

The San Bernardino County

News of Note
from Around the
Largest County
in the Lower
48 States

Sentinel

Late
Final
Edition

PRSR STD
ECRWSS
U.S.POSTAGE
PAID
EDDM Retail

LOCAL POSTAL
CUSTOMER

Friday, December 26, 2025 A Fortunado Publication in conjunction with Countywide News Service 10808 Foothill Blvd. Suite 160-446 Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730 (951) 567-1936

2026 To Show Whether County Supervisors Are Limited To Three Or Six 4-Year Terms

Leaders who as the dregs... flow through public scorn as mud from a muddy spring, rulers who neither see nor feel nor know but leechlike to their ebbing power cling 'til they drop without a blow ... as a two-edged sword to all who wield.

— Percy Bysshe Shelley

With the close of 2025, the San Bernardino County Establishment finds itself on the eve of what is to due to play out in 2026 as a major test of its political credibility.

Embedded in the convoluted mishmash

of competing principles and the self-interest of current officeholders is whether those who have the upper hand at the moment are going to reverse course and in spirit deviate from the principle their party has long stood for so they can ex-

tend their own personal control of the machinery of local government or whether they will stand down and pass the scepter to the next generation.

At the heart of the matter is the political machine that the county's Republicans constructed some six decades ago and which remains to the present the dominant force on the San Bernardino County political scene. Of parallel impor-

tance is the concept of term limits, which originated in San Bernardino County and elsewhere in California as a means by which Republicans hoped to hold in check the growing influence, hold and hold and now the dominance and monopoly the Democrats have over politics in the Golden State. Through attentiveness and energy, hard work, determination and vigilance and, increasingly, sleight-of-

hand and bareknuckled exploitation of the lack of coordination on the part of their counterpart Democrats, the Republicans have maintained their ascendancy in San Bernardino County.

In 1936, Harry Shepard, a former railroad executive and the president and owner of the King's Beverage Company of Los Angeles, at the age of 51 ran for Congress as a New Deal Democrat, de- See P 2

Down To The Wire On Federal Challenges Of No Secret Police & No Vigilantes Acts

Both the Donald Trump Administration and California's senior politicians are anxiously awaiting a determination by Federal Judge Christina A. Snyder and Magistrate Judge A. Joel Richlin with regard to the lawsuit brought by the U.S. Department of Justice in November which seeks to block the enforcement of two state laws restricting federal

agents from hiding their identities during immigration law enforcement operations.

In September, the California legislature passed and Governor Gavin Newsom signed Senate Bill 627, known as the California No Secret Police Act, and Senate Bill 805, the No Vigilantes Act. Set to take effect January 1, 2026, the No Secret Police Act prohib-

its law enforcement officers in California, with the exception of the California Highway Patrol/California State Police from wearing masks or facial coverings that hide or obscure their identity while on duty. The act is intended to promote accountability, and grew out of concern over masked federal agents enforcing immigration law. Assembly Bill 627

makes it a crime for most local and federal law enforcement officers to wear concealing masks or facial garb such as ski masks while on duty with exceptions for those engaged in special weapons and tactics [SWAT] operations or undercover work and for medically-related purposes.

Senate Bill 805, the No Vigilantes Act, is set

to go into effect on January 1, 2026 as well. It requires law enforcement officers, including Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents and Boarder Patrol agents in the state to visibly display clear identification, including their name and badge when not in uniform to prevent impersonation and enhance public trust. It further See P 3

China Lake H₂O Limitation Set Table For Settlement Of I WVGA And Searles Valley Minerals Lawsuits

The Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority and Searles Valley Minerals have reached a comprehensive settlement of the legal actions each had outstanding against one another, clearing the way for a water conservation, sharing and distribution arrangement impacting the westernmost extreme of the Mojave Desert and

Initial Use Of Victorville's Gunfire Detection System Thwarted By July 4 Revelry

Among the community-altering proposals to be considered by the Twentynine Palms City Council early next year is a 50-megawatt solar powerplant on 477 acres north of Two Mile Road, south of Amboy Road and west of Noels Knoll Road.

Temecula-based E-Group PS is seeking permission to change the zoning on the property

the northwestern tip of San Bernardino County.

The settlement reduces, but does not eliminate the procedural and legal complication which attends the struggle with regard to water availability in one of the driest areas of California.

Searles Valley Minerals is a 152-year-old company, now owned by Mirma Limited, located

in Trona, a San Bernardino County community immediately adjacent to the Inyo County line and proximate to Kern County. Searles Valley Minerals uses solution mining, which involves soaking portions of the company's dry Searles Lake in San Bernardino County with water to precipitate brine which is then extract- See P 3

in question from residential to a renewable energy use. If the city council agrees to what E-Group PS is asking, the company will erect 159,840 solar panels consisting of 720 rows of 222 ground mounted 104 foot wide and 252 feet high solar racks. There will be 10-foot-wide separations between the rows to allow maintenance workers to service

the panels. The overall project area will be just around 477 graded acres, but the panels will confine themselves to 241 of the acres.

To maximize light absorption and electrical power output, the fixed solar racks will be capable of tilting and will be controlled by computers so the panels track the sun from east to west over the course of day-

light hours.

The project improvements will include inverters and transformers, electrical cabling and communication lines, on-site switchgear, a generation tie-line, a driveway extending from the south boundary of the project site to Two Mile Road, and a 7-foot-high security fence. Off-site improvements will include underground

cabling extending and connecting the solar project's power supply to the Southern California (SCE) transmission network at the Carodean Substation, located approximately one-half mile west from the project site on the south side of Two Mile Road. The project will also entail certain improvements to existing SCE See P 5

A Number Of
Insiders Unsold
On Wapner's
Claim Airport
Reacquisition
Has Been An
Actual Benefit



Alan Wapner

A decade after Los Angeles agreed to return ownership of Ontario International Airport to the City of Ontario, an obscure debate is ongoing in the back halls of power throughout the county as to whether the change benefited or damaged the community.

While the ownership and management transition undeniably restored local control over what is arguably one of, if not the most valuable of San Bernardino County's man-made assets, there is a case to be made that its placement into the hands of a consortium of provincial, less sophisticated, inexperienced and self-focused civic leaders has curtailed the facility's growth potential over the next several foreseeable generations and obliterated the possibility of effectuating a rational approach to regional transportation [asset] operations and function.

Featured in that debate is the relative truth or falsity of the self-serving assertions of those who now hold sway over the airport that they are to be credited with having restored passenger levels at the medium hub facility to what they See P 2

**For Forty Years,
Ontario Airport
Flourished And
Expanded Under
The Management Of
Los Angeles World
Airports from front
page**

were 18 years ago, when, under the guidance of the political and administrative megalopolis to the west, the now 102-year-old aerodrome achieved its record ridership level.

Questions persist as to whether the reestablishment of local control over the airport has been and is a benefit to the city, its residents, the region, the airport itself or the flying public, as the change of title has resulted in expenses that have made it into one of the world's most costly airfields to fly out of on the West Coast, the country and, on a comparative basis, the world.

Among those close to the current situation and those who were once intimately involved in the airport's operations when it was under the management of Los Angeles World Airports, the corporate arm of the City of Los Angeles which operated Los Angeles International Airport, Ontario International Airport and Van Nuys Airport, there are accounts of how the politicians who have been entrusted with overseeing the airport and the quasi-governmental, quasi-corporate entity which operates it have used their authority to "shake down" companies or entities with service franchises or vending, service provision or consulting contracts at the aerodrome for what are, in essence, kickbacks, which has resulted in no-bid or skewed-bidding contracting processes by which work is performed at an increased cost.

During its first forty-plus years of existence, from its outset as the private Latimer Field in 1923 and its conversion to a public facility and name changeover to Ontario Airport in 1929, the ensuing Great Depression, World War II, its rebranding as Ontario International Airport in

1946 due to the trans-Pacific cargo flights originating there and the post-war prosperity that saw the largely agricultural Inland Empire, including the roughly 10,000 acres of vineyards that surrounded the airport gradually converted to industrial, commercial and residential use, the airport existed as a small regional airstrip. In 1967, at which point Ontario Airport had fewer than 200,000 passengers passing through its gates per year, the Ontario City Council entered into a joint powers agreement with the City of Los Angeles in which the larger city's Department of Airports was to take over aviation operations in Ontario. Los Angeles officials, with their control over gate positions at Los Angeles International Airport, was able to induce a multitude of airlines to fly into and out of the smaller facility. Los Angeles, through its Department of Airports and airport-operating corporate division, Los Angeles World Airports, also known by its acronym LAWA, made investments in the facility, paving its sand flea-infested gravel parking lot and modernizing, restructuring and gentrifying its basic facilities such as its terminal, passenger walkway, tower and walkway.

By 1969, flights out of Ontario had dramatically increased and would continue to do so as Los Angeles World Airports and Los Angeles city officials used their influence with various airlines. Continental Airlines, PSA, United, American Airlines, Hughes Air West, and Delta established routes to and from Ontario. Though a benchmark of 10 million passengers at the airport by 1975 was not achieved, Los Angeles World Airports still assiduously promoted Ontario International. Under the management and care of Los Angeles officials, in 1981, a modern, second east-to-west runway at Ontario International was built, necessitating the removal of the old northeast-to-southwest runway.

By the early 1980s Los Angeles had met all the performance criteria laid out in the 1967 joint powers agreement. The City of Ontario was at that time led by Mayor Robert Ellingwood, who was resistant to the concept of Ontario complying with the terms of the 1967 pact and turning ownership of the airport over to Los Angeles. In 1985, during Ellingwood's brief absence from the city, four members of the Ontario City Council as it was then composed voted to deed Ontario Airport to the City of Los Angeles for no consideration, pursuant to what was considered a public benefit transfer that most local officials, with a few notable exceptions such as Ellingwood, believed would improve the airport.

Indeed, over the four decades from 1967 until 2007, the relationship between Ontario and Los Angeles vis-à-vis the airport proved highly advantageous. All told, Los Angeles instituted some \$550 million worth of improvements to the airport, including quadrupling its parking capacity, modernizing its runways, including the widening of taxiways and the addition of storm drains. Ontario Airport's landing and take-off paths were converted into the longest such civilian facilities in Southern California, and Los Angeles erected a state-of-the-art control tower, and constructed two ultra-modern terminals at a cost of \$270 million, augmented with a world class concourse. The number of airlines using the airport had grown to 14. Throughout the massive financial lull of the Great Recession, however, air travel dropped off significantly and airlines, in an effort to shield themselves from the continuing economic decline, began cutting back on flights, particularly to locations outside the most heavily concentrated population centers. Beginning in late 2007 and until early 2014, passenger traffic at Ontario International declined

steadily. The number of passengers at Ontario International retreated from a record 7,207,150 in 2007 to 6,232,975 in 2008 to 4,861,110 in 2009 to 4,812,578 in 2010.

In 2010, Ontario City Councilman Alan Wapner initiated a campaign aimed at prying control and ownership of Ontario International Airport away from Los Angeles. Wapner approached this task by initiating a series of personal and vindictive attacks on Los Angeles officials, most prominently Los Angeles World Airports Executive Director Gina Marie Lindsey, claiming, spuriously, that they were responsible for the decline in ridership at Ontario Airport. LAWA and Lindsey were deliberately manipulating the situation to raise costs at Ontario International and thereby minimize both ridership and revenues there as part of a plot to increase revenue and gate numbers at Los Angeles International Airport, Wapner alleged. His city council colleagues echoed these accusations.

Even as Wapner was pursuing this strategy, passenger numbers at Ontario continued to fall, to 4,540,694 in 2011. Los Angeles World Airports executives sought to redress the situation, but were hamstrung by the consideration that the key to increasing ridership at Ontario International was keeping the airlines flying into and out of it in place and adding more. With the contraction of the airline industry generally in the face of the economic downturn, a number of airlines had already pulled up stakes and left Ontario and more were contemplating doing so. It took the best efforts of Los Angeles World Airports airline relations staff to convince two of the seven airlines that remained at Ontario, which were on the verge of leaving themselves, to stay in place.

LAWA managers asserted that the airline executives' decisions relating to where flights needed to be directed to maintain their corpora-

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

tions' profitability were the driving factor in the dwindling passenger levels at Ontario International. This softened no soap with Wapner, who along with other Ontario officials rejected such explanations as implausible excuses meant to mask the Los Angeles World Airports' ill intent to promote Los Angeles International Airport at the expense of Ontario. Ridership at Ontario International continued to decline in the face of the growing contretemps between Ontario and Los Angeles, falling to 4,296,459 in 2012 and hitting rock bottom at 3,971,136 in 2013. Amidst this, the City of Ontario joined with San Bernardino County in forming the Ontario International Airport Authority in 2012, designating Wapner as the president/chairman of the authority's board of directors. What Ontario officials clearly had in mind was that the authority would oversee the airport when Los Angeles was out of the picture.

In 2013, Ontario, represented by the Washington, D.C.-based law firm of Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton, sued Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports, claiming neglect and negligence, breach of contract and misfeasance in the operation and management of Ontario International Airport, along with damages. In 2014, however, as the economy began to rebound and air travel in general started to pick up around the country, ridership at Ontario Inter-

Continued on Page 6

Industrial Scale Solar Plant Proposed For Development On Residentially-Zoned Land In 29 Palms *from front page*

infrastructure.

The city, as the lead agency on the project, commissioned, at E-Group PS's expense, a draft environmental impact report compiled by Palm Desert-based Terra Nova Planning & Research, Inc., which has been preliminarily completed and is now available to the public for review.

Twenty-nine Palm residents – and citizens in general, have until

January 22 to comment on the environmental report for the record and offer criticisms and objections to the proposed mitigations outlined in it.

According to Terra Nova, the solar array is to be established on the northern half of the currently residentially-zoned property.

"The solar project will have the ability to generate 50 megawatts of solar power," according to

Terra Nova.

A megawatt is typically equivalent to the power needs of anywhere from 400 to 1,000 households.

The draft environmental impact report states that the project will have a number of unavoidable impacts on "aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, drainage/water absorption, energy, flood plain/flooding, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards & hazardous materials,

hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, schools/universities, septic system, sewer capacity, solid waste, transportation, utilities/service systems [and] vegetation."

In a minority of those cases, such as energy, the project will have a positive rather than negative impact. Most of the negative impacts, according to Terra Nova, can be mitigated, and the general impression given by the city's ap-

proach to the project proposal is that the conditions of approval that will accompany the city's processing of the project application and the eventual council vote to allow the project to proceed will involve mitigation of those impacts. In the parlance of land use professionals, the environmental impact of the project will be "less than significant" if the developer incorporates features and modifications into the project to offset or obviate the effects that will occur as a consequence of the al-

teration of the site and its environs.

The draft environmental impact report, however, contains an acknowledgment that the project will entail for the Twenty-nine Palms community a negative consequence with regard to aesthetics.

This impact, according to Terra Nova will be "significant and unavoidable."

As it now stands, the residential zoning on the land between Amboy Road and Two Mile Road west of Noels

Continued on Page 5

State Auditor Details Profligate Spending In Some Programs *from front page*

projects in a way that underscore misgivings long expressed by Governor Gavin Newsom's critics about the way he is managing the most populous state in the Union.

Of immense fiscal consequence, according to the report, is the way in which \$32 billion in COVID-19 relief funds was misspent or in some measure fraudulently

applied through various emergency aid programs overseen by the Department of Finance; \$2.5 billion was improper spent or utilized within CalFresh, the state's food-stamp program; \$18 billion was thrown into the state's high-speed rail project without any scheduled spans of track actually being laid down; and a completely unaccounted-for amount of money of at least \$24 billion and as much as \$37 billion having been utilized to eradicate or

otherwise address homelessness without any significant inroads against the problem being realized, while the incidence of homelessness throughout the state has risen some 20 percent.

In contrast, Governor Newsom, who has insisted in the past that California sets the standard for efficient, responsive and accountable government throughout the country, continues to maintain that he and the Democrat Party-con-

dition dragged on for several years.

In 2014, in the face of a persistent drought, then-Governor Jerry Brown declared a state of emergency with regard to California's water situation and then signed into law the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, which classified 21 groundwater basins in the state, including the one in Indian Wells Valley, as being in a state of critical overdraft, i.e., a circumstance in which the amount of water being

trolled apparatus in Sacramento are apply sound fiscal management tools California's operations.

In this year's report pertaining to what the auditor's office identifies as high-risk state agencies, State Auditor Grant Parks said he was broadening the number of agencies he defines as "posing a high-risk of serious detriment to the state or its residents. To be considered high risk, an agency must not only exhibit serious waste,

used exceeds the amount of water coming into the area naturally, predominantly through rainfall. That designation triggered the creation of the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority, a joint powers agency overseen by a board comprised of one voting representative from Kern County, the City of Ridgecrest, Inyo County, San Bernardino County, and the Indian Wells Valley Water District, as well as two non-voting members representing the U.S.

fraud, abuse or mismanagement, but must also have failed to take adequate, corrective action."

Though the auditor's office is considered to be nonpartisan, Parks, who was appointed to the post by Governor Newsom in 2023, is a Democrat by party affiliation. For that reason, his scathing analysis of fiscal misdirection under the supervision of Newsom is considered to be telling.

Park identified eight

Navy/China Lake Naval Air Station and the United States Bureau of Land Management. The Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority took as its charter the commitment to ensure a sustainable water supply for the region by overcoming the depletion of the groundwater basin and its aquifer which underlies 597 square miles and includes the northwest tip of San Bernardino County, the southwest tip of Inyo County and the northeast corner of Kern County.

Based upon a survey of water usage patterns undertaken by an engineering consultant, Carlsbad-based Stetson Engineers, the authority and the Indian Wells Valley Water District sought to derive a strategy for both reducing water use in the valley and increasing groundwater recharge to reach a balance of both that will end the overdraft. Several different plans, or models, were contemplated. Basically, the concept was to decrease

Continued on Page 7

Joint Powers Authority Was Formed To Manage H₂O Use & Eradicate Overdraft In Northwest Mojave Desert *from front page*

ed and processed to produce boric acid, potash, sodium carbonate, sodium sulfate, several specialty forms of borax, and salt. The litigation between Searles Valley Minerals grew out of the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority's application of previously nonexistent water use fees on water used by the company despite the

company having the the longest-standing claim on water rights and water use of any entity in the region. In response to the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority's imposition of those water use fees, Searles Valley Minerals filed a lawsuit against the groundwater authority, which responded with a countersuit. That litiga-

tion dragged on for several years.

In 2014, in the face of a persistent drought, then-Governor Jerry Brown declared a state of emergency with regard to California's water situation and then signed into law the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, which classified 21 groundwater basins in the state, including the one in Indian Wells Valley, as being in a state of critical overdraft, i.e., a circumstance in which the amount of water being

used exceeds the amount of water coming into the area naturally, predominantly through rainfall. That designation triggered the creation of the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority, a joint powers agency overseen by a board comprised of one voting representative from Kern County, the City of Ridgecrest, Inyo County, San Bernardino County, and the Indian Wells Valley Water District, as well as two non-voting members representing the U.S.

states, echoing the U.S. Supreme Court's 1819 decision in the case of *McCulloch v. Maryland* as well as the 1943 case of *Mayo v. United States* as precedent case on the matter.

Asserting the Supreme Court's landmark language in the *McCulloch* case that "[T]he activities of the Federal Government are free from regulation by any state," the lawsuit

Secret Police Act and No Vigilantes Act directly regulate the federal government by dictating permissible uniforms for federal agents and forcing federal agencies to adopt specified policies. But the federal government, not California, has authority to control its own agents and activities."

According to the U.S. Justice Department, "Not only are the laws

illegal attempts to discriminate against and regulate the federal government, but, as alleged in the complaint, the laws threaten the safety of federal officers who have faced an unprecedented wave of harassment, doxing, and even violence. Threatening officers with prosecution for simply protecting their identities and their families also chills the

Continued on Page 15

Trump Administration Cites Supremacy Clause In Contesting State Regulations Of Federal Agents *from front page*

bans bounty hunters from participating in immigration enforcement operations.

In November, the U.S. Justice Department filed suit against California, Governor Gavin Newsom, and Attorney

Republicans In SBC Who Championed Term Limits Now Eschew Them from front page

feating the Republican incumbent, Sam Collins in the race to represent the California's 19th Congressional, encompassing the lion's share of San Bernardino County. This shifted political control over San Bernardino County into the hands of the Democrats, who remained in charge for three decades. Sheppard served as San Bernardino County's primary Congressman in the House of Representatives from January 1937 until January 1965, representing California's 19th Congressional District in the 1930s, the state's 21st Congressional District in the 1940s, its 27th Congressional District in the 1950s and the state's 33rd Congressional District in the 1960s. He likely would have remained in office beyond that but for a major faux pas he engaged in during January 1964 when, over a two-day period, he made 27 separate \$10,000 deposits into 27 different banks and savings and loan institutions in Washington, D.C., and communities surrounding the nation's capital in Virginia and Maryland, in each case one cent below the mandatory IRS reporting threshold that banking institutions were bound by. Reports pertaining to the deposits reached the nation's newspapers. He claimed that he was merely making prudent deposits of his life savings, which he had formerly kept in a safe deposit box and in his bedroom closet. Though he was at that point the dean of California's Congressional Delegation, one of the two most powerful members of both the House Ways and Means Committee and the House Appropriations Committee and considered the most influential member of the CIA Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, instantaneously he was no longer an asset to President Lyndon John-

son and the Democrats but rather a liability. On February 20, 1964, he announced he was retiring from Congress after the completion of that term. He was succeeded in January 1965 by another Democrat, Kenneth Dyal, but the financial scandal Sheppard had embroiled himself in greatly damaged the Democratic Party and in 1966, Dyal was replaced by Jerry Pettis a Republican, who came into office in the same election cycle when Ronald Reagan was elected governor.

Over the next four decades, San Bernardino County remained a Republican stronghold, even as by the dawning of the Third Millennium the state as a whole fell back under the sway of the Democratic Party. Despite the state's leftward trend, right up until 2009, registered Republicans outnumbered registered Democrats in San Bernardino County. During the gradual GOP declension throughout the state, the Republicans had latched onto a number of approaches and strategies in an effort to remain, if not dominant, relevant politically. One of these included championing term limits, preventing New Age Democrats from becoming entrenched in office over the course of multiple decades in the way that Democrats such as Sheppard had in the middle of the 20th Century. Republican politicians such as Governor Pete Wilson and one-time Assemblyman and Los Angeles County Supervisor Pete Schabarum campaigned vigorously for the passage of term limits on statewide office, while Democrats, perhaps most notably Assembly Speaker Willie Brown, opposed them. The Republicans' calculation was that members of their party, supported by wealthy large corporate and smaller entrepreneurial interests, stood a better chance of being elected to office if they were not opposed by Democrats who could remain in office decade after decade

while accumulating and compounding donations coming their way through the advantage of incumbency.

In San Bernardino County, term limits were championed by County Supervisor Paul Biane, who acceded to both vice chairman and chairman of the board of supervisors while simultaneously serving as vice chairman and chairman of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee. In 2006, Biane sponsored Measure P, which, while raising the salary members of the board of supervisors received by over \$50,000 from \$99,000 yearly to \$151,000, imposed on them being limited to three four-year terms in office.

In 2009, the number of registered Democrats in San Bernardino County eclipsed the registered Democrats. In the more than 16 years since, the Democrats have widened that registration advantage. At present, 479,303 or 38.7 percent of the 1,238,861 total voters in the county are registered as Democrats, while 380,694 or 30.7 percent identify as Republicans, with 272,051 or 22 percent declaring on party affiliation and the remaining 8.6 percent registered with the American Independent, Green, Libertarian, Peace & Freed or other more obscure parties.

Despite the Democrats 8 percent registration advantage over the Republicans, Republicans remain as the dominant party in San Bernardino County politically. In California, all of the constitutional state offices from governor to lieutenant governor to attorney general to secretary of state to superintendent of public instruction to insurance commissioner to state controller in California are occupied by Democrats. In the state's lower legislative house, the California Assembly, 60 of 80 members are Democrats. In the upper house, the California Senate, 30 of 40 members are Democrats. In California's Congressio-

nal Delegation, both Senators are Democrats and of the state's 52 members of the U.S. House of Representatives, 43 are Democrats and nine are Republicans. San Bernardino County bucks the statewide trend significantly. While five of its eight state senators are Democrats, that is because large portions of three of those districts lie in neighboring counties dominated by the Democrats. Five of the district's ten assembly members are Republicans. Two of the district's four members of Congress are Republicans. In seventeen of the county's 22 cities and two incorporated towns, Republicans hold a majority of the council seats. Four of the five members of the county board of supervisors are Republicans.

In 2017, the Red Brennan Group, a nonpartisan government reform committee, sought to place a series of reform initiatives relating to San Bernardino County government on the June 2018 ballot. The board of supervisors effectively used its control over the San Bernardino County Registrar of Voters and the office of county counsel – the county's stable of in-house attorneys – to administratively and legally block those initiatives, despite the Red Brennan Group having obtained a sufficient number of voters' signatures to qualify the measures for a vote. Despite later determinations that the county's bureaucratic maneuvering was legally invalid, the delays that were created as a consequence of the challenges succeeded in keeping the measures off the 2018 ballot because the printing deadline for the ballot had elapsed. Despite that setback, the Red Brennan Group redoubled its efforts and once again qualified another reform measure for the November 2020 election, one that redefined the county supervisors' posts as part time ones, reduced the yearly total remuneration for the supervisor position to \$60,000 and imposed on them a

single four-year term in office. Despite legal and administrative efforts by the supervisors, the county's administrators and the office of county counsel, the Red Brennan Group succeeded in gathering sufficient signatures to place the measure on the ballot. Designated as Measure K, it passed on November 3, 2020 with 516,184 votes or 66.84 percent in favor and 256,098 or 33.16 percent opposed.

Shortly after the measure passed, the board of supervisors took the extraordinary step of directing the office of county counsel and retaining three attorneys – Bradley Hertz, James Sutton and Nicholas Sanders of the Los Angeles-based Sutton Law Firm – to file on its behalf a lawsuit against its own employee, Lynna Monell, who was the clerk of the board, in an effort to legally block Measure K from being implemented. The filing of the suit resulted in both the salary reduction and term limit provisions of Measure K being put on hold pending the outcome of the lawsuit.

Then-County Counsel Michelle Blakemore and then-San Bernardino County Chief Executive Officer Leonard Hernandez arranged to have the lawsuit maneuvered into the courtroom of Superior Court Judge Don Alvarez, who was known to be both beholden and sympathetic to the county's governmental hierarchy.

Judge Alvarez made a finding invalidating the entirety of Measure K on the grounds that its secondary provision limiting supervisors to a single four-year term was unconstitutional and that the term limitation element of the measure was not separable from its salary and benefit reductions. This, Judge Alvarez ruled, rendered Measure K unenforceable. The Red Brennan Group appealed Judge Alvarez's finding and obtained a ruling from the 4th District Court of Appeal in the summer of 2022 reversing his invalidation of the measure.

The lawsuit challenging Measure K bought the board of supervisors two years of time, during which the county government placed on the November 2022 ballot what it represented as its own government reform initiative, Measure D, which restored each individual supervisor's total annual compensation to roughly \$255,000 to \$275,000 – roughly 80 percent of what is provided to a Superior Court judge – while imposing on the supervisors term limits of three four-year terms, essentially equivalent to what had been the wage-scale and number-of-years-in-office rules that had been in place before Measure K's passage. Measure D passed by a margin of 241,894 votes or 58.22 percent to 173,582 votes or 41.78 percent in the November 2022 election.

In the meantime, the county lodged an appeal of the 4th District Court of Appeal's ruling validating Measure K. In 2023, the California Supreme Court let the Fourth District Court of Appeals' ruling upholding 2020's Measure K stand. Nevertheless, it was the position of the county board of supervisors and thus the county's position that Measure D superseded Measure K and that not only was the remuneration level for the supervisors restored, but that the members of the board of supervisors were once again permitted to serve three four-year terms.

Given that Measure D, technically, is applicable going forward and is not retroactive, there are those who now take the position that the incumbents in place when it passed – Fourth District Supervisor Curt Hagan, who was first elected to the board in 2014, reelected in 2018 and reelected in 2022; Third District Supervisor Dawn Rowe, who was appointed to the board in 2018, elected in 2020 and reelected in 2024; First District Supervisor Paul Cook, who was elected to the board in 2020; and Fifth District Super

Continued on Page 7

29 Palms Caught Between Conflicting Home Construction & Energy Production State Mandates
from page 3

Knoll Road is incompatible with the semi-industrial utilization of the property for generating electricity, and the city's general plan designates that area for development as a subdivision to consist of low density single family homes. Consequently, the city would require a variance be granted, two general plan amendments, and change in the city's development code, together with commitments from

"Systemic Issues" Plague Medi-Cal, Unemployment, Food Stamp & Dam Maintenance Programs, State Auditor Finds from page 3

errors in the Cal-Fresh Program could cost the state \$2.5 billion in federal funds. Another ongoing problem is determining the eligibility of recipients for Medi-Cal benefits. Medi-Cal is California's version of the federal Medi-Care program. According to Park, there are persisting problems in determining who is eligible, which extends to Medi-Cal continuing to make payments to people who do not meet the income threshold or who have left the state entirely. This has put over \$2 billion in federal money that would otherwise come to the state at risk. Continued fraud and overpayment with unemployment insurance benefits are continuing to cost the state as much as \$13 billion per year. This is in addition to \$32 billion in fraud during the COVID years. The state has missed six straight deadlines for its annual comprehensive financial report, which puts the state's credit rating as well as federal funding in jeopardy. The auditor's report documents IT projects that languished for months

the developer to adhere to conditions specified in a conditional use permit.

E-Group PS's project proposal presents not only Twentynine Palms and its citizenry but the State of California with a paradoxical set of mandates and priorities amidst state government in California making unprecedented efforts to curtail local land use authority.

California law now allows companies seeking permission to construct renewable energy projects to appeal directly to state bureaucrats for permission to proceed if local authorities turn their proposals down. Sacramento in such cases as an industrial scale solar

or for years as antiquated systems beleaguer the state's bureaucracy, despite Silicon Valley being a stone's throw away. There are state entities that continue to "fall short of minimum standards for information security," putting state government's and private citizens' data at risk to exposure, as well as leaving data relating to the state's physical infrastructure vulnerable to hacking. The auditor found that there are 49 dams throughout the state that pose "an extremely high risk to life and property." This risk is increasing, according to the auditor's office. In the last two years the number of dams rated poor or unsatisfactory has increased by 73 percent.

Of the state's 1,472 dams which play crucial roles in flood management, water storage and hydropower generation, 39 of them are in San Bernardino County.

According to the audit, the quality of government service is unacceptably low. With the California Department of Employment Development and Disability there is ongoing, continuing and mounting fraud and overpayments, while some of those entitled to legitimate payments have difficulty accessing the payments they are entitled to. The auditor found that a typical legitimate claimant

power project like that E-Group PS is proposing is able to usurp local land use/planning authority and issue a project approval that bypasses a city or county. This is an outgrowth of the state's "energy crisis."

Similarly, the California legislature and governor have commandeered land use authority that formerly resided with city councils and county boards of supervisors as well as both county and city planning commissions when it comes to approving residential development. This is an outgrowth of the state's "housing crisis."

In this case, the property west of Noels Knoll Road north of Two Mile

had to call the Department of Employment Development and Disability two to five times per week to get assistance. The Department of Employment Development and Disability has failed to meet federal benchmarks for timely benefits for payments to those deserving benefits while there are thousands of examples of those who are defrauding the system who seem to have no trouble obtaining money to which they have no real claim.

According to the auditor's report, "The Employment Development Department continues to struggle with improper payments, claimant service, and eligibility decision appeals. The Employment Development Department's efforts to reduce unacceptably high levels of improper payments including fraudulent payments in its unemployment insurance program are not yet adequate. The Employment Development Department has

not provided state residents with sufficient customer service, resulting in significant challenges to claimants obtaining unemployment benefits. The Employment Development Department has consistently failed to meet the federal standard for first payment timeliness. Many of the Employment Development Department's unemployment eligibility

Road and south of Amboy Road is zoned for residential use, such that the California Department of Housing and Community Development would normally take a dim view of the city changing the zoning in a way that would reduce the potential for accommodating more dwelling units to alleviate the state's and region's housing shortage.

At the same time, however, the city is subject to the authority of another part of state government, the California Energy Commission, which is responsible for enforcing California Solar Mandate, which prioritizes solar energy production throughout the

decisions are not upheld on appeal. The Employment Development Department's eligibility decisions continue to be frequently overturned on appeal to the appeals board, which contributes to some unemployment insurance claimants waiting much longer for decisions than federal standards consider acceptable. In 2023 and 2024, the appeals board overturned or modified in favor of the claimant more than 43 percent of the issues claimants appealed."

During the COVID years, the Department of Employment Development and Disability ordered 7,224 mobile devices consisting of hot spots and cell phones for employees who were not reporting to state offices so they could continue to work. The state continued to pay for the mobile devices after the end of the pandemic while they were no longer being used costing the state millions of dollars.

According to the auditor's office, one California Air Resources Board employee in particular was paid \$171,446 in salary for 15 months after he or she was no longer working.

The auditor found rampant nepotism within the Department of General Services and the California Department of Transportation relating to hiring practices.

state.

It thus appears that Twentynine Palms officials - in particular Mayor Steven Bildertin, Councilmen Daniel Mintz, Octavius Scott, MacArthur Wright, Councilwoman April Ramirez, City Manager Stone James and Community Development Director Keith Gardner are intent on approving E-Group PS's project by making two amendments to the city's general plan and granting the zone change on the property north of Two Mile Road and south of Amboy Road and west of Noes Knoll Road as well as the variance, conditional use permit and amendment to the city's

There were instances where managers gave interviewees answers to interview questions in advance of the oral phase of the hiring process to assist them in getting the jobs they had applied for.

With regard to California's High Speed Rail project, according to the California Auditor's Office, the anticipated cost of the project has escalated to \$128 billion, several more times than the original anticipated cost. No track has been laid for the project despite the state having spent \$18 billion of the \$128 billion thus far.

In highlighting the "systemic issues" plaguing the state, the report states "The state's management of federal COVID-19 funds continues to be a high-risk issue. Late financial reporting remains a high-risk issue. The Department of Health Care Services has not adequately demonstrated progress to resolve problems with Medi-Cal eligibility determinations. The state's information security

remains a high-risk issue. The California Department of Technology has not made sufficient progress in its oversight of state information technology projects. California's deteriorating water infrastructure and climate change may threaten the lives and property of its residents and the reliability of the state's water supply."

development code, together with entering into the development agreement with E-Group PS.

Since this will prevent the 477 acres from being developed for residential use, those city officials are ready to convert the zoning on other property in the city that is slated for development as low density single family homes into a different classification of residential zoning, such that the property will be eligible for transformation into higher density houses where up to four times more houses could be constructed than what is permissible now and, in some cases, multi family units such as duplexes, *Continued on Page 8*

According to the report, the California Department of Social Services evinced "a high rate of errors in calculating CalFresh benefits" at a cost of up to \$2.5 billion annually if not corrected and the issues with dams and water project delivery could become critical by 2043 if infrastructure needs are not addressed. The issues to avoid further financial and infrastructure challenges.

While Republicans cite the audit as a confirmation of "dysfunction" in the Newsom Administration, in which the state budget has grown by 50 percent, or \$124 billion, in the last five years with a regression in the quality of government service, Newsom's office, while acknowledging ongoing challenges in the Department of Social Services, asserted that with regard the auditor's issues of concern, reforms are already under way and patience is required to train staff and finalize strategies for improvement.

Kevin Kiley is a member of the U.S. House of Representatives from California's 3rd Congressional District. Mark Gutglueck is the publisher of the Sentinel.

COVID Crisis Gave Ontario Airport Officials A Sense Of Events Beyond Their Control *from page 2*

of its various operating funds and another \$30 million taken out of its reserves, and committing to make payments of \$50 million over five years and \$70 million in the final five years of the ten-year ownership transition. In addition, Ontario absorbed \$60 million of the airport's bond debt. As part of the settlement worked out between Los Angeles and Ontario, Los Angeles graciously agreed to continue its management/operational oversight of the airport until noon November 1, 2016.

In 2016, ridership at Ontario Airport continued to go up, to 4,251,903. Of note, when Ontario brought in its own management team for the post-November 1, 2016 era of Ontario International Airport's existence, it in large measure cannibalized management and operational personnel from Los Angeles World Airports.

In the interregnum between the settlement of the lawsuit in August of 2015 and Ontario's full reassumption of ownership of the airport in November 2016, the Ontario International Airport Authority in January 2016 exercised its nescient power as the overseer of the airport to bring in Kelly Fredericks, the president and CEO of the Rhode Island Airport Corporation and the manager of T.F. Green Airport in Providence, Rhode Island to serve as Ontario International Airport's executive manager. Fredericks was to acclimate himself to Ontario during the final nine months of Los Angeles World Airport's operation of Ontario International Airport and take over upon Ontario's assumption of the facility once more.

The department heads and submanagers at the airport under Fredericks both pre-November 2016 and post-November 2016 were Los Angeles World

Airports veterans. As things developed, Fredericks and his political masters on the Ontario City Council and the Ontario International Airport Authority did not see eye-to-eye and he departed from his post at the airport in July 2017.

The airport authority turned to another former executive with Los Angeles World Airports, Mark Thorpe, to replace Fredericks.

When push came to shove and Ontario's political leadership needed the necessary talent to keep planes taking off and landing at Ontario International Airport, they turned to the very people they had claimed were running the airport into the ground. Under the combined guidance of Fredericks and Thorpe, ridership at Ontario International Airport increased in 2017 to 4,552,225. With Thorpe as the titular leader of the airport, Ontario saw the number of passengers continue to increase, hitting 5,115,894 in 2018 and 5,583,732 in 2019.

Though Wapner, some of his council colleagues and those in their orbit sought to credit the jump in ridership at the airport to Ontario reasserting itself and seizing the aerodrome from Los Angeles, the reality was that the recovering economy had boosted air flight across the board. Indeed, a comparison to Los Angeles International Airport's passenger numbers at the same time demonstrates that the Southern California region was a popular departure and destination venue, and that Los Angeles officials did a better job of capitalizing on that opportunity than did their counterparts in Ontario. In 2015, the number of passengers at Los Angeles International Airport was 51.56 million. In 2016, the number of passengers at Los Angeles International Airport was 54.2 million. In 2017, the number of passengers at Los Angeles International Airport was 58.07 million. In 2018, the number of

passengers at Los Angeles International Airport was 87,533,177. In 2019, the number of passengers at Los Angeles International Airport was 88,068,013. In 2020, Wapner and the rest of the Ontario City Council and the Ontario International Airport Authority were given a stern lesson in economic reality and the way in which causation and factors that account for that reality can be willingly misinterpreted to be wielded against reality's bystanders. That year, the coronavirus/COVID pandemic resulted in a reduction of air travel even greater than what occurred during the Great Recession. At that point, however, Wapner and his city council colleagues were in complete charge and control over the airport, and could not blame the drop in total ridership at Ontario International Airport to 2,538,482, a decline of 54.54 percent over the previous year, on the City of Los Angeles.

By 2022, lockdowns and quarantines had been discontinued. In the years since, the economy has pretty much restored itself. Nevertheless, Ontario Airport officials do not have any leverage they can utilize to convince carriers to fly into or out of Ontario International. The growth that has taken place at Ontario International Airport since Ontario took possession of it, while not insignificant, is a fraction of the rate of growth that occurred historically when Los Angeles ran it. Eleven airlines at present have established gates at Ontario International, three fewer than was the case in 2007. Still, the airport is host to 20 airlines that make either regular or semi-regular flights into Ontario, those being Aeromexico; Air Canada; Air France; British Airways, Alaska Airlines and its affiliate Alaska Sky West; American Airlines and its affiliate American Eagle; China Airlines; Delta Airlines and its affiliate Delta Connection; Frontier Airlines;

Hawaiian Airlines; Iberia; KLM; Korean Air; LATAM; Qatar; Southwest Airlines; United and its regional network affiliate United Express; Virgin Atlantic; Volaris; and West Air. In addition, another 19 airlines – Alaska Horizon, Alaska Sky West, Avianca, Avianca El Salvador, Copa Airlines, Dreamline Aviation, Emirates, Flexjet, Jet Linx Aviation, Jet Out, Jet Blue, Lufthansa, Netjets, Porter Airlines, Silver Air, Solairus Aviation, Starlux, Vista America and WestJet – fly into and out of Ontario on an irregular, infrequent, pass-through, special or promotional basis.

With the anomaly of the pandemic and its 18-to-20-month paralysis from the imposed societal shutdown aside, Ontario's ownership and management of Ontario International Airport has corresponded with an expansion of the local, state and national economy. That economic advancement was reflected in the 6,430,033 passengers the airport serviced in 2023 and the jump to 7,084,864 passengers there from January 1, 2024 until December 31, 2024. Ontario International's 2024 numbers are a 10.2 percent improvement over 2023 and 27 percent more than pre-pandemic 2019. Citing those statistics, airport officials on January 23 put out a statement that Ontario International is "the fastest growing among medium- and large-size airports in California. The 2024 count also represents a 67 percent increase since 2016, when Ontario International Airport was transferred to local control from the City of Los Angeles." In addition, for 2024 at Ontario, the number of domestic travelers totaled 6,645,968, an increase of 10.5 percent year-over-year, while the number of international fliers grew by 5.1 percent to 438,896, the highest in the airport's history.

Passenger traffic in 2025 is on a trajectory to reach a number just slightly below that

achieved at the airport in 2007.

Ontario officials have hailed this as a milestone, one that will match the airport's passenger achievement in 2024.

Still, there is a very real sense among those with more than a passing acquaintance with the facts of the matter that had Ontario officials stayed the course by maintaining the ownership/management arrangement for the airport with the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports, the 7.2 million passenger mark at Ontario International would have been eclipsed two years ago and ridership in 2025 would have neared or surpassed 8 million.

Los Angeles International Airport is host to 93 different airlines and accommodates 76 of those on a daily basis. Los Angeles International Airport, which averages 1,578 take-offs and landings daily compared to Ontario International's 146 take-offs and landings, on average, daily. Had Ontario International Airport maintained its affiliation with Los Angeles International Airport, LAWA would have remained inclined to use its leverage with air carriers, trading [preferable] gate positions at Los Angeles International and other advantages, to induce airlines to schedule flights to the inland airfield.

The inability of the City of Ontario and the Ontario International Airport Authority to offer airlines the same corporate perquisites and operational edge at Los Angeles International Airport that LAWA could is only part of the reason why airlines are reluctant to fly into and out of Ontario International. That part of the story goes deep into the culture of Ontario politics over the last three decades and the rampant corruption that has infested city government there.

The impact of this corruption manifests in more than one way, two of which have been made increasingly apparent to

ever more airlines' corporate officers.

One of the disincentives influencing the decision of airline executives to forego having their companies fly into and out of Ontario International is cost – consisting of an added financial burden on the air carriers and higher ticket prices for passengers. For some 8 million residents of Southern California – those living in the inland areas of Orange and Los Angeles counties and all of those living in San Bernardino and Los Angeles counties – Ontario Airport represents a far more convenient flying option than Los Angeles International Airport, given its easier and swifter accessibility because of the gridlock on Los Angeles's streets and freeways.

For Angelenos who live as few as ten to fifteen miles east of Los Angeles International Airport, depending on the time of day and freeway conditions, they can drive to Ontario International Airport, which is some 40 miles distant, in less time and undergo far less hassle, difficulty and general inconvenience than what they need to endure to get to the larger airport. Despite that, the vast majority elect to fly out of Los Angeles because of the prohibitive expense of airline tickets in Ontario.

According to air traveler guides, flights out of Ontario International cost roughly \$90 more on average than those out of Los Angeles International. In some cases, the cost differential on flights to the same destination on the same airline run to as much as \$219 more.

That price differential is a function of the costs borne by the airlines for the services provided to them by airports, which include charges for the use of the runway and landing facilities, the tower, the terminal, refueling, routine external and internal plane inspection, ground handling, baggage and cargo management, aircraft marshalling, cabin

Continued on Page 8

Hagman Exploiting Loophole To Help Himself To 3 More Terms *from page 4*

visor Joe Baca Jr, who was elected to the board in 2022 – are bound by the three term limitation only as of elections that occurred after 2022. In addition, according to those of this mindset, Second District Supervisor Jesse Armendarez, who was elected in the same November 2022 election in which Measure D passed but who ran for election before it passed, is likewise not subject to the three term limitation until after the term he is now serving ends. By this interpretation, Hagman is now at liberty to run for reelection in 2026, 2030 and 2034, such that he would be barred from seeking reelection in 2038. Further, Cook, Baca and Rowe would count the term they were elected to in 2024 as the first of the three terms to be counted under the term limit rule now in effect, such that they can seek reelection in 2028 and 2032 if they choose to, and Armendarez can, like Hagman, serve out his current term and then have the three four-year term limit kick in, allowing him to seek reelection in 2026, 2030 and 2034.

It is nonetheless, unclear as to exactly what restrictions currently apply on the terms to be served by the members of the county supervisors, as there exists a competing theory with regard to when the clock began to run on the three terms specified in Measure D. Under that alternate theory, Hagman's first term in office, which initiated after his 2014 election, counts toward his three allotted terms, the term he served following his 2018 reelection counts as his second allotted term and his current term, to which he was elected counts as his final term in office. In applying this theory to the remaining members of the board of supervisors, Cook, Baca and Rowe are now serving the second of three terms they can be elected

to and they are entitled to seek reelection in 2028 if that is their will, but all three would be barred from seeking reelection in 2032. Armendarez, under this interpretation can run for reelection in 2026 and in 2030, and would be termed out when his third term concludes the first week of 2035.

Of immediate focus is Supervisor Curt Hagman, as he is currently the longest serving supervisor and the term limit issue is therefore relevant to the upcoming June 2026 primary election. If the first interpretation is applied and Supervisor Hagman is permitted under the way in which the county applies the three term rule contained in Measure D to seek reelection next year, that will serve as the precedent to allow Cook, Rowe and Baca to remain on the board of supervisors, conditional upon their decision to do so and the willingness of the voters to sustain them in office, until January 2037 and Armendarez until January 2029.

Key to which interpretation will prevail is Laura Feingold, who was elevated to the position of county counsel last month after what was either the willing or forced departure of Tom Bunton earlier this year. If, indeed, Hagman opts to seek or at least attempts to seek reelection as 4th District supervisor in the June 2026 primary election, Feingold will be called upon, either by the board of supervisors or the public at large, to render a decision as to whether under the term limits imposed by 2022's Measure D, Hagman is eligible to run for reelection.

When Curt Hagman was elected to the board in 2014, the restrictions of 2006's Measure P were in effect. Under Measure P, he was eligible to serve three terms as supervisor and after being reelected in 2018 and 2022, ineligible to run for 4th District supervisor in 2026. Measure P, however, was rendered null and void by the passage of 2020's

Measure K. Measure K never went into effect and has been, apparently, superseded by Measure D, which became effective following the 2022 election and subjected the supervisors once more to three four-year terms.

The question has now become whether Measure D went into effect as of the certification of the November 2022 election such that it obviated any previous limitations on the terms of service and began the clock anew on how many terms the supervisors could serve post 2022. Feingold will be asked whether Supervisor Hagman, who had his three bites at the apple under Measure P, has also had three bites at the apple under Measure D and, as such, is to be termed out of office after the term he was elected to in 2022 ends. In addressing that question, Feingold will also be called upon to determine, simultaneously and conversely, whether Measure D erased all previous term limitation rules or considerations and is only applicable going forward and not retroactively, such that Supervisor Hagman is now eligible to run for reelection in 2026, 2030 and 2034.

This week, the Sentinel addressed questions to both Hagman and Feingold.

It sought from Hagman whether he intends to seek reelection as Fourth District supervisor next year.

The Sentinel inquired of Feingold which interpretation of the applicability of Measure D is correct and if, in her legal opinion and that of her office, Supervisor Hagman's course as Fourth District supervisor will have run at the end of 2026, making him therefore ineligible to run for reelection in the June 2026 primary and November 2026 general elections or whether he is at liberty to run for reelection as Fourth District supervisor in the 2026 election cycle and by extension in the 2030 election cycle and the 2034 election cycle.

Neither Hagman nor Feingold responded to the Sentinel by press time.

It is of some note that Hagman, a Republican who was formerly a councilman and mayor in Chino Hills, served six years in the California Assembly between 2008 and 2014, at which point he was termed out of office and ran for supervisor. Before doing so, he maneuvered himself into the position of chairman of the San Bernardino County Republican Central Committee. In that capacity, he bought into and embodied the principles of the national and state GOP, which included support for term limits. At this point, as county supervisor, Hagman is provided with an annual salary of \$193,555.79, further remuneration of \$42,089.76 and benefits of \$86,122.97 for a total annual compensation of \$321,768.52.

To remain loyal to the Republican Party principle of embracing term limits he formerly espoused, as both an elected member of the California legislature, as a Republican Party

member and the leader of the Republican Party in San Bernardino County, Hagman will need to forego that \$321,768.52, subject to cost-of-living increases, he stands to make annually from, potentially, 2027 until the end of 2038, which would total \$3,861,222.21, without those cost-of-living increases being calculated. Whether Hagman is going to live up to that principle when doing so would come at such a steep personal financial cost will become known on March 6, 2026, when the filing period for supervisorial candidates closes.

Just like Hagman has a lot of money riding on whether he will seek to remain in office as 4th District supervisor, Feingold has a personal financial interest in which way she renders her legal opinion how the term limit provision in Measure D should be interpreted.

As county counsel, Feingold serves at the pleasure of the board of supervisors. Unlike the two previous county counsels in San Bernardino County – Mi-

chelle Blakemore, who served four years as the county's top staff attorney, and Bunton, who last likewise four years in the post before retiring – Feingold is nearly a decade younger than what her predecessors were when she assumed the position. Given her relative youth, she could remain as county counsel for as long as a decade. By rendering a legal opinion that would allow Cook, Baca and Rowe to begin counting the number of their permissible terms in office as of those they were elected to in 2024 and Hagman and Armendarez to begin the countdown on the number of terms they can be elected to as of the 2026 election, Feingold stands to accrue a degree of favor and ingratiate herself with those who are in a position to see that she remains for as long as they remain in office in a position which at present provides her with no less than \$326,500 in annual salary, another \$27,250 in perquisites and pay add-ons and \$150,500 in benefits for a total annual compensation of \$504,250.

way is used to purchase imported water and pay for the infrastructure needed to bring in the imported water. In September 2020, Searles Valley Minerals, based in the San Bernardino County community of Trona, represented by Eric Garner, Jeffrey Dunn and Maya Mouawad with the law firm of Best Best & Krieger, filed a lawsuit in Kern County Superior Court against the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority in an effort to protect what Garner, Dunn and Mouawad asserted are the company's groundwater rights within the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin, and to stop the collection of what they characterized as an illegal and unfair groundwater replenishment fee and a tax disguised, they assert, as an "extraction fee."

The disputes over water in the Indian Wells

Water Use Restrictions & Pumping SurchARGE Was Threatening Brine Extraction Operation With Extinction *from page 3*

the drafting of water from the regional aquifer through conservation, increased recycling of water and perhaps the minimization of evaporation, augmented by the importation of water from outside the valley to achieve, no later than 2040, a balance of water coming in with the amount of water usage, such that the depletion of the aquifer will end. Stetson Engineers was designated the water resources manager for Indian Wells Valley, and the authority's board in January 2020 passed a tentative proposed groundwater sustainability plan and voted to submit it to the state. Thereafter it made adjustments

to the plan, which contained water use limitation elements and water replenishment measures. The plan incorporated a farmland fallowing option as well as an increase in the monthly assessment or fee that was imposed on the extraction of water by major pumpers. That fee had been previously collected to cover the costs associated with the administrative activity of the groundwater authority. After a survey of water use by well owners both collectively and individually was made, the authority assigned water use allowances to the region's well owners. Excess use fees, referred to as augmentation fees, were formulated for application to those well owners who pump above their allowances as well as on any farmer whose use exceeds his respective share of the water supply set aside for agricultural usage. Money generated in this

Continued on Page 14

Reports Are Airline Executives Have Been Shaken Down For Campaign Contributions

Contributions from page 6

cleaning, passenger service, baggage tracking, baggage handling, immigration and customs clearance, passenger information, air cargo handling, passenger amenities and coordination with the Federal Aviation Administration. Those costs are passed along to the flying customers.

The inflated ticket prices this year alone resulted in thousands, indeed tens of thousands, of travelers who otherwise would have flown from Ontario to elect to fly instead out of Los Angeles. That reduction in customers has served as a factor in the decisions of airlines already functioning out of Ontario to refrain from increasing the number of routes or flights departing from Ontario. The steeper operating charges at Ontario International has, at least with a handful of airlines, impacted on their decision to not offer customers flights out of Ontario.

The reason behind those higher charges to airlines at Ontario is a mystery to some of those aware of it, been speculated at by others contemplating it and is known by more than a handful of city and airport insiders and close observers.

Even before Ontario reassumed ownership and operation of the airport in November 2016, the city had sway over many services and franchises that pertain to the airport itself or the airport's surroundings, such as taxi service, towing, car rentals and the like. With the ownership and management transfer, city officials and/or the Ontario International Airport Authority inherited authority over even more critical elements of the aviation facility's operation and the provision of services and functions. Included in this melange are the constant supply of aviation fuel, its storage and the equipment and machinery to

dispense it; runway/tarmac maintenance; concourse upkeep; terminal operation and maintenance, which in the case of Ontario International pertains to three separate terminals and includes physical repair, janitorial services, baggage conveyors, maintenance of extensive ventilation, heating and air conditioning systems; grounds and landscape maintenance; advertising venues such as signs and electronic billboards in and outside the terminal; and the concessions inside the terminal including those for food and merchandise. In addition, the City of Ontario and the Ontario International Airport Authority took over the administrative, corporate and management functions that had previously been the province of the Los Angeles Department of Airports and Los Angeles World Airports. This entailed a host of functions and services and the employment of staff and contracts with vendors and service providers and consultants.

Ontario politics had already been fraught with political patronage, whereby donors to the city's politicians' electioneering accounts – primarily the mayor and city council – were rewarded with lucrative city contracts that went to them or their companies. There were rampant rumors and even some tangible indications that those receiving favorable treatment by the city or blessed with franchises approved by the mayor and city council had been providing those politicians with money or inducements other than funding for political campaigns.

With Ontario's assumption of the airport's ownership, a remarkable number of the mayor's and certain city council members' political backers found themselves employed at the airport or with the Ontario International Airport Authority, hired as consultants by the airport authority or had a stake in or outright owned companies given contracts or franchises relating to the airport. In more than one case, the bidding process for those contracts had been dispensed with and no effort was made to determine if the same service could be provided at a lesser cost. In some cases, it was not clear what service or advice was being provided and what value to the airport, the airport authority, the City of Ontario or the Ontario community the service rendered or advice actually was.

Those contract or consulting services do, however, represent added costs to the airport and the airport authority, ones which are ultimately defrayed or recouped through higher airport service charges to the airlines, which in turn are reflected in higher ticket prices for air passengers flying out of Ontario International Airport.

Buried within this avalanche of untoward implication is what is said to be the refusal on the part of some airline executives to engage with representatives from the Ontario International Authority in a discussion relating to their airlines operating at Ontario International because of reports they have received with regard to members of the authority's board of directors previously seeking to shake down aviation industry officials for monetary support in the form of political donations to their campaign funds.

With the creation of the Ontario International Airport Authority in August 2012, the Ontario City Council appointed Councilman Wapner and Councilman Jim Bowman to its board and shortly thereafter Wapner was selected to serve as that panel's president. Throughout the board's entire 13-plus year history, Wapner and Bowman have remained on the board and there has been no other board president than Wapner. In that same 13-year timeframe, Wapner has proven to be the most prolific recipient of political donations among all of San Bernardino County's local

elected officials, taking in more than \$1.2 million.

After 31 years in office as a city councilman in Ontario, earlier this year Wapner announced that next year he will run for Ontario mayor, taking on the incumbent, Paul Leon, who has been mayor since 2005 and served seven years on the city council prior to that.

In seeking the mayoralty, Wapner intends to campaign, with even greater emphasis than he utilized in his city council campaigns in 2022 and 2018, on the contention that he is the person most responsible for wresting Ontario International Airport from the clutches of Los Angeles.

Most certainly, that assertion is a true one, as it is indisputable that Wapner was the prime mover in the successful series of maneuvers to have Ontario reclaim its namesake aerodrome. Such a campaign holds promise, as to the casual observers and the uninitiated, Ontario taking control of the airport's destiny is, at least superficially, a positive development for the Ontario community and San Bernardino County.

Nevertheless, actuality is far more complicated and convoluted than appearances. Leon, who for thirteen years has deferred to Wapner on virtually every matter, issue and item relating to the airport and has remained, if not entirely out of, at least rather removed from the informational loop regarding operations there, has his ear to the rail and is peripherally aware at this point of the highly questionable decision-making process that has been ongoing at the city's most visible and valuable asset. He, like only a relative handful of others, recognizes that had Wapner been less vituperatively offensive in dealing with the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports, Ontario might have preserved the positive relationship it had with those who had transformed

Ontario Airport from the small regional airfield with fewer than 200,000 people passing through its gates in a single year to one which handled 7.2 million passengers annually. He can make a credible case that but for Wapner's scorched earth approach, the airport and its management would yet have a cordial and mutually beneficial ties with the nation's second busiest airport and by extension access to the top executives of the world's 60 largest airlines, such that Ontario International Airport by the end of 2025 would have easily had upwards of 8 million passengers flying into it and out of it and approaching 9 million by the end of 2026.

Leon has access to information and the stump from which to expose that it is Wapner's doing that the cost of airline tickets for flights out of Ontario International Airport run anywhere from ten percent to 25 percent higher than for tickets to comparable destinations when the flier travels from Los Angeles. Along the way, Leon will be able to work into that narrative that a primary factor leading to those higher ticket prices is Wapner's willingness to accept campaign donations in exchange for lucrative positions of employment or contracts with the airport authority.

Perhaps most significantly, Leon is position to explain to Ontario's voters that in his headlong pursuit of taking control over Ontario International Airport, Wapner interrupted what was on track to be a rational and mutually beneficial coordination of how the eight primary commercial passenger airports in the Southern California – Los Angeles International Airport, San Diego International Airport, Ontario International Airport, Palm Springs International Airport, John Wayne Airport, Long Beach Airport, and Hollywood Burbank Airport and San Bernardino International Airport – are to share passengers and

airlines that eliminate unnecessary and extended travel on the freeway system.

In this way, the 2026 Ontario mayoral election has the potential of becoming a referendum on whether the Wapner-led campaign to return the airport to local control represents a boom or bust.

Wapner is ready to contest that viewpoint.

Ontario International Airport was in a downward spiral a decade ago, and local leaders took bold steps to bring it back home," Wapner said. "Today, Ontario International Airport is thriving – a vital economic engine for the Inland Empire and a source of pride for our entire region."

29 Palms Solar Plant

from page 5

quadplexes, apartments and condominiums.

A not insignificant cross section of the city's residents is opposed to the E-Group PS's proposal, and some of those people made their feelings known to city officials at various points earlier this year. Some of those have indicated that they would welcome industrial solar fields into the desert but that they believe they should be built at a point further removed from the most heavily populated area of Twenty-nine Palms and not in an area that is slated for the next logical round of the city's residential expansion.

City officials, nonetheless, are concerned that E-Group PS would appeal directly to the State of California and its energy commission if the city drags its feet in approving the project. They believe it would be better to allow E-Group PS to proceed under a process in which the city will have some say with regard to the approval process and the terms that can be imposed on the project proponent. The draft environmental report is viewable at www.ci.twentynine-palms.ca.us/announcements.

Public Notices

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2533622

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner JENEVAR ALCHADAY-DA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

JENEVAR ALCHADAY-DA to JENEVAR JANESSA ALCHADAY-DA

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:
Date: January 20, 2026,
Time: 9:00 AM, Department: S 23

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 12/3/2025
Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa
Gilberto Villegas, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2533868

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner JESSICA DELGADO [and] EMMA RODRIGUEZ filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

EMMA ROSE RODRIGUEZ to EMMA ROSE DELGADO

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:
Date: January 16, 2026,
Time: 9:00 AM, Department: S 31

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Public Notices

Dated: 12/5/2025
Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa
Leslie Zepeda, Deputy Clerk of the Court

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME CASE NUMBER CIV SB 2533915

TO ALL INTERESTED PERSONS: Petitioner FUYANG MAO and SHUN CUI filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

CALEB CUI MAO to CALEB MAO CUI

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted. Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:

Date: January 16, 2026,
Time: 8:30 AM, Department: S 22

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 12/5/2025

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/ ANGELICA GALVAN DIAZ, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/1/2025

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 K7326

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

FBN20250011077

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as CALIFORNIA AUTO REGISTRATION SERVICE 555 W 1st STREET RIALTO, CA 92376: LOW BUDGET AUTO SALES, INC. 555 W FIRST STREET RIALTO, CA 92376

Business Mailing Address: 555 W 1st STREET RIALTO, CA 92376

The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION registered with the State of California.

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/ BRIAN JOHNSON, Secretary

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/26/2025

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 K7325

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

FBN20250010165

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as CODE RED STEAM CLEANING 7868 MILLIKEN AVE APT 506 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: SHAWNTELLE N. WEST

Business Mailing Address: 1810 WEST ARROW RT APT 6 UPLAND, CA 91786

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: October 9, 2025.

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

Public Notices

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

FBN20250011210

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as RESTORED PATH 7124 VINE ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346: STEVEN J RIVAS

Business Mailing Address: 7124 VINE ST HIGHLAND, CA 92346

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ STEVEN J RIVAS

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/2/2025

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 J1808

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

FBN20250011142

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as LA MAS HERMOSA BEAUTY STUDIO 365 S MOUNTAIN SUITE 22 UPLAND, CA 91786: ANGELICA GALVAN DIAZ

Business Mailing Address: 1344 SPRINGFIELD ST APT A UPLAND, CA 91786

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/ ANGELICA GALVAN DIAZ, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/1/2025

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 J1808

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

FBN20250010165

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as CODE RED STEAM CLEANING 7868 MILLIKEN AVE APT 506 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730: SHAWNTELLE N. WEST

Business Mailing Address: 1810 WEST ARROW RT APT 6 UPLAND, CA 91786

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: October 9, 2025.

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/ TRENTON HARPER, Manager

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 11/26/2025

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 K7325

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

Public Notices

am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ SHAWNTELLE N. WEST

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/23/2025

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 J9965

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

FBN20250011111

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as LEE TAX AND REALTY ASSOCIATES 6109 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701: SAMUEL H. LEE

Business Mailing Address: 6109 VINEYARD AVE RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91701

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: 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/ SAMUEL H. LEE, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/1/2025

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 J1808

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 5, 12, 19 & 26, 2025.

FBN20250011073

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as MTHRSHP 16917 ADELANTO ROAD ADELANTO, CA 92301: HIGH SKY LLC 16917 ADELANTO ROAD ADELANTO, CA 92301 Business Mailing Address: 16917 ADELANTO ROAD ADELANTO, CA 9230

The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY registered with the State of California under the number 202359164632

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/ ANGELICA GALVAN DIAZ, Owner

Public Notices

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/ ALISHA CHEN, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/08/2025

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 K4616

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 12, 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2, 2026.

FBN 20250011460

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

STATE TAX AND ACCOUNTING 6930 SAN FRANCISCO STREET HIGHLAND, CA 92346: CINDY O GONZALES [and] DEXTER R GONZALES [and] PRISCILL R GONZALES 4195 CHINO HILLS PARKWAY, SUITE E-420 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709

Business Mailing Address: 4195 CHINO HILLS PARKWAY, SUITE E-420 CHINO HILLS, CA 91709

The business is conducted by: A GENERAL PARTNERSHIP.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ CINDY O GONZALES, Partner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/09/2025

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 K7325

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 12, 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2, 2026.

FBN20250010358

The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

PROPERTIES OASIS 353 PIONEER ROAD LAKE ARROWHEAD, CA 92352: REGINA A. MUÑOZ

Business Mailing Address: 11660 CHURCH STREET #367 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: February 27, 2025.

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/ REGINA A. MUÑOZ, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2025

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 K3379

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 12, 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2, 2026.

Public Notices

the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 12, 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2, 2026.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR CHANGE OF NAME

CASE NUMBER

CIVSB2534328

TO ALL INTEREST-ED PERSONS: Petitioner MONICA E VAZQUEZ MADRIGAL GARCIA filed with this court for a decree changing names as follows:

MONICA ELIZABETH VAZQUEZ MADRIGAL GARCIA to MONICA ELIZABETH MADRIGAL GARCIA

THE COURT ORDERS that all persons interested in this matter appear before this court at the hearing indicated below to show cause, if any, why the petition for change of name should not be granted.

Any person objecting to the name changes described above must file a written objection that includes the reasons for the objection at least two court days before the matter is scheduled to be heard and must appear at the hearing to show cause why the petition should not be granted. If no written objection is timely filed, the court may grant the petition without a hearing.

Notice of Hearing:

Date: January 21, 2026, Time: 09:00 AM, Department: S34

The address of the court is Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, San Bernardino District-Civil Division, 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order be published in the SAN Bernardino County Sentinel in San Bernardino County California, once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date set for hearing of the petition.

Dated: 12/10/2025
Judge of the Superior Court: Gilbert G. Ochoa
By Kristina Talley, Deputy Court Clerk

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on November 28 and December 5, 12 & 19, 2025.

Abandonment of a Fictitious Business Name

FBN20250011291

The following entity doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

HARDFORD MAINTENANCE GROUP 1547 E MERION ST ONTARIO, CA 91761: ESTELA C ESTRADA

is abandoning its fictitious business name. The original FBN number was FBN20220008749. The original date of filing was 9/21/2022

Business Mailing Address: 1547 E MERION ST ONTARIO, CA 91761

The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL.

The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: September 15, 2022.

By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing.

/s/ REGINA A. MUÑOZ, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 10/30/2025

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 K3379

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from

Public Notices

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/ ESTELA CAROLINA ESTRADA, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/19/2025

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 12, 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2, 2026.

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 K7325

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

Notice-This fictitious name statement expires five years from the date it was filed in the office of the county clerk. A new fictitious business name statement must be filed before that time. The filing of this statement does not of itself authorize the use in this state of a fictitious business name in violation of the rights of another under federal, state, or common law (see Section 14400 et seq., Business and Professions Code).

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 19 & 26, 2025 and January 2 & 9, 2026.

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 K9238

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).

Personals

\$10,000 REWARD for information regarding girl born August 4, 2001 whose parents (actors) were lost in a theater collapse in Colorado, April 27, 2003. Thomas W. Campbell, Attorney-at-Law 15 Williams St. New York, NY

Civil Service Employee wants to rent suburban detached apartment, 4 or 5 bedrooms 2 baths, will pay cash for the right setting Alfred Willenstein Post Office Box 843 Sempleton, Wis.

PERSONAL Lance Corporal who saw shy governess in rickshaw on the streets of Hong Kong on March 14 would like to meet up with her again. Steve Duvery of St. Louis Missouri.

Public Notices

ing heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons is served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case.

¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CAL- ENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entreque una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no le protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted puede usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.su-corte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida si secretario de la corte que le de un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su

Public Notices

sueldo, dinero y bienes sin mas advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de referencia a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos en un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.su-corte.ca.gov), o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación da \$10,000 o mas de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda deschar el caso.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y la dirección de la corte es):
San Bernardino County Superior Court
8303 Haven Avenue
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

The name, address and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el numero de telefono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):
Robert A. Piering, Esq.
SBN#166858

Piering Law Firm
775 University Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825
T: (916) 446-1944
F: (916) 446-1222
DATE (Fecha): 5/22/2025
Clerk (Secretario), by: Sabrina Jamison, Deputy (Adjunto)

Published in the San Bernardino County Sentinel on December 26, 2025 and January 2, 9 & 16, 2026.

FBN20250011947
The following entity is doing business primarily in San Bernardino County as

ONCE UPON A CAKE 6416 EAGLE PEAK PL RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737: MARIO A ARROYO
Business Mailing Address: 6416 EAGLE PEAK PL RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91737
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/ MARIO A ARROYO, Owner

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/26/2025

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 K7326

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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).

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/ YI HU, CEO

Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: 12/23/2025

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 K4616

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

Public Notices

11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025 CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250008565
The following person is doing business as: CHINA FOOT MASSAGE & WELLNESS CENTER. 1150 BROOKSIDE AVE STE H REDLANDS, CA 92373; MAILING ADDRESS 1150 BROOKSIDE AVE STE H REDLANDS, CA 92373 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO : CHINA FOOT MASSAGE & WELLNESS CENTER 1150 BROOKSIDE AVE STE H REDLANDS CA 92373 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20250263141. The business is conducted by: A CORPORATION. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: SEP 11, 2025 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/ SHPEND QERIMI, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 18, 2025 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 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025, 10/03/2025, 10/10/2025 CNBB38202508MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025 CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250008398
The following person is doing business as: CREACIONES LA OAXAQUITA; MINI'S PANCAKES SNACK CART 17228 MARYGOD AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 17228 MARYGOD AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LORENA J SALAZAR PACHECO; NICOLAS JIMENEZ RAMIREZ The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: SEP 08, 2025 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/ LORENA J SALAZAR PACHECO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: SEPTEMBER 08, 2025 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 08/01/2025, 08/08/2025, 08/15/2025, 08/22/2025 CNBB31202533MT CORRECTION DATES 09/12/2025, 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025 & 10/03/2025 CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025 CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250008902
The following person is doing business as: HAUS OF ESCROW A NON INDEPENDENT BROKER ESCROW 10803 FOOTHILL BLVD SUITE 112 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730; MAILING ADDRESS 10803 FOOTHILL BLVD SUITE 112 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730; COUNTY SAN BERNARDINO HAUS OF REAL ESTATE INC 10803 FOOTHILL BLVD

Public Notices

SUITE 112 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA 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/ SHPEND QERIMI, PRESIDENT Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 27, 2025 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 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025 CNBB44202512MT CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250010315
The following person is doing business as: PSALMS COFFEE. 14025 IVY AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LESLYE J GAZCON MUNIZ; JAIR F ZAMORANO PAZOS The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE. 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/ LESLYE J GAZCON MUNIZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 08, 2025 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 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025, 10/03/2025, 10/10/2025 CNBB38202508MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025 CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250006714
The following person is doing business as: MINA'S DIVINE HOUSE KEEPING; GRAYSON BLESSINGS SOBER LIVING HOME 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD STE D3 29 VICTORVILLE, CA 92392; MAILING ADDRESS 13782 BEAR VALLEY RD STE D3 29 VICTORVILLE, CA 92392; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GRAYSON BLESSING SOBER LIVING HOME LLC 13410 PROSPECTOR DR VICTORVILLE CA 92392 STATE OF ORGANIZATION CA The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ ISHIMINE A GRAYSON, CEO Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: JULY 17, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202501FA CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250010258
The following person is doing business as: ALEXI'SNACKS. 1524 MARJORIE AVE CLAREMONT, CA 91711; MAILING ADDRESS 1524 MARJORIE AVE CLAREMONT, CA 91711; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES RUBEN MALDONADO OLIN The business is conducted by: AN INDIVIDUAL. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ RUBEN MALDONADO OLIN, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 28, 2025 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 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2026, 01/09/2026 CNBB51202502MT CORRECTION DATES 09/12/2025, 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025 & 10/03/2025 CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025 CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250010227
The following person is doing business as: C&C PLOW. 1513 SHERIDAN RD SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; MAILING ADDRESS 1513 SHERIDAN RD SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO NEXT LEVEL LEGACY INC 1513 SHERIDAN RD SAN BERNARDINO CA 92407 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION B20250177085 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/ SHAWN EMMINGER, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 10, 2025 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 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025, 11/28/2025 CNBB45202504MT CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250011422
The following person is doing business as: RE/MAX TIME COMMERCIAL. 10535 FOOTHILL BLVD STE #460 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; MAILING ADDRESS 10803 FOOTHILL BLVD SUITE 112 RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91730; COUNTY SAN BERNARDINO HAUS OF REAL ESTATE INC 10803 FOOTHILL BLVD

Public Notices

STATEMENT filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: OCTOBER 27, 2025 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 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025, 11/21/2025 CNBB44202512MT CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250010315
The following person is doing business as: PSALMS COFFEE. 14025 IVY AVE FONTANA, CA 92335; MAILING ADDRESS 311 W CIVIC CENTER DR STE B SANTA ANA, CA 92701; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LESLYE J GAZCON MUNIZ; JAIR F ZAMORANO PAZOS The business is conducted by: A MARRIED COUPLE. 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/ LESLYE J GAZCON MUNIZ, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 08, 2025 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 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025, 10/03/2025, 10/10/2025 CNBB38202508MT CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025 CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250011459
The following person is doing business as: LMI LOEZA MECHANICAL INC. 24638 REDLANDS BLVD LOMA LINDA, CA 92354; MAILING ADDRESS P.O. BOX 492 YUCAIPA, CA 92399; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO LOEZA MECHANICAL, INC. 24638 REDLANDS BLVD LOMA LINDA CA 92354 STATE OF INCORPORATION CA ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION 4228150 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/ WENDY BAUTISTA, MANAGING MEMBER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 10, 2025 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 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2026, 01/09/2026 CNBB51202501MT

FBN 20250010258
The following person is doing business as: ALEXI'SNACKS. 1524 MARJORIE AVE CLAREMONT, CA 91711; MAILING ADDRESS 1524 MARJORIE AVE CLAREMONT, CA 91711; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES RUBEN MALDONADO OLIN 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/ OCTAVIO S. LOEZA, C.E.O Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 09, 2025 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 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2026, 01/09/2026 CNBB51202504MT CORRECTION DATES 09/12/2025, 09/19/2025, 09/26/2025 & 10/03/2025 CORRECTION DATES 10/31/2025, 11/07/2025, 11/14/2025 & 11/21/2025 CORRECTION DATES 12/12/2025, 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2025

FBN 20250011494
The following person is doing business as: MARIPOSA TIRE & AUTO. 12011 MARIPOSA ROAD HESPERIA, CA 92345; MAILING ADDRESS 12011 MARIPOSA ROAD HESPERIA, CA 92345; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MIRE FAMILY LLC 12011 MARIPOSA ROAD HESPERIA CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION CA ARTICLES OF ORGANIZATION 202358316214 The business is conducted by: A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY. The registrant commenced to transact business under the fictitious business name or names listed above on: N/A By signing, I declare that all information in this statement is true and correct. A registrant who declares as true information which he or she knows to be false is guilty of a crime (B&P Code 179130). I am also aware that all information on this statement becomes Public Record upon filing. s/ MELITA D CACHAPERO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 11, 2025 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 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2026, 01/09/2026 CNBB51202502MT

FBN 20250011632
The following person is doing business as: IRISH SEA MOSS. 9668 MILLIKEN AVE STE 104-253 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; MAILING ADDRESS 9668 MILLIKEN AVE STE 104-253 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91730; COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO Z A I N A L A B I - DEEN A AL-OMRAN 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/ ZAINALABIDEEN A AL-OMRAN 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/ MELITA D CACHAPERO, OWNER Statement filed with the County Clerk of San Bernardino on: DECEMBER 12, 2025 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 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2026, 01/09/2026 CNBB47202503CV CORRECTION DATES 12/19/2025, 12/26/2025, 01/02/2026, 01/09/2026

Public Notices

ING ADDRESS 10535 FOOT-HILL BLVD STE #460 RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA