



NEWS



News Headlines 09/29/2020

- Fire destroys two-story commercial building in San Bernardino; two firefighters are injured
- What's on Your Local Ballot?
- Woman Struck by Car In Yucca Valley Sunday Night

Fire destroys two-story commercial building in San Bernardino; two firefighters are injured

Staff Writers, Fontana Herald News

Posted: September 29, 2020



A fire destroyed a vacant two-story commercial building in San Bernardino on Sept. 29. (Contributed photo by San Bernardino County Fire Department)

Two firefighters were injured when a two-story commercial building was destroyed in an early-morning fire in San Bernardino on Sept. 29, according to the **San Bernardino County Fire Department**.

At 5:20 a.m., crews were dispatched to a reported commercial structure fire at South Central Avenue and South Waterman Avenue, said Battalion Chief/PIO Mike McClintock.

Company 221 arrived within six minutes of dispatch to find heavy smoke showing from the second story of the large vacant building.

Crews initiated a fire attack prioritizing a primary search of the office building. While performing the primary search and fire attack, conditions deteriorated, forcing crews to transition to a defensive posture.

While transitioning from an offensive to defensive posture a collapse occurred, causing injuries to two firefighters. One firefighter was treated and transported to a local hospital for minor injuries. An additional firefighter was treated on scene.

Crews utilized ladder pipes to suppress the fire and limit its spread. The blaze was ultimately knocked down in about 90 minutes.

The Fire Department was investigating the cause of the fire.

https://www.fontanaheraldnews.com/news/inland_empire_news/fire-destroys-two-story-commercial-building-in-san-bernardino-two-firefighters-are-injured/article_e5ed38d6-02ab-11eb-b886-f3172d685fe9.html

What's on Your Local Ballot?

Staff Writers, City News Group

Posted: September 29, 2020 at 1:02 PM



On Monday October 5, 2020 early voting begins at the Registrar of Voters so get to know what California Propositions, County and City Measures are on your ballot this fall.

On Monday October 5, 2020 early voting begins at the Registrar of Voters and mail ballots are delivered to the U.S. Postal Service- increasing the already present deadline for Election Day on November 3, 2020.

With early voting in full swing, the consumption of information on candidates and legislature is paramount. Knowing who and what will be on your ballot before Election Day, may provide you the time to get to know the people and legislature that impacts our community and day-to-day lives before you cast your vote. Get to know what California Propositions, County and City Measures are on your ballot this fall.

County of San Bernardino Measures:

Measure J:

REVISED CHARTER OF THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

The revised Charter requires that the County maintain a discretionary stockpile of supplies and equipment for a disaster or emergency and that orders issued by the County Public Health Officer to the public at large be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors.

It will change Supervisor term limits from three consecutive terms to three total terms.

The revised Charter will change the process for the filling of vacancies.

The current Charter sets Supervisor compensation (salary and benefits) at the average of total compensation for Supervisors in Riverside, Orange, and San Diego counties. The revised Charter will set the base salary at a level equal to 80% of the salary of a Superior Court Judge and provide that Supervisors receive the same benefits given to County exempt employees (department heads). The revised Charter will provide that any future increases in salary or benefits will only go into effect if approved by the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing. This provision would apply to Supervisors elected after the new Charter is approved.

Information for "Arguments in Favor" and "Arguments Against" is from the official arguments section on the voters ballot

Argument in Favor:

San Bernardino County's charter - the laws that govern our community - was written more than 100 years ago. It's time to modernize our charter. Measure J will:

Remove sexist language

Close political loopholes

Put a stop to future Governors meddling in local matters

Increase transparency and accountability in our local government

Argument Against:

Don't be fooled. This charter "reform" is not reform. It's a way for the county board of supervisors to lock out voters when it comes to decisions about term limits and compensation. Since elected Supervisors collect a salary of over \$250,000 annually – nearly six-times the median income of San Bernardino residents – and can serve twelve long years, it's easy to understand their motives.

Measure K

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY SUPERVISOR COMPENSATION REDUCTION AND TERM LIMITS.
This Measure would amend the San Bernardino County Charter provisions relating to the term limits and compensation of the members of the Board of Supervisors. San Bernardino County Charter Article I, Section 2 would be amended to impose a term limit of one-term for each Supervisor. The Measure would add Section 10 to Article I of the San Bernardino County Charter to set the total compensation for each member of the Board of Supervisors at \$5,000 per month and would repeal San Bernardino County Charter Article VI, Section 1 that currently sets compensation for members of the Board of Supervisors.

Argument in Favor:

Voting YES for term limits and reduced salaries will finally attract representatives interested in public service and committed to following the will of the people.

Argument Against:

Measure K will result in less representation for residents of San Bernardino County on the Board of Supervisors. We need more representation, not less.

City of San Bernardino Measure S:

To prevent reductions to City services including public safety, 911 emergency response, Currently, the City has a one-quarter percent (1/4%) retail transactions and use (sales) tax, that generates approximately \$9 million annually. The current tax expires on March 31, 2022. If this Measure is approved by a majority of San Bernardino voters, this Measure would authorize an increase of the retail transactions and use (sales) tax from one-quarter percent (1/4%) to one percent (1%) within the City of San Bernardino.

Argument in Favor:

Vote YES on Measure S to provide a brighter future for San Bernardino. Measure S renews a critical source of local funding, prevents further cuts to essential city services, improves 911 emergency response, and protects local businesses and jobs here in San Bernardino

Argument Against:

“No Argument Against Measure S was filed.”

San Bernardino County Fire Protection District Measure U

This Measure, if approved by a majority of those voting, would repeal the special tax associated with Fire Protection Service Zone Five (FP-5). County Service Area (CSA) 70, Improvement Zone FP-5 was formed on April 18, 2006. On August 1, 2006, a special tax was authorized following a two-thirds vote of registered voters in CSA 70, Improvement Zone FP-5 for fire and emergency medical services. The previously authorized special tax per parcel remained in effect in the reorganized FP-5. Over time, FP-5 has been expanded to include some cities and unincorporated territory in the County of San Bernardino.

Argument in Favor:

VOTE YES on Measure U to END THE UNFAIR FIRE TAX! Beginning in 2015, to save themselves money, politicians across San Bernardino County traded away local fire protection and joined a large, regional agency, saddling residents with a tax increase that penalizes poor and middle-class families the same as rich corporate property owners. This tax approved by only a small number of people, impacts over a million San Bernardino residents. In fact, over 99% of those impacted never had the chance to vote on dismantling local fire protection or paying a new tax!

Argument Against:

VOTE NO on Measure U Measure U is a DANGEROUS PROPOSAL to DEFUND FIRE PROTECTION services for residents in the communities served by the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District. Measure U ELIMINATES \$40 MILLION in funding for Emergency Medical and Fire Protection services. It cuts essential life-saving services – not budgetary fat. By REDUCING PARAMEDIC SERVICES, Measure U will WORSEN response times in life-threatening medical emergencies – putting our families at greater risk.

California State Propositions:

Proposition 14: AUTHORIZES BONDS CONTINUING STEM CELL RESEARCH. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

Authorizes \$5.5 billion in state general obligation bonds to fund grants from the California Institute of Regenerative Medicine to educational, nonprofit, and private entities for: stem cell and other medical research, including training; stem cell therapy development and delivery; research facility construction; and associated administrative expenses. Increased state costs to repay bonds estimated at about \$260 million per year over the next roughly 30 years.

Argument in Favor:

Prop. 14 provides continued funding to develop treatments, advance clinical trials and achieve new scientific breakthroughs for California's patients with Cancer, Diabetes, Heart Disease, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, HIV/AIDS, ALS, MS, Sickle Cell Disease, Lung Diseases, Kidney Disease, Bubble Baby Disease, Age-Related Blindness and Genetic Blindness, Epilepsy, Stroke, Schizophrenia, Autism, other Mental Health and Brain Conditions, and Infectious Diseases like COVID-19.

Argument Against:

WE CAN'T AFFORD TO WASTE BILLIONS In the middle of an economic crisis, with soaring unemployment and budget shortfalls in the tens of billions of dollars, we don't have money to burn. We simply cannot afford the \$5 billion that proponents of Prop. 14 are asking for. And that's on top of the nearly \$3 billion this troubled state agency has spent over the past 15 years—with poor results.

Proposition 15: INCREASES FUNDING SOURCES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES BY CHANGING TAX ASSESSMENT OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Increases funding sources for K–12 public schools, community colleges, and local governments by requiring commercial and industrial real property be taxed based on current market value, instead of purchase price. Exempts from taxation changes: residential properties; agricultural land; and owners of commercial and industrial properties with combined value of \$3 million or less.

Most owners of commercial land and buildings worth more than \$3 million would pay higher property taxes. Only some of these property owners would start to pay higher taxes in 2022. By 2025, most of these property owners would pay higher taxes. Beginning in 2025, total property taxes from commercial land and buildings probably would be \$8 billion to \$12.5 billion higher in most years

Argument in Favor:

We are all better off when everyone pays their fair share. But California is giving away billions of dollars in property tax breaks to wealthy corporations. These billions could be used instead to deal with increasing inequality, persistent poverty, unemployment, unaffordable housing, homelessness and underfunded schools.

Argument Against:

PROP. 15 WILL BE THE LARGEST ANNUAL PROPERTY TAX INCREASE IN CALIFORNIA HISTORY—UP TO \$12.5 BILLION PER YEAR! Prop. 15's massive increase in annual property taxes will have disastrous economic impacts for every Californian—from small businesses and consumers to farmers and homeowners.

Proposition 16: ALLOWS DIVERSITY AS A FACTOR IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, AND CONTRACTING DECISIONS. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Permits government decision-making policies to consider race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin to address diversity by repealing article I, section 31, of the California Constitution, which was added by Proposition 209 in 1996. Proposition 209 generally prohibits state and local governments from discriminating against, or granting preferential treatment to, individuals or groups on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, education, or contracting.

Argument in Favor:

All of us deserve equal opportunities to thrive with fair wages, good jobs, and quality schools. Despite living in the most diverse state in the nation, white men are still overrepresented in positions of wealth and power in

California. Although women, and especially women of color, are on the front lines of the COVID-19 response, they are not rewarded for their sacrifices. Women should have the same chance of success as men.

Argument Against:

REPEAL WOULD BE A STEP BACKWARD Discrimination of this kind is poisonous. It will divide us at a time we desperately need to unite. Politicians want to give preferential treatment to their favorites. They think they can “fix” past discrimination against racial minorities and women by discriminating against other racial minorities and men who are innocent of any wrongdoing. Punishing innocent people will only cause a never-ending cycle of resentment.

Proposition 17: RESTORES RIGHT TO VOTE AFTER COMPLETION OF PRISON TERM. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Amends state constitution to restore voting rights to persons who have been disqualified from voting while serving a prison term as soon as they complete their prison term. Increased one-time state costs, likely in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, to update voter registration cards and to update voter registration cards and systems.

Argument in Favor:

Proposition 17 is simple—it restores a person’s right to vote upon completion of their prison term. When a person completes their prison sentence, they should be encouraged to reenter society and have a stake in their community. Restoring their voting rights does that.

Argument Against:

PROPOSITION 17 WILL ALLOW CRIMINALS CONVICTED OF MURDER, RAPE, SEXUAL ABUSE AGAINST CHILDREN, KIDNAPPING, ASSAULT, GANG GUN CRIMES AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING TO VOTE BEFORE COMPLETING THEIR SENTENCE INCLUDING PAROLE.

Proposition 18: AMENDS CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION TO PERMIT 17-YEAR-OLDS TO VOTE IN PRIMARY AND SPECIAL ELECTIONS IF THEY WILL TURN 18 BY THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION AND BE OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

The California Constitution currently permits individuals who are at least 18 years old on the date of an election to vote in that election. Increased costs for counties, likely between several hundreds of thousands of dollars and \$1 million every two years, to send and process voting materials to eligible registered 17-year-olds

Arguments in Favor:

This important election reform will not only allow first-time voters to participate in the full election cycle, but also has the potential to boost youth participation in our elections.

Arguments Against:

“Many tax increases and bond debt measures are decided on primary and special election ballots. That’s why only adults should vote.”—Jon Coupal, President, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Proposition 19: CHANGES CERTAIN PROPERTY TAX RULES. LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Permits homeowners who are over 55, severely disabled, or whose homes were destroyed by wildfire or disaster, to transfer their primary residence’s property tax base value to a replacement residence of any value, anywhere in the state. Local governments could gain tens of millions of dollars of property tax revenue per year. These gains could grow over time to a few hundred million dollars per year.

Argument in Favor:

Tax Savings and Housing Relief for SENIORS, WILDFIRE VICTIMS, and PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES. Proposition 19 protects vulnerable Californians, closes unfair tax loopholes, and generates needed revenue for fire protection and emergency medical response.

Argument Against:

“Proposition 19 is an attempt by Sacramento politicians to raise property taxes by removing two voter-approved taxpayer protections from the State Constitution. This measure would require reassessment to market value of property transferred from parents to children, and from grandparents to grandchildren.”—Jon Coupal, President, Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

Proposition 20: RESTRICTS PAROLE FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES CURRENTLY CONSIDERED TO BE NON-VIOLENT. AUTHORIZES FELONY SENTENCES FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES CURRENTLY TREATED ONLY AS MISDEMEANORS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

Limits access to parole program established for non-violent offenders who have completed the full term of their primary offense by eliminating eligibility for certain offenses.

Increased state and local correctional costs likely in the tens of millions of dollars annually, primarily due to increases in county jail populations and levels of community supervision.

Argument in Favor:

Under California law, assault with a deadly weapon is classified a “nonviolent” offense—along with date rape, selling children for sex, and 19 other clearly violent crimes. All are “nonviolent” under the law. Proposition 20 fixes this.

Argument Against:

California already has lengthy sentences and strict punishment for serious and violent crime. Backers of Prop. 20 are trying to scare you into rolling back effective criminal justice reforms you just passed, to spend tens of millions of your taxpayer dollars on prisons.

Proposition 21: EXPANDS LOCAL GOVERNMENTS’ AUTHORITY TO ENACT RENT CONTROL ON RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

Amends state law to allow local governments to establish rent control on residential properties over 15 years old. Allows local limits on annual rent increases to differ from current statewide limit. Overall, a potential reduction in state and local revenues in the high tens of millions of dollars per year over time. Depending on actions by local communities, revenue losses could be less or more.

Argument in Favor:

KEEP FAMILIES IN THEIR HOMES, PRESERVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, STOP HOMELESSNESS, AND SAVE TAXPAYERS MONEY.

Argument Against:

PROP. 21 IS A DEEPLY FLAWED SCHEME THAT WILL INCREASE HOUSING COSTS AND HURT CALIFORNIA'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY.

Proposition 22: EXEMPTS APP-BASED TRANSPORTATION AND DELIVERY COMPANIES FROM PROVIDING EMPLOYEE BENEFITS TO CERTAIN DRIVERS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

Classifies drivers for app-based transportation (rideshare) and delivery companies as “independent contractors,” not “employees,” unless company: sets drivers’ hours, requires acceptance of specific ride or delivery requests, or restricts working for other companies.

Minor increase in state income taxes paid by rideshare and delivery company drivers and investors.

Argument in Favor:

Sacramento politicians recently passed legislation that threatens to eliminate the ability of Californians to choose work as independent contractors providing app-based rideshare, food and grocery delivery services.

Argument Against:

Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash paid to put Proposition 22 on the November ballot. They hired lawyers to write this misleading initiative and paid political operatives millions to collect the voter signatures needed.

Proposition 23: ESTABLISHES STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR KIDNEY DIALYSIS CLINICS. REQUIRES ON-SITE MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

Requires at least one licensed physician on site during treatment at outpatient kidney dialysis clinics; authorizes California Department of Public Health to exempt clinics from this requirement if there is a shortage of qualified licensed physicians and the clinic has at least one nurse practitioner or physician assistant on site.

Argument in Favor:

To patients, dialysis is lifesaving. But to industry executives, it's a huge money-maker, so they're at it again, stoking fear by threatening to close clinics if Prop. 23 passes and they're held accountable to higher standards. Once again they are using gravely ill dialysis patients to shield their perks and million dollar salaries.

Argument Against:

NURSES, DOCTORS AND PATIENTS URGE NO ON 23—THE DANGEROUS AND COSTLY DIALYSIS PROPOSITION Nearly 80,000 Californians with failed kidneys receive dialysis treatment three days a week to stay alive. Dialysis treatment does the job of the kidneys by removing toxins from the body. Missing a single treatment increases patient risk of death by 30%

Proposition 24: AMENDS CONSUMER PRIVACY LAWS. INITIATIVE STATUTE.

Permits consumers to: (1) prevent businesses from sharing personal information; (2) correct inaccurate personal information; and (3) limit businesses' use of "sensitive personal information"—including precise geolocation; race; ethnicity; religion; genetic data; private communications; sexual orientation; and specified health information. Increased state costs of at least \$10 million annually for a new state agency to oversee and enforce consumer privacy laws.

Argument in Favor:

The world's biggest corporations are collecting deeply personal and private information about all of us. Sadly, our current laws aren't strong enough to protect us or our families from those who would abuse our most personal information.

Argument Against:

Vote NO on Proposition 24 because it was written behind closed doors with input from giant tech corporations that collect and misuse our personal information—while the measure's sponsor rejected almost every suggestion from 11 privacy and consumer rights groups.

Proposition 25: REFERENDUM ON LAW THAT REPLACED MONEY BAIL WITH SYSTEM BASED ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND FLIGHT RISK.

A "Yes" vote approves, and a "No" vote rejects, a 2018 law that: Replaced the money bail system (for obtaining release from jail before trial) with a system based on a determination of public safety and flight risk. Limits detention of a person in jail before trial for most misdemeanors

Increased state and local costs possibly in the mid hundreds of millions of dollars annually for a new process for releasing people from jail prior to trial. Unclear whether some of the increased state costs would be offset by local funds currently spent on this type of workload

Argument in Favor:

Now is the time to replace California's money bail system with one based on safety and fairness. End money bail. Vote YES on Proposition 25 for a safer, fairer and less costly system.

Argument Against:

PROP. 25 ELIMINATES THE RIGHT TO BAIL FOR EVERY CALIFORNIAN California's justice system guarantees that people accused of a non-violent crime have the CHOICE of securing their release by posting

bail or by order of a judge. But Prop. 25 replaces this right with an automated system of computer-generated predictive modeling based on mathematical algorithms administered by 58 different counties.

<https://www.citynewsgroup.com/articles/whats-on-your-local-ballot#Gallery>

Woman Struck by Car In Yucca Valley Sunday Night

Staff Writers, z1077fm.com

Posted: September 29, 2020

A woman was hit by a car while she was walking home from work in Yucca Valley Sunday night. **County Fire Battalion Chief Scott Tuttle** said the 23-year-old woman was walking home on Balsa Avenue when she was hit by a 2006 Acura that was being driven northbound on Balsa. The driver told Sheriff's deputies he heard a thump about 10:05 p.m.; he stopped his vehicle and turned around, at which time he saw a woman lying on the ground and screaming near Spring Drive. A friend of the family said the woman suffered non-life-threatening injuries; she was taken to Desert Hospital in Palm Springs. A Sheriff's report said the driver had a dashcam video that showed the woman walking in the road with no streetlights in the area.

<http://z1077fm.com/woman-struck-by-car-in-yucca-valley-sunday-night/>