KZGN News 29th Talking Points Editorial

By: Thomas Wiknich

The topic of today’s editorial is: Do we need a certain criteria for the city to approve memorial plaques or naming of facilities for a person?

But first, a couple comments about last Tuesday’s editorial titled: Should a family that has a concealed carry weapons permit be prohibited from taking in foster children?

Here are some comments from viewers:

Harry wrote, “Law abiding gun owners who have a CCW permit have taken training about gun safety and existing laws for the state they reside in. They should not be denied the ability to become foster parents.”

Ken wrote, “Of course they shouldn't be prohibited. This is just another example of zero tolerance run amuck from well-meaning but misguided liberals.”

Suzzy wrote, “Tom, I think the subject might have come up because of a recent case in Texas (I think) where a foster child (4-5 years old) had got a hold of gun and shot himself.”

There were other comments all finding indifference in a government agency discriminating against law abiding gun owners. And to Suzzy, all responsible gun owners agree that we should store and keep our guns away from children. That is why states like California do have a storage requirement. I want to thank everyone for the comments.

Now on to today’s topic: Do we need a certain criteria for the city to approve memorial plaques or naming of facilities for a person?

At yesterday’s council meeting where they discussed installing a memorial plaque at the Ridgecrest skate park for former Mayor Ron Carter, Dave Mathews got up and adamantly suggested there needs to be an official process for naming parks and erecting memorials on city property or facilities. This editorial does not have any emphasis on this particular naming. I support the memorial for Ron Carter. What about the next idea, and then the next idea?

I agree with Mr. Mathews. I believe there should be an established procedure for these ideas. Why you ask? What if someone on the council just decided they wanted to erect a plaque honoring the parent, or what if there was a ground swell of people suggesting naming a park in the name of some radical? What if a big group wanted to name a park in President Obama’s name? I bet that would stir things up. We need an official process that everyone must follow. Whoever has this request should make the request to the city in writing, providing the basis for their recommendation. It should address funding. I don’t think the taxpayer should be taxed to pay for non-city business functions. After all, how much can be spent on this type thing?

This may be an exaggeration, but what if someone wanted to erect a tall 20-foot statue of someone on a horse? You might laugh, but it could happen. Look at any big city in their center squares and parks. The requestor should address how it will be funded. There should be a certain criteria of who would be considered for the honor: local officials, city police, local veterans, etc. There should be a set committee to receive the application and review it. There should be a set review period at the committee level, 30 days would be appropriate. Not just bring it up at a meeting and send the council a recommendation, public comment at the committee level, and then again when presented to the council.

In conclusion, again, this is not about the memorial plaque for Ron Carter. I support that.

It’s about an open process that allows considerable time for comment and consideration from the people. It shouldn’t look someone quietly came up with the idea, ran to the council individually getting their support, and then all of a sudden, there’s and agenda item to name a park. That appears to come out of nowhere. I agree with Mr. Mathews. Come on council, let’s get this set up.

I’m Tom Wiknich, and that’s what I think. If you have any comments about this editorial, or would like to discuss or recommend a topic, I’d like to hear from you. Please email them to [info@kzgn.net](mailto:INFO@KZGN.NET).