino Unified School District's policy but the momentum the July 20 vote of the board had created with other school districts in the state which had a majority of conservative/Republican members who were emulating the Chino board and were in various stages toward adopting their own parental notification policies.

On August 28, 2023, *Continued on Page 4*

Mayor Tran Came Into Office In SB, Hoping That Everyone Involved In Running The City Would Be Dignified & Respectful *from front page*

with the undying enmity of local public employee unions, he managed to get some level of credit for his efforts to maintain the city's solvency and managed to stay in office for a decade-and-a-half.

Initially, Shorett and Sanchez appeared to be and actually were on a collision course, as Sanchez ran for office and was elected as an ally of John Valdivia, whom Shorett had beaten in the 2009 Fourth Ward election primary and who came into office in the Third Ward in 2012 as a candidate backed by the city's firefighters' union who advocated for increasing firefighter salaries and benefits. Valdivia served as a foil

to Morris until he left office in 2014, and the differences between Valdivia and Shorett were legendary. Valdivia successfully ran for mayor in 2018, at which point, with the support of Sanchez and then-newly elected Second Ward Councilwoman Sandra Ibarra, Fifth Ward Councilman Henry Nickel and then-Sixth Ward Councilwoman Bessine Richard, Valdivia took firm control of the machinery of government in the county seat. Valdivia's hold on the city intensified in May 2019, when Juan Figueroa, whom the mayor backed, was elected to finish out the nearly two years remaining on Valdivia's term as Third Ward Councilman.

In relatively short order, however, Valdivia overplayed his hand, and one by one he lost the support of Ibarra, Nickel and Sanchez, as he was engulfed by scandal upon scandal relating to the pay-for-play ethos of his administration.

Ultimately, in 2022, Valdivia was ousted from the mayor's post, having been beaten in that year's primary by both former City Attorney Jim Penman and the city's one-time human resources director, Helen Tran. Ultimately, Tran was elected mayor in the November 2022 election.

Under Tran, a Democrat, the San Bernardino ship of state has had less than smooth sailing as she took the helm of a council that consisted of four Republicans and three Democrats. Tran had hoped city affairs might be run in a stable and effective manner. Nevertheless, she was hampered by Robert Field's departure as city manager just before she acceded to office. Field had been at the helm of the city during the last two years of Valdivia's mayoralty.

In December 2022, upon Tran's ascendancy to mayor, the council members appeared to be on good terms with

one another all around. Tran's, Ibarra's, Reynoso's and Calvin's shared Democratic Party affiliation put them on the same wavelength, and Sanchez, Figueroa, Shorett and Alexander were in no haste to engage in any sort of divisive partisan bickering that would potentially compromise their efforts at effective municipal leadership, particularly given that San Bernardino is an overwhelmingly Democratic city, with 48,317 or 46.4 percent of its 104,156 voters registered as Democrats and 22,944 or 22 percent registered as Republicans and 22,858 or 21.9 percent unaffiliated with any party and the remaining 8.7 percent registered with the American Independent, Green, Libertarian, Peace & Freedom or other more obscure parties. From December 2022 and through the first several months of 2023 there was an air of harmony on the council dais. Difficulties arose

toward the middle of 2023.

Tran's tenure in office began with a caretaker city manager in place, and at first subtle and then more pronounced differences surfaced among the members of the council with regard to whom the city should hire as its top administrator while the recruitment process was ongoing in the summer of 2023. This included a manifestation of collective schizophrenia when some members of the city council at first advocated and then rejected the idea of hiring the individual they had brought in as the interim city manager, Charles McNeely, as the full-fledged city manager. McNeely had served as city manager in San Bernardino from 2009 until 2012, his exit at that time marred by the city's filing for bankruptcy protection a few months later. The fully retired McNeely agreed to take on the interim city manager's post with

the proviso that it was to be no more than a temporary assignment, and the council at that time was of the attitude that the competition for the long-term city manager post should be a fair contest, such that one of the candidates should not have the advantage of being in the position of the serving city manager when the council's decision on who should fill the post was ongoing. After a less than two months in the assignment, however, McNeely's attitude changed, and he began to seriously entertain the notion of remaining as city manager for two, three, four or as many years as his health and acuity remained intact. This precipitated a divide on the council, as some members were amenable to permanentizing McNeely and others were opposed to doing so, based on the earlier decision not to allow the interim manager to compete for the *Continued on Page 5*

At Least Six Measures, All So Far Seeking To Raise Taxes Or Fees, To Appear On The Ballot In SB County In November *from front page*

after the registrar of voters' July 22 deadline for measure submissions.

San Bernardino County officials say the bed/hotel tax increase will bring it into line with nearby jurisdictions that charge overnight guests more. Inyo and Los Angeles counties charge 12 percent at present, and both Orange and Riverside counties impose a 10 percent assessment.

The rate will only go up in the county's unincorporated areas, which do not include its 22 cities and two incorporated towns. The tax increase will create a windfall of \$9.4 million for the county, officials say. The county will use the money to improve county's infrastructure and augment the sheriff's and fire department budgets.

Grand Terrace civic leaders said they are making the request for the sales tax because a citizens ad hoc committee in the 12,867-population 3.5 square mile city "found a need to fund increased law enforcement services based on the city's increased population, call volume, traffic,

non-emergency response time, heavy reliance on mutual aid and higher-than-average ratio of calls to deputies and deputies to population."

Needles, which in 2012 was the first of San Bernardino County's cities to permit medical marijuana dispensaries to operate, is now one of just five of the county's 24 cities which have decided to cash in on the financial bonanza that came with the passage of 1996's Proposition 215, the Compassionate Use of Marijuana Act, permitting the sale of medical marijuana, and 2016's statewide passage of Proposition 64, the Adult Use of Marijuana Act, allowing the

sale of marijuana for intoxicative purposes. The Needles City Council previously and currently is imposing fees and collecting money for the granting of permits. The measure to appear on the ballot in November, if passed, will dispense with the previously collected fees and substitute a 10 percent "excise" tax on sales of marijuana from dispensaries and marijuana shops and a 10 percent "excise" tax on the profits yielded by marijuana cultivation operations in the 31.08-square mile city abutting the Colorado River near California's border with Arizona at the extreme east end of San Bernardino County.

Alternatively, the measure would allow the city, instead of charging the 10 percent tax on cultivation operation, to impose a \$1.75 per square foot monthly assessment on the space in such operations used for the growing of marijuana. Residents who abide by the state's allowance of an individual to cultivate up to six marijuana plants for the production of marijuana personal use will not be subject to the tax.

According to Needles officials, the reason for asking the city's residents to pass the tax measure is that, despite the city having obtained "significant revenues" under the city's current

regulation of commercial marijuana activity, there is concern that "the current gross receipts tax may not be the most appropriate basis for the city's cannabis cultivation facilities, which could lead either to underreporting of revenue or costly auditing expenses." City officials, however, did not explain how cannabis-related business operators could not find a way to evade reporting all of their sales or profits.

According to the language submitted by the City of Rancho Cucamonga, the city's voters in November will determine if outsiders staying in the city over-

Continued on Page 15

Witnesses Offered A Different Version Of Events Than Deputies' Narrative In Describing What Led To Vinyard's Shooting *from front page*

not in possession of a gun. Vinyard did, however, according to the department, arm himself with a "large metal object" as other deputies arrived on scene.

As that was taking place, according to one

of the deputies, a second deputy and a third deputy opened fire on Vinyard after a first deputy discharged his service gun, even though one of those deputies did not consider Vinyard at that moment represented a threat, but

considered it necessary for the deputies on the scene to act in unison because the threshold of a use of deadly force was occurring.

As of April 4, the California Attorney General's Office had initiated a review of Vinyard's shooting under California Government Code Section 12525.3, which requires that the



Keith Vinyard

California Department

of Justice serve as an independent agency to investigate statewide police officer shootings resulting in the death of an unarmed civilian.

While the sheriff's department maintains that Vinyard was in possession of a deadly weapon – the large metal object it was claimed Vinyard was holding – witnesses at the scene as well as at

least one of the deputies did not have anything in his hands and was yet inside his car when he was felled in a hail of gunfire.

Gage's lawsuit on behalf of Tiffany Sherman-Vinyard and the couple's four sons and one daughter maintains Vinyard had not in any way threatened the physical safety of the officers at the scene.

Ontario Airport Dodges A Cyber System Meltdown *Bullet from front page*

period over the course of 24 hours was hit by 128 delays and 76 cancellations, while San Francisco International suffered 67 delays and 79 cancellations, compared to San Diego International's 58 delays and 13 cancellations. In the same timeframe, San Jose International experienced 23 delays and 3 cancellations, Bob Hope Airport in Burbank reported 12

delays and 3 cancellations and operations at Fresno's Yosemite International were marred by five delays and five cancellations.

Initial reports that a cyberattack caused the massive scale digital system failure, which impacted not only airlines and railways but banking and medical facilities and large-scale companies such as Visa, ADT Security and Amazon, were in error, the Sentinel has been informed.

Rather, a cascade of system crashes came about as a consequence

of a sequence of defective code contained in a CrowdStrike update that was made to tens of thousands of computers using Microsoft's Windows latest operating systems. CrowdStrike is a cloud-based cybersecurity platform used by a substantial number of modern technology users, including approaching 60 percent of Fortune 500 companies. CrowdStrike's Falcon software was designed and is used to keep computer systems and networks safe from malware and cyberattacks.

The faulty code resulted in multiple system failures, causing communications networks to shut down. CrowdStrike CEO George Kurtz took immediate responsibility for what had occurred and apologized for the disruptions during multiple media appearances beginning this morning. This was accompanied by a blanket statement from CrowdStrike that "the issue has been identified, isolated and a fix has been deployed."

Nevertheless, there were lingering outages

of primary and crucial systems used by multiple airlines.

What was reported to the Sentinel is that Ontario International in large measure avoided problems because the largest volume passenger carrier operating there, Southwest Airlines, is yet using a flight and passenger coordination system that runs on Windows 3.1, which dates from 1992 and is so old that it is incompatible with software designed by CrowdStrike, which has only been in existence as a company

since 2011 and has no cybersecurity programs that work in conjunction with any software manufactured prior to that date. In particular, the Falcon sensor software, which was filter involving the defective coding that triggered the system glitch, has no applicability to Windows 3.1.

The airport delays grew out of problems with the computer systems used by the various airlines rather than any difficulties that manifested with the information processing systems

since 2011 and has no cybersecurity programs that work in conjunction with any software manufactured prior to that date. In particular, the Falcon sensor software, which was filter involving the defective coding that triggered the system glitch, has no applicability to Windows 3.1.

Continued on Page 15

Virtually Every SBC GOP Politician Is In Burum's Pocket *from front page*

support Democrats.

Despite California being a solidly Democratic state in which all of the constitutional offices from governor to lieutenant governor to attorney general to secretary of state to superintendent of public

instruction to state treasurer to controller to insurance commissioner are held by Democrats and the Democrats hold a supermajority in both houses of the state legislature, San Bernardino county remains tightly within the grasp of the Republican Party. This is at least partly because of efforts by deep-pocketed Republican donors, of whom Burum is the foremost, heavily invest-

ing in the political process, providing the San Bernardino County Republican Party and Republican candidates with enough money to grandly outspend their Democrat rivals and purchase newspaper ads, hand bills, mailers, radio spots, television commercials and yard signs and billboards to promote their candidates. As a consequence, even though registered

Republicans are outnumbered by registered Democrats by a [4 to 3] margin, four of the five members of the board of supervisors are Republicans and Republicans outnumber Democrats on 17 of the county's 24 city and town councils.

Burum was mentored by his business partner, Dan Richards, who was formerly an elected officeholder as a member of the Foothill Fire Dis-

trict Board of Directors before that agency was subsumed by the City of Rancho Cucamonga. What Richards had learned while serving in the Foothill Fire District board member capacity is that governmental policy is controlled entirely by the votes on the boards or councils overseeing such governmental entities, including decisions on franchises, contracts and project ap-

plications. As developers, Richards and Burum took this understanding to heart, and they established a pattern of making hefty political donations to officeholders or would-be office holders, ingratiating themselves with those elected decision makers who in virtually every case returned the favor by making decisions favorable to Richards and Burum

Continued on Page 15

While State Officials Maintain Allowing Students To Hide Their Sexual Orientation From Their Parents Will Protect Them, Four CVUSD Board Members See Such Secrecy As Trampling On Parents' Rights
from page 2

California Attorney General Rob Bonta filed a civil suit against the Chino Valley Unified School District, petitioning the San Bernardino County Superior Court to stop enforcement of the notification policy. Bonta asserted that the need to prevent “mental harm, emotional harm and physical harm” to those students who are products of families who are not accepting of their choice to deviate from their birth or biological gender trumps the right of all parents to be informed of their children’s identity choice. “This policy is destructive,” Bonta asserted. “It’s discriminatory and it’s downright dangerous. It has no place in California, which is why we have moved in court to strike it down.” The suit maintained that the policy “has placed transgender and gender nonconforming students in danger of imminent, irreparable harm from the consequences of forced disclosures.” Transgender students, as a consequence of the school district action were, according to Bonta, “under threat” and “in fear,” facing “the risk of emotional, physical, and psychological harm from non-affirming or unaccepting parents or guardians.” Bonta charged that the policy “unlawfully discriminates against transgender and gender nonconforming students, subjecting them to disparate treatment, harassment, and abuse, mental, emotional, and physical.” On September 6, San Bernardino County Superior Court Judge Thomas Garza granted the State of California a temporary restraining order prohibiting the Chino Valley Unified School District from enforcing the policy. In doing so, Judge Garza signaled that the court was favorably predisposed toward Bonta’s position when he suggested the rights with

regard to gender transitioning were as basic to the U.S. and California constitutions as religious freedom when he analogized changing from one gender to another to making a religious conversion, while stating that under his analysis, Chino Valley Unified’s Policy 5020.1 qualified as being “too broad, too general” while lacking “clear purpose or reference of parental support and involvement.”

Garza acknowledged that it was not likely that the matter would be resolved in San Bernardino County Superior Court and that whatever ruling came about at the trial court level would be appealed to the appellate court, the California Supreme Court and possibly to the U.S. Supreme Court. Despite the Chino Valley Unified School Board majority being outmuscled politically, having lost ground legally within the forum of San Bernardino County Superior Court, as well as being outmaneuvered in terms of the presentation of its position to the public within the popular media in many different venues, there followed developments suggesting the principle of parental notification at the heart of the policy might withstand the efforts to resist it. Numerous other school districts in the state put into place identical or very similar parental notification policies. If it once appeared that Chino Valley Unified was on its own in a struggle against the entire State of California and its political establishment as dominated by governor, state attorney general and superintendent of schools together with the legislature, it was soon apparent that was not the case, as other school districts, each with their own legal representatives, came to stand side-by-side with Chino Valley Unified. Whereas Bonta may

have thought that by taking Chino Valley Unified to court would cost the district money and make it rethink the policy altogether while simultaneously intimidate other districts and effectively prevent them from adopting parental notification requirements, school board members of like mind to the majority in Chino Valley Unified were willing to take on the attorney general, the superintendent of public instruction, the governor, the legislature and the state in general, in a ploy to cost it money, force them to expend resources and have their attorneys and officials tied up in court in counties up and down the state on cases separate from the one involving Chino Valley Unified in San Bernardino County.

If Bonta thought that the lawsuit would harm the board majority politically in that the four would be portrayed in the left-leaning press as closeminded, bigoted and transphobic sadists intent on hurting defenseless children, that never came about as the media focused as much if not more on the parental rights aspect of the controversy. The board members’ constituents – the parents within the district whose votes counted in determining who would serve on the school board – turned out to be lopsidedly in favor of parental notification. In this sense, the lawsuit challenging the policy had strengthened rather than weakened the board majority.

Moreover, all four members of the board majority, Shaw as the board chairwoman in particular, took on a certain cachet, both statewide and nationally, as conservative icons fighting the liberal establishment. They garnered a place in the national media spotlight as crusaders gamely fighting to ensure parental rights in the face of bullying by an overwhelming state bureaucracy run by ultra-liberal politicians willing to throw the power of government into the fray against a small but determined band of local

elected officials upholding principles they fervently believed in.

At the same time, California state officials had hoped that forcing the district to go to court to defend its policy would generate negative publicity for district officials, as they would be in the position of expending precious district funding to put up a legal fight. This would leave Chino Valley’s school officials vulnerable to the charge that they were spending money that should have been going to educate students on lawyers because of the board members’ use of their positions to make a political statement unrelated to the district’s academic mission, the Democrats ruling the roost in Sacramento believed. As it would turn out, however, the Liberty Justice Center, a non-partisan public-interest litigation center with major offices in Illinois and Texas that champions the constitutional rights of American families, workers, advocates, and entrepreneurs throughout the United States, has taken up a defense of the policy, reducing tremendously the cost of mounting a defense of the district policy and limiting the drain and strain on the districts’ assets and personnel. As significantly, there have been court rulings at the federal level which suggest that parental rights, in particular the ability of parents to know or learn about the terms and conditions under which their children are being educated as well as the substance of what they are being taught cannot be abridged by action, priorities or policies of the educational institutions to which those parents have entrusted their children. Even if Bonta, Thurmond, the California Department of Public Instruction and the State of California itself prevail in the legal action that has been taken against Chino Valley Unified within the state court system, including San Bernardino Superior Court, the appellate courts and the California Supreme Court, the issue does not

promise to be that cut and dried upon reaching the federal courts. Of significance is that one of those federal court rulings took place not in a venue outside California or under a jurisdiction subject to another federal circuit, but one in Southern California, in which the federal judge in question was called upon to decide a question precisely the same as that at stake with Chino Valley Unified’s parental notification procedure. Within days after Judge Garza’s ruling, Senior United States District Judge Roger Benitez in a ruling emanating from the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California rejected the legal theory that minor students have privacy rights that preclude their parents from learning about their gender identity, which is the central premise in the lawsuit Bonta filed against the Chino Valley Unified School District. In April 2023, Elizabeth Mirabelli and Lori Ann West, middle school teachers in the Escondido Union School District, filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California against the Escondido Union School District Board of Education, the California State Board of Education, the California Department of Education and State Superintendent of Schools Tony Thurmond over a district policy which required them to dissemble and outright mislead parents when they face a situation in which students have assumed a gender at a variance with their natural sex. Their lawsuit stated teachers were required to use “any pronouns or a gender-specific name requested by the student during school, while reverting to biological pronouns and legal names when speaking with parents in order to actively hide information about their child’s gender identity from them.” Mirabelli and West contended in the suit that their First Amendment rights were violated by the district in its requirement that they either

lie to parents outright or prevent the parents from learning the truth. In his ruling issued September 14, 2023, Judge Roger Benitez summarized the question he was face with thusly, “A parent’s right to make decisions concerning the care, custody, control, and medical care of their children is one of the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests that Americans enjoy. However, if a school student expresses words or actions during class that may be the first visible sign that the child is dealing with gender incongruity or possibly gender dysphoria, conditions that may (or may not) progress into significant, adverse, lifelong social-emotional health consequences, would it be lawful for the school to require teachers to hide the event from the parents?” Judge Benitez concluded that the teachers’ religious beliefs and free speech rights were violated by the Escondido Union School District’s policy, and wrote that students in the position of being caught between attending school using one gender identity while maintaining a different gender identity at home would be harmed because they need “parental guidance and possibly mental health intervention to determine if the incongruence is organic or whether it is the result of bullying, peer pressure, or a fleeting impulse. Parental involvement is essential to the healthy maturation of schoolchildren. The Escondido Union School District has adopted a policy without parent input that places a communication barrier between parents and teachers.” The court granted Mirabelli and West a preliminary injunction against the district policy. What was revealed during the course of Mirabelli’s and West’s litigation was that school staff and teachers at the school where they taught were sharing with one another lists of students that essentially revealed which students at the school

Continued on Page 6

Council Rivalries, A City Manager Militating For Control, Unprofessional Shortcutting By A Headhunting Firm As Well As Investigating Consultants Hired By The City & Good Old Fashioned Greed Contributed To A Poisonous Environment Within The Halls Of San Bernardino Government

from page 2

job and/or the perception that McNeely, at the age of 71, was simply not up to the task and would not last more than a few years, at most, necessitating yet another recruitment process.

Once it became clear that McNeely was not going to solve the city's long-term city manager dilemma, Tran sought to convince her council colleagues to hire her first choice for the post, David Carmody, who had been the city manager in West Covina, the city where she had gone to work as human resources director after she departed from the employ of San Bernardino in 2019. Tran made no headway in that regard.

In the early summer, the city council came to a near consensus about hiring Stockton City Manager Harry Black. That resolve fell apart when Black's salary demands gave the council pause prior to his withdrawal over concerns about the confidentiality of the recruitment process.

Thereafter, inexplicable delays and stalling that took place in finalizing the council's majority choice, arrived at in August 2023, to have Salinas City Manager Steve Carrigan manage the city. Those delays, however, led to Carrigan's decision in late September to withdraw as a candidate for the post.

Ultimately, the city in October 2023 made a decision to hire Charles Montoya, such that a coordinated and forward-looking running of municipal affairs did not begin in earnest until November 2023, nearly 11 months after Tran was sworn into office.

As it would turn out, even that progression would turn out to be riddled with misdirection.

There was tension on the council between

three of the council Republicans – Sanchez, Figueroa and Shorett – who began to vote on many issues as a block and two of the council's Democrats – Fifth Ward Council Benjamin Reynoso and Sixth Ward Councilman Kimberly Calvin – who voted on virtually all issues of any substance in lockstep with one another. Sometimes, Reynoso and Calvin were joined by Seventh Ward Councilman Damon Alexander, a Republican, with regard to certain matters. Occasionally, Ibarra, a Democrat, came across to back Reynoso and Calvin, as well. More often, however, Ibarra leaned in favor of the policies favored by Sanchez, Figueroa and Shorett. Initially, a major issue for Reynoso and Calvin was the management style, approach and action of Montoya, whose hiring they and Alexander had opposed.

For Tran, who had seen her ability to initiate long-term policies compromised most of her first year in office by the city not having a full-fledged city manager in place, the prospect of having Montoya begin the process of planning, organizing, directing and controlling the city's day-to-day operations and future was encouraging. Montoya had been previously employed as the city manager of Watsonville in California and the town manager of Florence, Arizona, as the city manager of Avondale, Arizona, the finance director and treasurer with the Town of Castle Rock in Colorado, and the chief financial officer for both Centennial, Colorado and for Jefferson County, Colorado.

There was some confidence on Tran's part as well as that of Sanchez, Ibarra, Figueroa and Shorett that with his fi-

nancial expertise, Montoya would be able to provide sound guidance while overseeing a city that had declared bankruptcy in 2012 and had not exited from that status until 2017, and was yet wobbly on its feet with regard to generating sufficient revenue to deal with the challenges of funding services to the county's most populous city, one in which roughly 13.3 percent live below the poverty level, as defined by the U.S. government.

From the time he took on oversight of municipal operation in San Bernardino on the second-to-last day of October, Montoya set about impressing the city council with his can-do attitude and energetic approach, seeking to address long-standing issues that had been festering because of bureaucratic and political malaise and procrastination. He set about having staff analyze problems and challenges the city faced, often initiating preliminary action or laying groundwork for decisive moves to be taken in an effort to demonstrate his ability. This approach was appreciated by some members of the council, who felt decisive action with regard to certain problems was called for. It was further appreciated that Montoya was not adhering to the direction of one dominant member of the city's decisionmakers, such as had been the case with former City Manager Bob Field and former Mayor John Valdivia.

In much of his approach, Montoya was presuming upon the acceptance of his action being done in good faith and that the mayor and both the individual council members and the council as a whole would view his taking action without their explicit consent, based upon his own independent judgment, as not only justifiable but not being disrespectful of their authority. Very early on, this approach created a schism on the council, with Councilwoman Kimberly Calvin and Councilman Ben Reyno-

so in particular believing that Montoya was overstepping his authority.

Montoya appeared to be safe in the niche he had created for himself, since there was a growing and intensifying estrangement between Calvin and at least three members of the council – Sanchez, Figueroa and Shorett – as well as the mayor. As Montoya, too, was on the outs with Calvin, he and the council majority, primarily Sanchez, Ibarra, Figueroa and Councilman Shorett, along with Mayor Tran, generally hewed to one side, while Calvin increasingly found herself isolated or with the support, on-again and off-again, of Councilman Reynoso and Councilman Damon Alexander. It thus appeared that Montoya had carved out for himself a safe haven within the administrative quarters of City Hall, which had relocated from the actual City Hall to offices within the immediately adjacent Vanir Tower in downtown San Bernardino.

While Montoya was yet riding high in San Bernardino, he not only took full advantage of the deterioration of the Calvin's relationship with Tran, Sanchez, Ibarra, Figueroa and Shorett, but sought to intensify it. While Montoya was yet the city manager, the city commissioned Laguna Niguel-based JL Group LLC to carry out two separate investigations. The first of these focused on Calvin directly and unequivocally, relating to what were alleged to be her improper dealings with city staff members, more precisely having direct contact with those employees rather than dealing with them indirectly through the city manager, i.e., Montoya. The second investigation focused on what were deemed, or suspected to be, leaks of confidential information.

Since the first investigation were carried out by JL Group was pointedly focused on Calvin, quite predictably, the relationship between JL Group's investigators/

management and Calvin soured immediately. The testy relationship between Calvin and the JL Group, which lacked subpoena power and thus was dependent upon the cooperation of witnesses identified by the investigators, most of whom were in some fashion affiliated with the city or were city employees who were answerable to Montoya, again predictably led to investigatory conclusions that were in the main less than flattering toward Calvin. At the time that the JL Group was carrying out its investigation, Montoya had immediate access to the preliminary and final reports pertaining to that investigation. The hostility between Montoya and Calvin was no secret. Many city employees, who were directly answerable to and serving at the pleasure of Montoya, out of fear that their jobs were on the line if they did not cooperate with JL Group's investigators, submitted to questioning and colored their statements to the investigators in a hue that might have been damaging to Calvin. The mayor and city council, with Calvin, Reynoso and Alexander dissenting, took the extraordinary steps of publicly releasing the executive summaries of the final reports provided by JL Group, along with 18 expurgated pages of the report relating to the leaks of confidentiality. Those materials revealed the investigators' conclusions that Calvin had improperly communicated with city staff and was the likely source of at least some of the leaks of confidential information.

At that point, Sanchez and Shorett were entirely exasperated with Calvin and made no effort whatsoever to mask their enmity, hostility and contempt toward her. Ibarra, Figueroa and Tran, while somewhat less demonstrative, had lost patience with her. All five in April used the JL Group's findings as a public relations cudgel against Calvin, citing those findings as a pretext to initiate censure proceedings against

her.

That ploy baffled many, as the previous month, in the municipal election corresponding with the March 5 California Primary, Calvin, who had failed to qualify her candidacy for reelection and therefore ran as write-in candidate, was turned out of office by the Sixth Ward's voters. Similarly, both Reynoso and Alexander lost their bids for reelection.

Despite Calvin's political fortunes having been eclipsed, she had expended tremendous energy and time over the previous six months inveighing against Montoya. In January, she had glommed onto an effort initiated by Montoya to have the city issue somewhere in the neighborhood of \$120 million in bonds to finance various city capital improvements and infrastructure augmentations, including the seismic retrofit of the San Bernardino City Hall, which had been shuttered in 2017 because of concerns about its structural stability. Montoya's move in this regard included his having signed, on December 12, 2023, a letter of intent, composed and dated December 4, 2023, to have the city enter into an exclusive relationship with the bond underwriting firm, Stifel Financial, Inc., to have it serve as the city's financial advisor and underwriter with regard to the bond issuances Montoya was pushing. That arrangement with Stifel meant there would be no open public bid on the bond underwriting contract.

While Calvin's efforts to vector the attention of the mayor and her council colleagues to what Montoya was hatching with Stifel was not immediately successful, she continued to push for an examination of the relationship between Montoya and Stifel, which had done financing work with a number of the other cities in California and elsewhere that Montoya had worked with over the years.

To a very real extent, Mayor Tran was

Continued on Page 7

District's Lawsuit Challenges Whether State Restriction On Telling Parents Their Children Have Changed Their Gender Identity Protects The Children From Harm, Asking Instead If It Deprives Them Of Crucial Family Guidance *from page 4*

had changed gender, as those lists provided the names and pronouns teachers should use when dealing with the students in the educational setting and the other names to use when communicating with parents. One exhibit presented in the Mirabelli and West case, a 2022 email, demonstrated many parents were unaware of their students' preferred names and pronouns. The Mirabelli and West case has direct relevancy to the circumstance being dealt with in lawsuit brought by Bonta against the Chino Valley Unified School District in state court. The principle enunciated by Judge Benitez has not yet been established at the level of California's Superior Court. Binding precedent applies only among courts of the same system, such as a state court hierarchy. Legal precedent set in the federal court system is not generally binding on any state court, though it could be utilized as what is commonly referred to as persuasive precedent. So far, Bonta has disregarded implication of Judge Benitez's ruling in the Mirabelli and West case, as it interfered with the legal theory he is proceeding under. Nevertheless, Bonta may have already inadvertently invited the court to consider Judge Benitez's ruling in the Mirabelli and West case when his office, on October 12, 2023, asked for the court to take judicial notice of a case that does not fall under California law, that being a decision of the New Jersey Superior Court in the case of Platkin v. Middletown Township Board of Education. In that case, on August 18, 2023, the Monmouth County Superior Court preliminarily enjoined three school districts from enforcing a mandatory parental disclosure policy similar to the one contained in Policy 5020. In this way,

Bonta opened the playing field for the magistrate hearing the matter in San Bernardino County Superior Court, Judge Michael Sachs, to consider Judge Benitez's decision, which is on point in the Chino Valley Unified case, to be considered. After Judge Garza and Judge Sachs entered temporary rulings and a preliminary injunction preventing the school district from implementing portions of Policy 5020.1, the district sought a workaround with regard to the potential that Bonta could prevail at the trial court level, then perhaps again at the appellate level and perhaps before the California Supreme Court.

A little more than four months ago, the district made what legal and constitutional experts said is calculated to be an adjustment of the parental notification policy that Bonta challenged which will allow the notification mandate to stand. The policy originally passed by the school board was more or less specific to efforts at or toward gender alteration or showings thereof. The action taken by the school board on Thursday, March 7 made the notification requirement more general but yet inclusive of the circumstances covered by the policy initiated in the summer of 2023.

The revised policy adopted on March 7 states that schools must notify parents or guardians if a student makes any change to his or her official or unofficial record, participates in extracurricular activities, or is involved in any case of bullying or possible suicide. All references to gender were removed from the revised policy. The presentation of the new policy and its discussion lasted for more than two hours and forty minutes during the March 7 meeting, at which point it was given approval by

the same 4-to-1 margin that the original policy was approved, with Shaw, Monroe, Cruz and Na voting in favor of it and Bridge in opposition. The district undertook to make the change after Riverside Superior Court Judge Eric Keen, who is hearing a case brought by the State of California against the Temecula Valley Unified School District similar to that one filed against Chino Valley Unified, on February 23, 2023 refused to grant the State of California a temporary restraining order to prevent Temecula Valley Unified from enforcing its parental notification policy, which is slightly different from that of Chino Valley Unified in that it makes no reference to gender or gender reidentification. After Lesbian Gay Bisexual Queer and Transsexual advocates argued that the new policy adopted by Chino Valley Unified and other parental notification policies in other districts that avoided mention of gender reidentification merely created a loophole that allows those districts to infringe on students' rights, Assembly Member Chris Ward crafted AB 1955, which bans schools from requiring teachers to notify parents about their children's gender identity. The Liberty Justice Center, which was aware that AB 1955 was in the works, prepared to take action. After AB 1955 was passed by both houses of the state legislature and signed by Governor Newsom on Monday, July 15, attorney Emily Rae, who is a member of the California Bar and who is based out of the Liberty Justice Center Austin, Texas office, filed suit on behalf of the Chino Valley Unified School District on July 16.

According to the suit, "Numerous studies assert that transgender and gender nonconforming students suffer from increased psychological, emotional, and physical harassment and abuse, and that transgender youth experience an abnormally high number of suicidal thoughts and

make an abnormally high number of suicide attempts. Faced with these concerns, various California school districts have adopted policies under which the school respects the wishes of students who ask to be treated as a gender different from their natal sex, while also making parents aware that the school is participating in the social transition of their child. These policies ensure that school districts do not betray the extraordinary trust placed in them by parents, who otherwise would be misled about a monumental change to the development of their child and to that child's official and unofficial school records."

The suit states, "These parental notification policies often address not only gender transition but also myriad other issues that parents would want or need to know about their child's education and development. For example, if a student is injured, bullied, or exhibits suicidal behavior at school, but does not want their parents to know, a school will notify the parents. If a student breaks their arm, hits their head, or develops a fever, the school will immediately tell the student's parents. If a student is bullied or involved in a verbal or physical fight, the school will tell the parents. If a student expresses a desire to hurt or kill themselves, the school will tell the parents. So, too, must a school tell parents if a student has asked the school to participate in that student's gender transition. But through Assembly Bill 1955 (AB 1955) California now seeks to bar schools from adopting policies that would require notifying parents when their children may be at increased risk of psychological, emotional, and physical harassment and abuse, and extremely high rates of suicide and suicide attempts. Specifically, AB 1955 states that a 'school district... shall not enact or enforce any policy, rule, or administrative regulation that would require an employee or

a contractor to disclose any information related to a pupil's... gender identity or gender expression to any other person without the pupil's consent..." (emphasis added). This means that, no matter how young a child is, a school cannot tell the child's parents the school is socially transitioning their child without the minor's 'consent.'"

The lawsuit states, "This action is brought on behalf of Chino Valley Unified School District and certain California parents of children in the public school system who seek to bar California from implementing AB 1955 in violation of their First and Fourteenth Amendment rights and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act."

Taken together, these provisions upend the traditional relationship between students, their parents, and their teachers.

According to the lawsuit, "Socially transitioning children without parental involvement negatively impacts children." The suit contends that by preventing parents from knowing their children are undertaking medical procedures or being administered hormones or drugs to alter their gender, the physicians treating those children or prescribing them chemicals that will alter the adolescents' bodies may be deprived of information that could be crucial to rendering safe and proper medical care and assistance.

"A social transition can include more than just name and pronoun changes—individuals adopting a transgender identity sometimes change their hairstyle, clothing, or their appearance in other ways; begin using opposite-sex facilities; and make other social changes," the suit states, "In medical and psychological literature, however, the phrase 'social transition' is primarily used to refer to name and pronoun changes. 'Social transition' is distinct from medical transition, which refers to various medical interventions to bring

one's physical appearance into closer alignment with one's asserted gender identity, such as puberty blockers, cross-sex hormone therapy, and various surgical interventions. The primary therapeutic purpose of social transitioning is to relieve the psychological distress associated with having a mismatch between one's natal sex and gender identity."

The lawsuit notes that the World Professional Association for Transgender Health a scientific, professional, and educational organization that has produced a set of recommendations for transgender health care in its "Standards of Care" document calls for parents of children who are undergoing a gender transition to be intimately involved in that process when it takes place.

Moreover, according to the lawsuit, it is illegal in most jurisdictions in the United States to subject a minor to gender transition without the knowledge and consent of the minor's parents.

"Aside from a few limited exceptions, medical and mental-health providers generally cannot see or treat a minor without informed consent from the parent(s)/legal guardian(s), both as a matter of state laws and as a matter of medical ethics," the suit states, quoting from the World Professional Association for Transgender Health's Standards of Care for the Health of Transgender and Gender Diverse People, continuing, "In most settings, for minors, the legal guardian is integral to the informed consent process: if a treatment is to be given, the legal guardian (often the parent[s]/caregiver[s]) provides the informed consent to do so."

The lawsuit states, again referencing and incorporating quotes from Standards of Care for the Health of Transgender and Gender Diverse People, "This is because children and adolescents lack the 'skills for future thinking, planning, big picture thinking, and self-reflection' that are necessary for informed

Continued on Page 8

Under Montoya's Management, Everyone In SB, It Seemed, Had His Or Her Hand Out, Including The City's Bond Underwriter, The City Attorney & Her Law Firm Colleagues, An Applicant For City Manager Who Withdrew, While The Councilwoman Who Was Challenging Those Efforts By The Entrusted Few To Head Off With Millions Of Dollars In Taxpayer Funds Was Being Demonized *from page 5*

convinced by not only Montoya but Sanchez and Shorett to ignore Calvin's constant soundings of alarm and warning about the untoward relationship between Montoya and Stifel because, they said, she was hellbent on causing trouble and making the city look bad as part of her negative orientation sour grapes attitude at having been voted out of office. Simultaneously, both City Attorney Sonia Carvalho and Assistant City Attorney Thomas Rice, partners in the law firm of Best Best and Krieger, were lending credibility to the attacks on Calvin, as they downplayed the concern that she was enunciating about the potential long-term negative impact the bond issuances would have on the city financially.

In May came a string of revelations that virtually reorganized Mayor Tran's thinking from top to bottom.

Then-Finance Director Barbara Germaine Whitehorne, who had been hired into that post in February 2021, 32 months before Montoya arrived, had grown curious about Montoya's bond financing proposal, particularly as he had been excluding her from internal and external city communications involving a number of entities including corporate officers with Stifel and the city attorney's office. Sparing time from her normal workload, which extended to preparing the city's 2024-25 budget, she began to quietly churn the numbers that pertained to the bond issuance Montoya had unveiled in selected circles within the city's confines, the need for debt service those issuances would create, breaking that number down into the annual drain it would represent and comparing

that alongside the numbers in the annual spending plan she was working on. She was driven to a conclusion that the city would not be able to logically service that debt in either the short or long term. Exploring the matter further, it became clear that what Montoya was driving the city toward was having to pull \$12 million out of its revenue stream to service the bonded indebtedness in upcoming 2024-25 and the city would thereafter have to devote \$10 million annually toward that debt at a minimum starting Fiscal 2025-26, doing so continuously without respite for the next 29 years. The week of May 1, before she left on vacation, Whitehorn confronted Montoya, telling him in plain terms, she said, "The city does not have that money." She then provided the same information to the city's team in charge of capital projects, including the City Hall retrofit. Upon returning from vacation on May 15, Whitehorn met with Montoya, indicating her unwillingness to offer her support for the City Hall salvaging effort or the bond issuance. She said that Montoya sought to pressure her into changing her position by threatening to release, she said, "information damaging to my career into the public domain." She responded by telling Montoya he would have to fire her to prevent her from opposing the bond issuances as a city employee. She quoted him as responding, "Oh, then I'll just fire you without cause." Indeed, that is what Montoya did, arranging for Whitehorne to receive a pink slip later that day. Whitehorne cleaned out her desk and left, but, catching Montoya un-

awares, returned for that evening's city council meeting, where she gave the city council a blow-by-blow account of her confrontation with Montoya over the bond issuance proposal.

Simultaneously, questions arose over Montoya's single-minded dedication to hiring Stifel. Almost overnight, the remainder of the city council began to focus on what Calvin had been irritatingly harping on all along: Montoya's obstinate opposition to any kind of competitive bidding by a fuller range of bond underwriters. It was noted that Stifel had hit a rough patch, in which its annual net income for 2022 had been \$625 million, a 20.83 percent decline from 2021 and that the financial doldrums for the company had persisted into 2023, when its net annual income declined 22.34 percent from what it was in 2022 to \$485 million. Some had the perception that Montoya was militating more on behalf of Stifel than he was for San Bernardino. Some went so far as to suggest that he was feathering for himself a future nest by which he would be able to move into a lucrative position with the company after he was no longer city manager.

Boiling to the surface was that among the arrangements for the bond issuance that Montoya and Stifel were making was that Best Best & Krieger, the law firm in which City Attorney Carvalho and Assistant City Attorney Thomas Rice are partners in, was to serve as bond counsel, and that Carvalho's and Rice's colleague at Best Best & Krieger, Kim Byrens, was to serve as disclosure counsel. Typically, a bond counsel collects a fee somewhere between a quarter of a percent and one-half of a percent [.0025 and .005] of the bond issuance. Typically, a disclosure counsel is paid a fee equal to one-eighth of a percent and a quarter percent [.00125 and .0025] of the bond issuance.

Thus, if the issuance of \$120 million in bonds had proceeded as Montoya intended, Best Best & Krieger stood to collect a fee of somewhere between \$300,000 and \$600,000 and Byrens stood to make between \$150,000 and \$300,000.

The matter stewed for a while. The council called for a special meeting on May 22, one to be held behind closed doors and outside the view or earshot of the public, at which it was scheduled to engage in a "public employee performance evaluation... public employee performance dismissal [and] public employee appointment" relating to the "city manager."

After hearing from a number of irate members of the public, the city council in private voted unanimously, citing no cause for the action. Pursuant to Section 11.7 of his employment contract, his termination without cause entitles Montoya to collect a specified severance equivalent to 12 months of his base salary, or \$325,000. After months during which the council majority was constantly taking action in which it prevailed over Calvin's dissenting votes or opposition, sometimes with and sometimes without the accompanying votes of Reynoso and Alexander, the full council and the mayor followed her lead.

Since Montoya's departure, the half-gestated censure effort against Calvin has been dormant.

Going back at least a year, Mayor Tran has grown increasingly angry over what she considers to be a lack of respect. Those on the council have not recognized her crucial role as the city's leader, she believes. What Tran is experiencing is an outgrowth of a reality that few, including herself, understand or at least in her case, understood. In actuality, the mayor in San Bernardino has far less political power than is commonly recog-

nized. Throughout most of the 20th Century and into the beginning of the Third Millennium that was the case. It is even more true today. The San Bernardino City Charter that went into effect in 1905 did not, under normal circumstances, empower the mayor to vote. While the mayor presided over the city council's meetings, controlling the gavel and the ebb and flow of debate and discussion, with a certain discretion over how and when votes were to be taken, only in such cases as there being a tie or with regard to the firing of personnel was the mayor allowed to vote. The mayor did have veto power, however on any vote of the council which passed by a 4-to-3 or 3-to-2 vote. In this way, it could be said, on issues of controversy or close differences, as long as the vote was framed properly, the mayor had two votes. Whereas the mayor's political power under the 1905 Charter was rather limited, however, his/her administrative power was immense. The charter made him/her, with the city manager, a co-regent of the city in that he/she had the power to hire personnel. In 2015, the charter was redrafted and presented to the city's residents the following year. Like the 1905 Charter, the mayor's political reach remains limited in the 2016 Charter, which replicates the provisions of having the mayor preside over meetings, voting with regard to personnel decisions and possessing veto power on votes of the council wherein passage was by a single vote margin. But unlike the 1905 Charter, the 2016 Charter dispenses with the mayor's administrative authority. Rather than the 1905 Charter's council-mayor/city manager form of government, the 2016 Charter specifies a council-city manager form of government. The mayor no longer has the authority to engage with the city manager in making hiring decision of department heads and line employees, which

are then confirmed/rubberstamped by the city council.

Since coming into office, Tran has essentially presided over city council meetings in which she has a modicum of control in managing the proceedings, but that has about been it. And in a very real way, her control has been limited, at best.

Her frustration at her circumstance has been tangible. She has requested that the entity she presides over be one that functions efficiently and in a dignified fashion. At the outset of city council meetings, she has repeatedly made a request, which goes, "Before we conduct city business, as a friendly reminder, as the elected leaders of the city we will endeavor to be respectful to each other, our public and especially our staff. Our behavior this evening sets the tone for how our residents, business community and others view our city. We must conduct city business with professionalism and respectful behavior to build trust, credibility and move our city forward. We shall commit to these values and foster a positive and productive working environment that is conducive to achieving our goals effectively and efficiently." Over the last several months, when making that statement, delivered word for word as if she is reading it from a script, there has been an ever more plaintive tone to her voice."

Tran made a personal sacrifice in becoming mayor. To do so, she had to resign from a relatively lucrative professional assignment with the City of West Covina as the director of human resources there.

At the time she left West Covina in 2022, Tran was pulling down a salary of \$142,031 with perquisites and add-ons of \$13,335 per year plus benefits of \$35,603 annually together with a \$92,450 contribution toward her pension fund

Continued on Page 13

Governor's Office & California Attorney General Dismiss CVUSD Parental Disclosure Suit As A "Dumpster Fire" from page 6

decision-making. Minors' decisions are often influenced by factors that are unrelated to their long-term best interests, such as 'a sense of urgency that stems from hypersensitivity to reward,' a 'heightened focus on peer relationships,' and 'increased risk-taking behaviors.' In light of the ongoing and unfinished development of emotional and cognitive maturity during childhood and adolescence, '[i]n most settings, for minors, the legal guardian is integral to the informed consent process.'

According to the suit, "Parental involvement is also necessary as a practical matter. Many children and adolescents could not get to any appointments with a mental-health provider without their parents' assistance. And most children and adolescents do not have their own health insurance and would have no way to pay for those appointments. Parental involvement is also important for accurate diagnosis, as parents often have a critical perspective on the history and likely causes of a child's or adolescent's gender questioning feelings. Parents

are often the only people who have frequently and regularly interacted with a child or adolescent throughout the child's or adolescent's entire life, and therefore they have a unique view of the child's development over time. Indeed, parents often have more knowledge than even the child or adolescent does of whether their child or adolescent exhibited any signs of gender incongruence or gender dysphoria during the earliest years of life. Thus, parental involvement is a critical part of the diagnostic process to evaluate how long the child or adolescent has been experiencing gender incongruence, whether there might be any external

cause of those feelings, and a prediction of how likely those feelings are to persist."

The lawsuit states, "[A]s the World Professional Association for Transgender Health notes, 'a parent/caregiver report may provide critical context in situations in which a young person experiences very recent or sudden self-awareness of gender diversity and a corresponding gender treatment request, or when there is concern for possible excessive peer and social media influence on a young person's current self-gender concept.' Thus, the reconstructed history from a child or adolescent often does not match the reported history from the parent. Likewise, children and adolescents often acknowledge that they have consumed many hours of social media from other transgender youth and have absorbed these experiences in some personal way."

The lawsuit maintains, "Indeed, the World Professional Association for Transgender Health recommends 'involving parent(s) or primary caregiver(s) in the assessment process... in almost all situations,' and adds that 'including parent(s)/caregiver(s) in the assessment process to encourage and facilitate increased parental understanding and support of the adolescent may be one of the most helpful practices available.' The World Professional Association for Transgender Health recommends that mental health providers 'should provide guidance to parents/caregivers and supports to a child when a social gender transition is being considered' and to 'facilitate the parents/caregivers' success in making informed decisions about the advisability and/or parameters of a social transition for their child.' If a school facilitates a social transition at school without parental knowledge and buy-in, it necessarily interferes with the parents' ability to take a cautious approach and pursue an evaluation and assessment before allowing their child or adolescent to make sig-

nificant changes to their identity. A school-facilitated transition without parental knowledge also interferes with parents' ability to pursue a treatment approach that does not involve an immediate transition—such as an exploratory process to understand the cause of the feelings or self-perceptions of gender incongruence."

According to the suit, "A school-facilitated transition over the objection of parents (or, possibly worse, without their knowledge) necessarily creates tension in the parent-child relationship. A common principle in the training for psychotherapists who work with children and adolescents is to never create or aggravate any tensions in the parent-child relationship. By facilitating a social transition at school over the parents' objection or without their knowledge, a school would drive a wedge between the parent and child. Similarly, facilitating a double life for some children, in which they present as transgender in some contexts but not in other contexts, is not in their best interest."

The lawsuit asserts that "The World Professional Association for Transgender Health recognizes that 'social transition for children typically can only take place with the support and acceptance of parents/caregivers.' Likewise, 'adolescents are typically dependent on their caregivers/parents for guidance in numerous ways,' including as they 'navigate through the process of deciding about treatment options.' As the World Professional Association for Transgender Health notes elsewhere, '[p]arent and family support of transgender diverse youth is a primary predictor of youth well-being.' Circumventing, bypassing, or excluding parents from decisions about a social transition undermines the main support structure for a child or adolescent who desperately needs support. Indeed, Plaintiffs are not aware of any professional body that has endorsed school-facilitated

social transitions without parental knowledge."

The lawsuit maintains that "When a child presents with a desire to use a new name or pronouns, the very first step should be to notify parents and involve them in the process of considering whether the child should undergo a careful professional assessment by a mental health professional with expertise in child gender incongruence. Prekindergarten to 12th grade minor students, most of whom are too young to drive, vote, or provide medical consent for themselves, are also too young to make life-altering decisions about their expressed gender identity without their parents' knowledge. But that is precisely what AB 1955 enables, with severe consequences for children too young to fully comprehend them."

The lawsuit makes the point that "A number of school districts in California had, prior to AB 1955's passage, enacted policies designed to protect students, and to protect parents' rights to determine, without undue interference by the State, how best to raise, nurture, and educate the child. Parental notification policies like those adopted by the Chino Valley Unified School District and other school districts are consistent with best practices relating to parental notification when a child or adolescent expresses a desire to be socially transitioned at school insofar as they encourage and facilitate maintaining the relationship between parents and their children. Best mental health practices abhor activity that maintains secrets between children and their parents, which create distrust and tension. In all cases, parental consent is required to provide medical and psychological treatment to minors. In part, this is because the science of mental health recognizes that the best evidence regarding a minor's mental and emotional well-being comes from first-hand accounts by parents, rather than potentially biased accounts from immature children."

The *Sentinel* sought

from Governor Newsom, Attorney General Bonta and Superintendent of Public Instruction Thurmond their reaction to the lawsuit.

The *Sentinel* noted that there are parents in the Chino Valley and elsewhere who believe they should be able to learn in a timely manner if their children are assuming a gender identity other than the one those parents associate with those offspring. The *Sentinel* asked if Newsom, Bonta and Thurmond perceived that expectation on the part of parents to be unrealistic.

Noting that many people consider it to be unrealistic to expect that the parents of children who have concluded that they are a gender different from their gender designated at birth will not at some point discover that these children in question are reidentifying their gender, the *Sentinel* observed that some of those parents will likely come to greatly resent having been kept in the dark about a key aspect of their children's lives by responsible entities such as school officials who may have discovered that before they do. The *Sentinel* sought from Newsom, Bonta and Thurmond how they would respond to those who think that it is not right for the government to be secretive about such things that it becomes privy to as a result of parents entrusting their children to the state/local educational system.

The *Sentinel* asked Newsom, Bonta and Thurmond if they maintain that parents should have no right to know about their children's gender identification if it deviates from their birth gender. The *Sentinel* asked Newsom, Bonta and Thurmond whether, given the interpersonal dynamics within families, it wouldn't be better that parents learn about things such as the gender reidentification of their children sooner rather than later.

Conceding that the intention of AB 1955 is to ensure the safety of children who gender reidentify who might have parents who would re-

act violently or inflict violence, physical or psychological or emotional, on them upon finding his/her/their child is not conventionally gender conforming, the *Sentinel* asked Newsom, Bonta and Thurmond if it might be better to address the issue by enforcing the law with regard to child abuse, etc. rather than lumping all parents together, particularly since the vast majority of parents are not abusive toward their children.

The *Sentinel* asked Newsom, Bonta and Thurmond if in their view AB 1955 prevented as many children from obtaining the support of their parents as it will protect from abusive parents

Lastly, the *Sentinel* inquired of Newsom, Bonta and Thurmond if they consider AB 1955 to be a perfect law or rather saw it as an imperfect law that is nonetheless necessary.

In response, Newsom's spokesman, Izzy Gardon, who was formerly Bonta's official press mouthpiece, stated that those at the pinnacle of California's state government do not perceive the lawsuit challenging AB 1955 as raising valid legal issues.

"This is a deeply unserious lawsuit, seemingly designed to stoke the dumpster fire formerly known as Twitter rather than surface legitimate legal claims," Gardon said. "AB 1955 preserves the child-parent relationship, California law ensures minors can't legally change their name or gender without parental consent, and parents continue to have guaranteed and full access to their student's educational records consistent with federal law. We're confident the state will swiftly prevail in this case."

-Mark Gutglueck

Ontario Airport Sidesteps Computer Failure Disaster from page 3

employed by the airport's administration, management and facility operator, in this case, the Ontario International Airport Authority.

Public Notices

Public Notices

Public Notices

Public Notices

Public Notices

Public Notices

Public Notices

HGUNKH, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 08, 2024 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.

FBN 20240006066 The following person is doing business as: J.C.P. - INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPANY. 16234 BLUE IRIS ST FONTANA, CA 92336;

FBN 20240005719 The following person is doing business as: BLESSED TASTE EVER. 813 N CAMPUS AVE ONTARIO, CA 91764;

FBN 20240006093 The following person is doing business as: GALVEZ TRANSPORT. 10727 WILLIAM AVE BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316;

becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ DANIEL GALVEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 05, 2024 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.

FBN 20240002092 The following person is doing business as: S & J CLEANING SERVICES. 435 W 3RD ST APT C RIALTO, CA 92376;

FBN 20240004290 The following person is doing business as: TINO'S TRUCKING. 3171 JUNE ST SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407;

FBN 20240003674 The following person is doing business as: POMONA PRINT STOP; AMERICAN SPIRIT PRINTING 9077 ARROW ROUTE STE 120 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730;

CAMONGA, CA 91730 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 201900810100 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: JAN 14, 2019 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20240003865 The following person is doing business as: CALIFORNIA ROOF BROWKER 9769 RAMONA AVENUE MONTCLAIR, CA 91763;

FBN 20240004271 The following person is doing business as: NB CONSTRUCTION 5199 SILVER MOUNTAIN WAY RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737;

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 05/10/2024, 05/17/2024, 05/24/2024, 05/31/2024 CNBB19202408MT CORRECTION DATES 07/12/2024, 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024 & 08/02/2024

FBN 20240003834 The following person is doing business as: ON THE SPOT. 2999 W KENDALL DRIVE SUITE #210 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407;

FBN 20240004489 The following person is doing business as: 4D CONSTRUCTION. 7549 VISTARIOHIGHLAND, CA 92346;

FBN 20240004187 The following person is doing business as: FLOORS DESIGN SERVICES 243 N MERIDIAN AVE SPC 109 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92410;

FBN 20240003207 The following person is doing business as: A'S PLUMBING AND DRAIN CLEANING. 6341 N ANGELS PEAK DR SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407;

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.

FBN 20240003637 The following person is doing business as: EMPIRE PAVING. 2717 ETI-WANDA AVE RIALTO, CA 92376;

FBN 20240004375 The following person is doing business as: HANSON'S MOTEL. 1391 WEST REDLANDS BLVD REDLANDS, CA 92373;

FBN 20240006490 The following person is doing business as: MIGUEL RABADAN UPHOLSTERY SERVICE. 2151 S FERN AVE ONTARIO, CA 91762;

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.

FBN 20240004680 STATEMENT OF ABANDONMENT OF USE OF FICTICIOUS BUSINESS NAME STATEMENT The following person is doing business as: IVY NAILS SALON. 1505 S RIVERSIDE AVE UNIT A RIALTO, CA 92376;

FBN 20240006377 The following person is doing business as: GOD WITH US HOA JANTORIAL. 12835 10TH ST APT #12 CHINO, CA 91710;

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MIGUEL RABADAN The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUL 16, 2024 By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct.

FBN 20240006494 The following person is doing business as: VICTOR MENDOZA DETAIL. 2151 S FERN AVE ONTARIO, CA 91762;

FBN 20240006331 The following person is doing business as: RADIO KALY CALIENTE. 15419 RIDGECREST DRIVE FONTANA, CA 92337;

Public Notices

EDUARDO R SANCHEZ The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: JUL 10, 2024 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/EDUARDORSANCHEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 11, 2024 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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202409MT

FBN 20240006435 The following person is doing business as: NORTH D-LTC PHARMACY. 1556 N D ST SUITE B SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405;[MAILING ADDRESS 1556 N D ST SUITE B SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MEDRX PHARMA INC. 50 S CHURCH AVENUE BLOOMINGTON, CA 92316 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 4723737 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and

Public Notices

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/ ABIGAIL MARTIN, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 15 2024 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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202408MT

FBN 20240006437 The following person is doing business as: NEW WEST UPHOLSTERY SHOP. 8046 CENTRAL AVE HIGHLAND, CA 92346;[MAILING ADDRESS 26978 CY-PRESS ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO NEW WEST UPHOLSTERY SHOP, INC. 8046 CENTRAL AVE HIGHLAND, CA 92346 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 6269508 The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130. I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ALBERTO VALENCIA DIMAS, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk

Public Notices

of San Bernardino on: JULY 15, 2024 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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202407MT

FBN 20240006409 The following person is doing business as: PRECIOUS DAYS BOUTIQUE. 937 S OLIVE AVE UPLAND, CA 92376;[MAILING ADDRESS 937 S OLIVE AVE UPLAND, CA 92376]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MARIA H SUAREZ 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/ MARIA H SUAREZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 12, 2024 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

Public Notices

seq., Business and Professions Code). Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202406MT

FBN 20240006398 The following person is doing business as: JETTER PRO 1. 16482 ELAINE DR FONTANA, CA 92336;[MAILING ADDRESS 16482 ELAINE DR FONTANA, CA 92336]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO BRANDON E BARILLAS GATICIA 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/ BRANDON E BARI LLAS GATICIA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 12, 2024 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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202404MT

FBN 20240006397 The following person is doing business as: VIO SHOP. 8467 OLEANDER AVE FONTANA, CA 92335;[MAILING ADDRESS 8467 OLEANDER AVE FONTANA, CA 92335]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO EVELYN A VIORATO CHAVARIN

Public Notices

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/ EVELYN A VIORATO CHAVARIN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 12, 2024 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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202404MT

FBN 20240006379 The following person is doing business as: BANUELO'S MOBILE AUTO REPAIR. 236 E 48TH ST APT #19 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404;[MAILING ADDRESS 236 E 48TH ST APT #19 SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DOLORES BANUELOS GONZALEZ 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

Public Notices

that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ DOLORES BANUELOS GONZALEZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 12, 2024 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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202403MT

FBN 20240006271 The following person is doing business as: EMPTY STOMAX. 1137 W LA GLORIA DR RIALTO, CA 92377;[MAILING ADDRESS 1137 W LA GLORIA DR RIALTO, CA 92377]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GERALD WATERS SR 1137 W LA GLORIA DR 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/ GERALD WATERS SR, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 10, 2024 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

Public Notices

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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202402MT

FBN 20240006272 The following person is doing business as: TIRE TECH. 528 TEXAS ST REDLANDS, CA 92374;[MAILING ADDRESS 528 TEXAS ST REDLANDS, CA 92374]; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO FELIPE LOERA HUERTA 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/ FELIPE LOERA HUERTA, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 10, 2024 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 07/19/2024, 07/26/2024, 08/02/2024, 08/09/2024 CNBB29202401MT

SB Mayor Now Wondering What Throwing In With Montoya, Sanchez & Shorett In Opposing Now Vindicated Calvin Availed Her from page 7

for a total annual compensation of \$283,419.

As San Bernarino Mayor throughout 2023, Tran was provided with a salary of \$48,654 plus perquisites and pay additions of \$8,769, together with benefits of \$23,122 and a \$14,572.58 contribution to her retirement fund for a total annual compensation of \$95,117.56.

Throughout the latter half of 2023 and the beginning of 2024, in the contretemps between, on one side Calvin and on the other Sanchez and Shorett and to a lesser extent Ibarra and Figueroa, Tran found herself gravitating more or less toward Sanchez and Shorett, two of the panel's Republicans, putting her ad odds with her sister Democrat Calvin. While the closed session discussions that precipitated the council decision to release the

JL Group's investigation into the complaints relating to Calvin's contact with staff members and what was characterized as leaks relating to last year's city manager recruitment effort have remained under wraps and it is not clear whether Tran was in concurrence with that decision, it is known that both Sanchez and Shorett were pushing for that disclosure. On June 21, Steve Carrigan, the Salinas city manager who applied for the San Bernardino job, was selected and then voluntarily withdrew his application in September, sued the City of San Bernardino, claiming the city failed to maintain the confidentiality of the recruitment process, which either directly or indirectly led to his firing by Salinas shortly after he signaled he was not interested in the San Bernardino job. The strongest element of the suit Carrigan has brought, in which he wants at least \$2.3 million, is the material contained in the JL Group report which blames Calvin for the leaking of that information.

The Carrigan lawsuit promises to be another black eye for the

City of San Bernardino, consisting of events that took place under Tran's stewardship of the city. Word is that following the revelations that came about during the final chapter of the Montoya saga, Tran now believes that she erroneously put her faith in the judgment of both Shorett, the senior member of the city council, and Sanchez, with Ibarra, the second longest serving member on the current council when it came to dealing with Calvin. As it turned out that Calvin was correct in her skepticism with regard to Montoya, sources say that Tran has come to see how Shorett's and Sanchez's antipathy toward Calvin resulted in them joining with Montoya in orchestrating the framing of Calvin with regard to the so-called "leaks" from the city manager recruitment effort. There is extant countervailing evidence to suggest that it was not Calvin or anyone in San Bernardino who actually allowed information about the identities of any of the 67 applicants for the job to slip out but rather a lack of security with regard to communications between the Berkeley-

based headhunting/professional executive services recruitment firm, Koff & Associates/ Arthur J. Gallagher & Company, that was conducting the city manager position application and evaluation process for the city. Tran, it is said, is livid with both Sanchez and Shorett, and a principal in JL Group, Jeffrey Johnson, with whom she previously had a close professional and political relationship, for having misled her into thinking that Calvin was acting irresponsibly and vindictively in her capacity as a city councilwoman.

In June, around the time that Carrigan filed his lawsuit against the city, a movement to hold Sanchez and Shorett accountable for the liability they had exposed the city to was materializing. There was a report that both would be served with recall papers at the July 3 council meeting. That date came and went, however, without either councilman being served with recall documents.

At this week's meeting came confirmation that some order of a recall effort is under way.

During that portion of the July 17 meeting

reserved for public comments, Sharon Negrete made her way to the podium.

"I, Sharon Negrete am here today to to serve Fourth Ward Councilman Fred Shorett and First Ward Councilman Theodore Sanchez pursuant to Section 11020 of California Elections Code," she said. "This notice of intention to circulate recall petition," she said. "This is for you Fred. I'll give this to the clerk."

After providing the notices to City Clerk Genoveva Rocha, Negrete, alluding to the Lewis Carroll works Through the Looking Glass and Alice Wonderland, stated her belief that the city was plagued by the "ineffective leadership of our city council under your watch. We're spiraling down a path of confusion and inaction much like the dissent into a bottomless rabbit hole. Our community deserves more than this circus act."

Negrete did not specify who, beyond herself, was involved in the recall effort. Thereafter, assertions were made that the official initiation of the recall has yet to be made, as Negrete

presented the documents to Rocha rather than to Shorett and Sanchez. After the meeting, it was related, an effort to serve both took place, but both moved too quickly to actually be served. A video surfaced the following day depicting what appeared to be two women attempting to serve Shorett, who was not visible in the video but was alleged to be inside his white pickup truck as it backing out of a parking space. One of the woman, carrying a packet in a large yellow-orange envelope standing to the driver's side of the truck, attempts to approach the moving vehicle and engage with the driver, who does not allow himself to be inveigled into any sort of an exchange. After truck completes backing up and turns to pull away and down the aisle of the parking lot, another woman with a similar envelope is seen standing to the side of the truck on the passenger side. As the truck begins to move forward, the first woman throws the envelope into the bed of the pickup truck before it drives off.

The events of this week set off a frenzied

Continued on Page 14

Belatedly, Tran Has Come To Recognize That Her Alliance With Montoya, Sanchez, Ibarra, Figueroa & Shorett In Cutting Calvin Off At The Knees In Pursuit Of Coordinated Action In Civic Affairs Has Come At The Price Of A Likely \$2.3M Payout To A City Manager Job Applicant Who Spurned The City from page 13

set of speculations as to exactly who the recall proponents are and who is behind them.

Unfortunately, because the proponents failed to serve either Sanchez or Shorett properly, neither of them are in a position to provide the Sentinel or anyone else with their identities. Despite the Sentinel making a plea with the 13 other entities provided with the video of the effort to serve Shorett that those involved provide further information about themselves and the grounds they allege justify the recall effort, no documentation relating to the petition was provided, nor any explanation of what grounds are being cited for the attempt to remove Shorett and Sanchez from office.

The *Sentinel's* effort to determine Negrete's connection to any political figures or groups in San Bernardino or elsewhere turned up only that she is a former sheriff's deputy with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department who has or had an address on North E Street in San Bernardino, is a resident of the Fourth Ward and is an activist or fundraiser with Southern California Animal Relief, known by its acronym SCAR and was appointed by the mayor and city council to the San Bernardino Animal Control Commission in July 2023.

There is some indication of bad blood between Shorett and Negrete in that on January 17 of this year, the city council, based upon Shorett's recommendation, removed Negrete from the San Bernardino Animal Control Commission. The report and recommendation for the action, authored by Shorett, does not give a cogent reason for the removal other than saying that commission mem-

bers serve at the pleasure of the council.

There were both suggestions and direct statements to the effect that Negrete was acting on behalf of Tran, though the *Sentinel* was able to find no evidence to support that.

Similarly, there are recurrent reports that Tran is the prime mover behind the recall, having come to the realization that she has squandered more than a year-and-a-half in office without any meaningful accomplishments, and that the lack of dignity maintained around what passes for the atmospherics in San Bernardino Hall of Government. Three of members of council who have been in place throughout Tran's tenure in office – Reynoso, Calvin and Alexander – are on their way out, based upon the outcome of the March 5 primary vote. Figueroa, whom Tran does not particularly care for, was reelected on March 5. She is prepared to coexist with him. At the same time, she is hopeful that Kim Knaus, one of her political associates, will capture Reynoso's seat as a result of the November runoff she is engaged in with Henry Nickel, who was the Fifth Ward Councilman replaced by Reynoso in 2020. In the 7th Ward race, Tran is faced with what are for her two equally unpalatable choices: Treasure Ortiz and Jim Penman. The mayor has developed a testy relationship with Ortiz, who has been constantly critical of San Bernardino municipal government since well before Tran became mayor. Ortiz was one of the competitors for the mayor's post in 2022, having finished in the balloting in fifth place, just behind the fourth place showing of the incumbent, John Valdivia.

Tran dreads the prospect of having to share the council dais with Ortiz, who would be able to use the bully pulpit of a the Seventh Ward council post to continue to highlight governmental shortcomings in the county seat. Penman, the longtime city attorney in San Bernardino whose political ambition prompted him to run, unsuccessfully, for district attorney in 1994 and San Bernardino mayor in 2005, 2009, 2013 and 2022, was the finalist in the runoff against Tran in the last contest. By seeing Sanchez, with whom she rarely sees eye-to-eye, and Shorett removed from office, at some point next year Tran would be able to start from scratch with a city council that would consist of five new members, all of whom would very likely be looking toward her, as the city's highest elected official, for guidance. For that reason, and the perception that both Shorett and Sanchez were major factors in the Montoya and Calvin censure debacles, numerous people in San Bernardino believe Tran is pushing the recall effort.

There is reason to dispute that assumption. Primarily, Shorett for the virtual duration of Tran's mayoralty has considered himself to be aligned with her. Publicly, there has never been a cross word between the two. As recently as early June, Shorett, openly, candidly and publicly spoke about what a good job she had been doing, stating how she represented a vast improvement over her predecessor, Valdivia, and was more cut out for the mayoral assignment than the mayor prior to Valdivia, Carey Davis. That Tran would be in favor of removing from office one of her highest profile and most vocal supporters is hard to fathom. And while the ostensible relationship between Tran and Councilman Sanchez is no longer as positive as hers has been with Shorett, it would appear that just as Tran has much to lose by turning Shorett form an

ally into an enemy, she has nothing to gain by becoming openly hostile toward Sanchez.

The political reality is that, statistically, recall efforts are rarely successful. If Tran signs on to an effort to remove Sanchez and Shorett from office or if she, indeed, already has and those moves do not succeed, she would greatly complicate her prospects to succeed as mayor from her on out. Having two antagonists on the council who are set to remain in place until the close of her current term in 2026 and who would be, like her, eligible and perhaps even likely to seek reelection to serve through to 2030, would be the height of folly. Gettin on the wrong side of Sanchez and Shorett now would diminish her chances of effectively guiding the city for the remainder of her current term. If all three were to be reelected in 2026, that disadvantage would perpetuate itself.

There is an unreliable report that former Mayor Patrick Morris is pushing the recall. Morris is a Democrat and both Sanchez and Shorett are Republicans. Morris has no history to speak of with Sanchez, negative or positive. Despite their partisan differences, Morris and Shorett were allies during the 2010 to 2014 span when Morris was mayor and Shorett serving his first term on the council. That Morris would be fueling the recall effort against the duo appears doubtful.

Some have suggested that Treasure Ortiz is the hidden hand behind the recall effort against Shorett and Sanchez. Ortiz and Shorett despise one another, and the only question in that regard is whose antipathy toward the other is greater. Shorett has called Ortiz "despicable." To Ortiz, Shorett is "a sad old man who is politically irrelevant." Ortiz is only slightly less uncharitable toward Sanchez, calling him "an embarrassment."

Nevertheless, Ortiz is far too engaged in her effort to capture the Seventh Ward post, her professional commitments

as a lecturer in the public administration department at Cal State University San Bernardino and work at the Akoma Unity Center to be able to devote herself to coordinating a recall attempt.

Moreover, Ortiz finds herself at war with Tran. As such, it is beyond unlikely that the two would be simultaneously engaged in a political campaign which would have the shared goals impacting the San Bernardino City Council

Penman, who twice ran for mayor against Patrick Morris, by extension is one of Shorett's political rivals. Still, as is the case with Ortiz, he is too involved in his campaign for the Seventh Ward to focus on a campaign not directly related to advancing his own political agenda. Were he too succeed in getting elected in November, it would be in his interest to bridgebuild and iron out any past differences with Shorett rather than engage in political activity which, if it did not prove successful, would leave him with an implacable enemy on the council who might steer others on that panel toward voting against his proposals.

A likely suspect for being the sponsor of the recall against Shorett and Sanchez is Scott Beard, a developer and would-be kingmaker who in 2013 spearheaded an effort to recall Penman as city attorney and simultaneously recall then-Mayor Patrick Morris, then-First District Councilwoman Virginia Marquez, then-Second District Councilman Robert Jenkins, then-Third District Councilman John Valdivia, Fourth District Councilman Fred Shorett, then-Fifth District Councilman Chas Kelly, then-Sixth Ward Councilman Rikke Van Johnson and then-Seventh Ward Councilwoman Wendy McCammack. Beard invested \$146,210 in that effort, which proved successful only insofar as qualifying recall elections against Valdivia, McCammack and Penman for the ballot. Of those, McCammack and Penman were

removed from office, while Valdivia survived the attempt to remove him.

Beard was a primary donor to Gil Botello, who ran against Sanchez in 2018, providing him with \$2,500 donations at a time. He was also, however, a primary donor to Shorett in his elective and reelective efforts at different points, despite having sponsored the unsuccessful recall effort against him in 2013.

Conflicting evidence suggests that Beard has the motive and means to seek to remove current members of the council in San Bernardino from office, but it is not clear whether he is availing himself of the opportunity to do so.

The Sentinel reached out to both Sanchez and Shorett to get their perspective on what is going on. Sanchez did not respond.

Asked who was driving the recall effort, Shorett said, "I don't know for sure.

I have some inside information, which gives me reason to believe I know who is behind this or at least get close to having a good idea. I think there's people involved in this who are, obviously, connected other political figures. Their fingerprints are on this."

Asked if he could be more specific, Shorett said, "Not at this time. I'll be responding appropriately as to what the regulations are."

Shorett said he did not want to go off half-cocked or overreact, as there was some indication that the recall proponents might not follow through with what they have started.

"I don't think it will succeed," Shorett said, "either with regard to me or Theodore [Sanchez]. There is reason to believe it is not going forward. I would bet a small amount of money that it will not go forward. There are reasons why I think the recall process itself is unlikely to come to complete fruition, but I'd prefer not to be heard saying that I think it will fail, because

Continued on Page 16

Upon Leaving California, San Bernardino County, As Its Own State, Would Seek Minting Authority *from page 3*

in their capacities as project proponents/developers. That paved the route for their economic success, which provided them with more and more capital with which to invest in the political process.

While comprehensive figures are not available, over the years, Burum has made somewhere between \$4 million and \$5 million in donations to politicians.

It is Burum's view that the Democratic Party is anti-development. This led him to the conclusion that the only realistic way of obtaining a level playing ground for himself and other developers, given the Democrats' domination of Sacramento, is to remove the areas where he wants to develop out of California. Thus, in July 2022, less than a month before the deadline for getting initiatives onto the November 2022 ballot, Burum came before the San Bernardino County board of Supervisors with a call for San Bernardino County to secede from California. Despite the fact that the normal lead time on qualifying an initiative for the ballot runs from anywhere between six and nine months, the four Republican members of the board of supervisors at that point demonstrated just how beholden to Burum they were by ordering county staff to facilitate placing a measure onto the ballot asking the county's voters whether they would support withdrawing the county from the State of California. County Staff did so with alacrity, qualifying what became Measure EE for the ballot.

On November 8, 2022, at the county's precincts and using mail-in ballots, the county's voters passed Measure EE, calling for San Bernardino County to secede from California, with 212,615 or 50.62 percent of the county's 420,054 voters in favor of leaving the Golden State and

207,439 or 49.38 percent remaining as Californians.

San Bernardino County's Republican officeholders, together with Burum and his political consultants and representatives, confident that Donald Trump will prevail in the upcoming November 5 presidential race and that he is very likely to bring in with him Republican majorities in both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, believe that the time will be ripe to bring the issue of having Republican-controlled San Bernardino County leave the Democratic fold in California. Multiple vectors of momentum will be coursing in that direction at that time. In Washington, D.C., the majority of the nation's leadership will be, they believe, primed to have five of California's 54 electoral college votes that always safely fall to the Democrats peeled off and put into the Republican column thereafter. Moreover, things will have evolved to a point, they hope, that the Democrats in Sacramento will be willing to divest themselves of San Bernardino County and its persistently GOP-leaning electorate.

Given the two years or so, at a minimum, that it will take to effectuate the San Bernardino County secession from California and the admission of Empire as a state, the secessionists feel that they need to act rapidly before political dynamics in both Washington, D.C. and Sacramento change to prevent them from achieving the goal they are pursuing. The Trump Administration, they are certain, will prove amenable to the actuation of their game plan.

That game plan includes creating Empire as a state along with its administrative offices, which, while entailing the complex and varied machinery of government needed operate

and provide basic public services, including public safety and regulatory functions, not coming close to replicating the excessive bureaucracy and overregulation that Burum and those of like mind consider to be the primary problem with the State of California.

With the assistance of the Trump Administration, advocates of Empire statehood are intent on exploring Empire embarking on what would be a significant deviation from a major limitation imposed on states' authority throughout U.S. history to this point. Essentially, Empire would either seek a reinterpretation of a key element of the U.S. Constitution and marry that with certain historical precedents relating to the state's before the forming of the union or otherwise obtain a special dispensation from the U.S. Government in general and the Trump Administration and the John Roberts Supreme Court in particular, to allow it to issue currency.

Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 of the Constitution prohibits the states from coining money, and rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court have recognized Congress's coinage power to be exclusive. Nevertheless,

Six Taxing Proposals On The November 5 Ballot *from page 3*

night overnight should be referred to as "transients" and whether to amend the city's municipal code to state, "For the privilege of occupancy in any hotel, each transient is subject to and shall pay a tax in the amount of twelve percent (12%) of the rent charged by the operator."

Yucaipa's sales tax proposal, which is being euphemistically referred to as "public safety and essential services protection measure establishing a one cent transactions and use tax," comes more than four years after Yucaipa's voters soundly defeated a request for the imposi-

tion of a half cent sales tax in the March 2020 primary election.

Yucaipa officials, who have consistently refused to consider reducing city employee salaries and benefits, say that without the infusion of revenue from the sales tax, "the city may have to close one of the three fire stations [and] will be forced to cut up to half of the city's police officers [and] close the community pool and senior center."

The Morongo Unified School District maintains it will use the \$88,300,000 in proceeds from the bond sales it will ask the Morongo Basin's residents to approve toward capital projects, which will qualify the district to receive State of California matching grant funds to complete

there have been deviations from the monetary policy laid out in the U.S. Constitution which would indicate that the prohibition on states minting coins and paper money is not necessarily absolute.

According to the U.S. Constitution, the basic unit is the dollar, what at that time was a silver coin containing 371.25 grains of pure silver. Only gold or silver coins and currency, that is, paper money backed by gold or silver could be considered legal tender, according to the U.S. Constitution. Furthermore, the U.S. Constitution disallowed the individual states from issuing coins or currency. And the Constitution further banned fiat money notes, also known as "bills of credit," that is, paper money not backed by gold or silver.

In the years since the U.S. Constitution was ratified, the dollar has been redefined, such that at present the dollar is equated not to 371.25 grains of pure silver but 12.59 grains of silver. The United States no longer requires that its currency be backed by gold or silver. A substantial number, indeed a majority, of legal and Constitutional scholars maintain that the creation of the

Federal Reserve Bank, upon which the nation's entire monetary system is now fully dependent, is inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution. Consequently, the prohibition against states issuing legal tender is now subject to potential contravention, particularly if in issuing that legal tender the states adhere to the principle of backing that tender with precious metal. Empire state formation advocates have just such a plan. Located toward San Bernardino County's extreme northeast end, close to the Nevada border and about 53 miles southwest of Las Vegas is the Mountain Pass Mine. Discovered in 1949, the Mountain Pass Mine is the world's richest source of lanthanides, also known as rare earth metals. The Mountain Pass Mine, in addition to featuring deposits of other highly valuable substances, contains substantial concentrations of bastnäsite, which is riddled with the rare-earth minerals cerium, lanthanum, neodymium and europium. Compounds containing rare earths have diverse high tech applications, including in electrical and electronic compo-

nents, lasers, glass, magnetic materials, and industrial processes.

The Molybdenum Corporation of America, which more than two decades later changed its name to Molycorp, first began operating the mine on a small scale in 1952, and over the next dozen years transformed it into the largest rare earth mining operation in the world as the demand for europium, a critical component in color television screens, skyrocketed. Molycorp was acquired by Union Oil/Unocal in 1977, which was bought out by the Chevron Corporation in 2005. Rare earth metals generally exist in a radioactive environment, often coexisting in conjunction with thorium, radium and uranium. Contamination of the desert floor as a consequence of leaks from a pipeline conveying wastewater used in the mining process dogged Molycorp beginning in the 1990s, leading to regulatory and prosecutorial action against the company, which ceased operating in 2002 as a consequence of the costs associated with the mitigation of those environmental issues, including \$1.4 million in fines and settlements in

Continued on Page 16

educational facilities. The bond purchasers will be paid back by assessments imposed on property owners within the confines of the district, according to school officials.

The county, Grand Terrace, Needles, Rancho Cucamonga and Yucaipa measures will need to be approved by a simple majority vote, that is, at least 50 percent of those voting plus one. The Morongo Valley District initiative must garner the support of 55 percent of those voting to pass.

Any other entities seeking to place a measure on San Bernardino County's ballot will need to act with alacrity.

The timelines with regard to measures to be placed on the November 5 general election bal-

lot in San Bernardino County include a submission deadline of next Monday, July 22, which is also the deadline for the submission of arguments; a deadline of July 26 for the submission of argument rebuttals; a deadline of August 1 for the registrar's office to examine the arguments; and a deadline of August 5 for the registrar's office to examine the rebuttals. The measures are to be provided with their nomenclature, that is, their letter designations under which they are to appear on the ballot, on August 12. Two days later, August 14 is the deadline for withdrawing the measures, after which point they will be printed on ballots.

-Mark Gutglueck

Shorett Doubtful Recall Effort Will Proceed Or Succeed But Vows To Campaign Against It As If It Is Going Ahead Full Steam *from page 14*

that just might motivate those who are behind this to prove me wrong. I am taking this seriously until I don't have to. I haven't been properly served at this point, if what the lawyers are saying is accurate. I am going to assume that whoever is behind this knows what they are doing and that eventually I will be given proper notice of the intent to circulate a petition to remove me. The threshold they have to meet is fairly low. They have to follow the proper procedure. They can't serve me through the city clerk's office, but they must coordinate what they are doing with the city clerk and give me an opportunity to respond with, I believe, up to 200 words."

Shorett said it looked like enough people to

force the issue were in place to work the process against him.

"I am told there are 30 people or what purports to be 30 people who have signed one petition or set of petitions and six people who have signed as proponents on another and then I think 11 more and 10 more, then 7 more and four more," Shorett said. "If all that they have done is truly what it purports to be, then what they have done is more than adequate and we are soon to be off to the races, I guess."

Those coming after him are not fully grounded in political reality and are going about things in a less than practical way, Shorett opined.

"I think there are a lot of citizens who don't understand the role of a city council member," he

said. "They want you to be a combination of Jesus Christ and someone who will go out and fix potholes and grow trees in a city where people have a whole lot to complain about. I suspect that some of these people didn't really know what they were signing. From what I know, I don't think many of these people know me. There may be a few for sure that I recognize if you were to recite me their names. I know some of them don't care for me. Sharon Negrete is obviously disgruntled. I can give you the names of a few others if I think hard about it, ones who have not been happy with my performance or aspects of it."

Pressed on what it is that is motivating the recall proponents, Shorett acknowledged he has not fulfilled the expectations of some of his constituents in the Fourth District and antagonized some residents of other

districts as well as "some of my colleagues."

Calling the grounds for the recall "frivolous... ridiculous [and] petty," Shorett said, "This is going to use up a lot of resources and it will create a lot of distraction. It has the potential, anyway, of ruining the reputation of the city. There is a better way to go about these kinds of things. I will need to run for election in another two years, which means a campaign that will be in full swing in just a little over a year. They should conserve their money and their effort and use it then. This is just another example of the toxic politics in San Bernardino. It is not good. Like me or hate me, whether you think I'm doing a good job or a bad job, there is a better way to deal with this. There is going to be money spent on their side and I can guarantee you there will be money spent on my side that could be used for a way

better purpose."

In addition, Shorett said, if the recall proceeds to a vote, it will cost the taxpayers money.

"There is not time to get enough signature to get this on the November ballot, which would then bring the city and the taxpayers into it," Shorett said. "They will have to pay to hold a special election. This is no way to run a railroad.

And he is not going to just roll over and die, either, Shorett said.

"I have some people who are supportive," he said. "I was elected once and then reelected three times after that for what is now a total of 15 years."

The recall proponents have delusions of grandeur, Shorett said.

"If there were a successful recall of the two senior members of the council and we had to move out of office you'd have almost a completely new council next year,"

he said.

He has a trick or two up his sleeve and a tried-and-true formula to withstand what is being hatched against him: constant vigilance and hard work, Shorett said.

"I'll listen to what these people who want to remove me from office have to say and then I'll go out and run a campaign telling people why I should be allowed to stay in office," he said. "There are obviously some people out there who for sure don't like me. There were people who showed up at the meeting to let me know that. It was the first time they have been at a meeting for months or in some cases years. For every meeting they've been at, I was in attendance for, I don't know, 40 meetings or 60 meetings or something like that. Now, they are going to put some effort into getting me out of office. I'm going to match that effort with what I do."

Empire Statehood Would Create Synergy With Effort To Protect The American Rare Earth Mining Industry *from page 15*

addition to the costs of purchasing new equipment and infrastructure. Shortly thereafter, China eclipsed the United States as the leading supplier of rare earth metals, and has not relinquished that position. In 2005, 96 percent of the world's rare earth elements were mined in China.

Unocal in 2004 obtained a new operating permit for the mine, which was thereafter inherited by the Chevron Corporation and then by Molycorp Minerals LLC, based in Greenwood Village, Colorado, a company formed to revive the Mountain Pass mine, when it purchased the operation from Chevron in 2008. In July 2010, Molycorp, Inc. became a publicly-traded firm by selling, using the proceeds from its stock sales and taking on an additional \$1.4

billion in debt to modernize the mine. While Molycorp, Inc. made tremendous strides in this regard, the Chinese government was monitoring what was occurring, subsidizing its rare-earth mining and production operations to intensify the competition for rare earth element customers worldwide, by so doing undercutting Molycorp and destroying any potential the company had for profitability for four straight years, which ultimately forced the company into Chapter 11 bankruptcy in 2015.

The Mountain Pass Mine was acquired out of bankruptcy in July 2017 by MP Materials, which is 51.8 percent-owned by US hedge funds JHL Capital Group and QVT Financial LP. Prospectus and corporate management statements by MP Materials were that it had acquired the Mountain Pass Mine with the intention of reviving America's rare-earth industry, and it did resume mining and refining operations in January 2018. However, Shenghe Resources Holding Co. Ltd., a state-owned and

controlled enterprise of the Chinese Government holds an 8 percent stake in MP Materials. It is further known that Gina Rinehart, an Australian mining magnate, has a 5.3 per cent interest in MP Materials, and it is believed that as another 26 percent of the investment capital in MP Materials originated with speculators outside the United States.

It is believed that a second Trump Administration, if installed following the November 2024 election, after facilitating the Empire break-off from California, would be willing to issue a national security memorandum declaring the Mountain Pass Mine a critical national asset that should not be subject to control or ownership by any foreign entity, clearing the way for the State of Empire to effectuate a government takeover of the Mountain Pass Mine, the ownership of which would transition to a public-private partnership. This would be coupled by a special dispensation, giving the State of Empire the authority to issue legal ten-

der, which in this case would be backed by the valuable metals accumulated from the Mountain Pass Mine.

The faces that are to grace the denominations of the paper money to be issued by the State of Empire have already been determined, as have been the visages that are to be struck on the State of Empire coins.

George Washington will be depicted on the \$1 bill; San Bernardino Supervisor Paul Cook on the \$2 bill; Abraham Lincoln on the \$5 bill, the \$10 bill is to feature Former San Bernardino County Supervisor Paul Biane; George Chaffey's likeness will be on the \$20 bill; San Bernardino County Supervisor will inhabit the \$50 bill; San Bernardino County Supervisor Curt Haggman the \$100 bill; the \$500 bill will portray San Bernardino County Founder Charles Rich; the \$1,000 bill will picture Jeff Burum; and the \$5,000 bill will honor San Bernardino County Founder Amasa Lyman. Edith Head is to be engraved on the silver dollar; William Chaffey's

face is to appear on the fifty cent piece, Fontana Mayor Acquanetta Warren on the quarter; Upland Mayor Bill Velto's face is to be struck on the dime; Ontario favorite son Anthony Munoz is to be outlined on the nickel and Medal of Honor recipient George Sakato's face is to be sculpted on the surface of the Empire penny.

Upon its chartering as the 51st State, Empire will in large measure subsume several elements of state government that exist within San Bernardino County, primary among which is the California Superior Court as it exists in San Bernardino County, including its two downtown San Bernardino Courthouses, one of which was built/completed in 1927 and the other in 2014; the West Valley Courthouse in Rancho Cucamonga; the Fontana Courthouse in Fontana, the Mental Health Court in Colton, the Victorville Courthouse in Victorville, the Big Bear District Courthouse in Big Bear Lake, Barstow Courthouse in Victorville; the Joshua

Tree District Courthouse in Joshua Tree; and the Colorado River District Courthouse in Needles. With the lone exception of Judge Charles Umeda, the Superior Court judges in San Bernardino County, who are currently technically State of California employees in their judicial capacities, will be offered Empire Superior Court judgeships. Umeda, who as a deputy prosecutor with the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office, pursued a civil/criminal case against Unocal/Union Oil/Chevron/Molycorp in the late 1990s and early 2000s relating to contamination and pollution issues at the Mountain Pass Mine, a legal action which greatly complicated operations at the facility, resulting in Molycorp shuttering mining operations there. For that reason, as a consequence of the Mountain Pass Mine being an asset that is central to Empire's success as an independent state, it is thought best that Umeda not be affiliated with the Empire state government.

-Mark Gutglueck