

These minutes are provisional until approved by the Domestic Names Committee. Any changes will be noted in the minutes of the next meeting.

U.S. Board on Geographic Names

Domestic Names Committee

Six Hundred Fifty Second Meeting

Department of the Interior, Conference Room 3004

January 8, 2004 – 9:30 a.m.

Members and Deputy Members in Attendance

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Betsy Kanalley | Department of Agriculture (Forest Service) |
| Chick Fagan (Chair) | Department of the Interior (National Park Service) – not voting |
| Mike Fournier | Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census) |
| Tony Gilbert | Government Printing Office |
| Ronald Grim | Library of Congress |
| Robert Hiatt | Library of Congress |
| Curtis Loy | Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey) |
| Joe Marinucci | Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census) |
| Doug Vandegraft | Department of the Interior (Fish and Wildlife Service) |

Ex Officio

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Roger L. Payne | Executive Secretary, U.S. Board on Geographic Names |
|----------------|---|

Staff

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Lou Yost | |
| Jennifer Runyon | |

Guests

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Barry Napier | Department of Agriculture (Forest Service) |
| Trent Palmer | Department of Defense (National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency) |
| Scott Zillmer | National Geographic Society |

1. Opening

The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed Barry Napier from the Department of Agriculture (Forest Service) who is currently on detail to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Mr. Napier reported that he has been involved in the development of procedures to disseminate current and accurate geospatial data to local, State, and Tribal governments. In numerous instances, it has been shown that in the case of emergency situations, the first responders are usually the local people who may know the local landscape and placenames, but there is a need to provide and share this information with others through the use of accurate and detailed maps and reports. Because of the importance of geographic names, the DHS has expressed an interest in establishing membership on the Board.

The Chair also introduced Trent Palmer of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), formerly the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA), who serves as the Secretary of the Board's Advisory Committee on Undersea Features (ACUF). Mr. Palmer requested an opportunity to address the Domestic Names Committee regarding some issues of mutual interest to the DNC and ACUF.

2. Minutes of the 651st Meeting

The Minutes of the 651st Meeting, held December 11, 2003, were approved with one change. The deputy member from the Bureau of the Census reported that in the vote on the proposal for Cherith Brook, Pennsylvania, he had abstained from voting.

3. Communications and Reports

3.1 BGN Chairman's Report (Loy)

The Chairman reported that the full Board has not met since the last DNC meeting, but is scheduled to meet on January 20, 2004, at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) in Reston, Virginia at 1:30 p.m.

3.2 BGN Executive Secretary's Report (Payne)

All appointment and reappointment letters have been received. The appointment letter for the Department of Homeland Security is being forwarded to the Office of the Secretary of the Interior for signature. The Board looks forward to establishing a dialogue with the Department and will offer to make a presentation if requested. It is hoped that the new appointee(s) will be involved in geospatial data, and that if possible, the new members will represent the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Coast Guard. The Board encourages other Federal agencies such as FEMA to become more active in the maintenance of the Geographic Names Information System (GNIS). In response to the comments from the visitor from the Forest Service, it was noted that the names of roads and highways are not included in the GNIS nor are they under the purview of the Board.

The Executive Secretary reminded the members that the next meeting of the United Nations Group of Experts is scheduled for April 20-29, 2004, in New York. Attendance is limited to 10 official delegates, and there are still three openings. He encouraged all interested Board members to attend.

No further information is available on the scheduling of the next joint conference of the Board and the British Permanent Committee on Geographical Names (PCGN).

The next Annual Conference of the Council of Geographic Names Authorities (COGNA) is scheduled for October 19-23 in Jacksonville, Florida. The 2005 conference will be in Portland, Oregon; 2006 possibly in Colorado; 2007 in Oklahoma City; and 2008 possibly in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

The PAIGH geographic names training course will be conducted in either August or September, most likely in Aguascalientes, Mexico.

3.3 Report of the Publicity Committee (Payne for Wood)

In Ms. Wood's absence, the Executive Secretary reported that he has been interviewed by several media organizations regarding the Lake Powell vs. Glen Canyon Reservoir issue, and the proposal for Burroughs Creek in Kansas.

3.4 Executive Secretary's Report (Payne)

The Executive Secretary continues to receive e-mail correspondence regarding the Lake Powell vs. Glen Canyon Reservoir issue, with many in support of the change. However, no official organizations have indicated support for the change. Neither the Arizona Board on Geographic and Historic Names nor the Utah Board on Geographic Names has provided their official recommendations yet.

The DNC has still not received any communication from the Governor of Rhode Island regarding the proposal to rename the island of Rhode Island. The Executive Secretary asked for guidance from the members and indicated that one more attempt will be made. The staff also has not heard from the Congressmen and Senators that were contacted. There was discussion regarding the validity of the Colonial Laws of Rhode Island, that stipulated that the island shall be named Rhode Island "in perpetuity". It was suggested that if these laws were formally accepted by the United States Congress at the time Rhode Island became a State that these laws might be legally binding to the Federal government. The staff will make efforts to research this matter further.

There continues to be considerable opposition to the proposal to name a stream in the City of Lawrence, Kansas, Burroughs Creek. The Executive Secretary has spoken with two of the Douglas County Commissioners, one of whom has indicated he does not wish the County Commission to issue a formal statement on the matter. The DNC staff has found reference to the name Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Tributary on a Federally-approved source, so that name has been added to GNIS, and the proposal for Burroughs Creek is being processed as a name change.

The government of Currituck County, North Carolina continues to seek guidance from the DNC staff on the proposal that has been submitted to change the names and applications of various islands in the county. Although it is not possible for the DNC staff to visit the county in person, it has been suggested that a teleconference be established with the North Carolina and Virginia State Names Authorities, the City of Virginia Beach and Currituck County.

3.5 BGN Staff Report (Yost)

The following is a statistical report of the BGN/DNC staff activities since the December 12 meeting:

| | |
|-----|--|
| 0 | cases written |
| 47 | inquiries received and answered |
| 112 | letters written (answered and initiated) |
| 160 | e-mail messages |

The National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) is holding its 2004 Midyear Conference in Reston, Virginia, March 26-28, and it is suggested that the topic of geographic names might be of interest to the attendees. The DNC staff will pursue the possibility of this topic being added to the agenda.

3.6 GNIS and Data Compilation Program (Yost)

The DNC staff participated in a teleconference at USGS between the University of Alabama and the USGS Mapping Partnership Offices (MPO's) nationwide. The University was recently awarded a contract to compile geographic names data (primarily "administrative" or man-made features) for 46 of the 133 Urban Areas prioritized by the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency. It is imperative that there is communication and cooperation between the University and the MPO's, particularly where the MPO's have already acquired digital data for those urban areas. It was also suggested that the MPO's be made aware of the existence of the State Geographic Names Authorities, some of which are already involved in the GIS activities of their State. A recent example of this cooperation is the establishment of a partnership agreement between the West Virginia Office of

Geographic Information Systems, which is now submitting names to GNIS, and therefore to *The National Map* as well. It was noted that one of the sources used for compiling data under the new contract will be FEMA maps.

There are still four States awaiting Phase II data compilation, but this work will likely be delayed until the Urban Areas compilation program is completed.

A list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) has been posted at the GNIS website. The members were encouraged to visit the site and offer any comments or suggestions.

3.7 PPP Review: Conflicting Items Needing Resolution

There are still two items that need to be resolved before the Board's Principles, Policies, and Procedures (PPP) can be finalized and forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior for signature. Specifically, there is an apparent discrepancy in the pet/animal names policy as stated in the Commemorative Names Policy and under the section on Miscellaneous Policies. The Chairman suggested that the observations made by the Executive Secretary of the Missouri Board on Geographic Names were valid and should be considered. He agreed that there is a difference between "commemorative" naming for persons and animals, and suggested that the policy should not apply to pets/animals. After discussion, the members agreed they would continue to accept proposals to name features for pets and other animals and that each case would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The staff will prepare some wording to reflect this opinion and circulate it to the members for review and comment.

Similarly, there is a discrepancy between the Derogatory Names Policy and the Variant Names Policy regarding the possible publication of the word "Squaw" as a variant name on Federal maps. It was suggested that the policy might be reworded to indicate that in those cases where a name containing the word "Squaw" had been changed by the Board because it was determined to be derogatory, the variant name should not be published. However, because the word "Squaw" has not been added to the list of two names that are prohibited universally, this might still be confusing and inconsistent. The deputy member from the Forest Service asked whether the word "Squaw" should be determined to be derogatory and offered to draft new wording of the Derogatory Names Policy stating that the name should be recognized as being universally derogatory. This resulted in some discussion regarding the establishment of a universal replacement word for "Squaw". There has been some interest in applying the term "Indian Woman", although it is still understood that many Tribal groups would prefer to propose a name in their native language or that has significance in their culture. The staff will draft some wording in an effort to convey the results of these discussions and will distribute these to the members for review at the February meeting. It was asked that three versions be prepared: one stating the original wording; another outlining the results of the June 2003 policy review meeting; and a third summarizing the results of this meeting.

It was noted that the revision of the PPP should be an ongoing process; that is, it should be permissible for changes, additions, and editorial corrections to be proposed, evaluated, and applied at any time, not just at five-year intervals.

3.8 Issues of Joint Concern to the DNC and the Advisory Committee on Undersea Features (Palmer)

The Secretary of the Advisory Committee on Undersea Features (ACUF) restated the need for cooperation between the DNC and ACUF in cases where a geographic feature under consideration lies within an area of interest to both Committees. In reviewing the Undersea Features database, he has discovered entries for several features that should be under the purview of the DNC or under the purview of both Committees jointly. As an example, there are approximately 80 features that fall wholly or partially within the 12-mile nautical limit off the coast of California. After further review, only six of these still need to be resolved, with just one of real concern because the honoree of the name, which was approved by ACUF in 1990, is still living. For features that straddle the 12-mile line, the entry can and should appear in both the domestic and undersea features databases, and the

entries should be coordinated. It was noted that there are a few entries in the GNIS for which the feature type was recorded incorrectly; the ACUF staff will forward the details on these to the DNC staff for resolution. It was also noted that there are numerous entries for trans-boundary features which probably should be added to GNIS. An exception are those which are near Guantanamo Bay in Cuba; that area is only leased by the U.S. Government, and any geographic features which fall in leased areas are not under the purview of the DNC, and therefore are not listed in GNIS. The DNC Executive Secretary reaffirmed the need for increased communication between the DNC and ACUF, and thanked the Secretary of ACUF for attending this meeting to report his findings. He also reminded the members that for features that lie within the 12-mile limit but are beyond three miles of the coastline, the county and State governments are not consulted, as these features are outside State purview.

4. Docket Review

The staff noted that this Review List includes for the first time a link to the Topozone website showing the location of the feature. Several Committee members indicated this was a very helpful addition.

Staff-Processed New Names and Name and Application Changes agreed to by all interested parties.

Change Squaw Nipple to Deer Point, Montana (Docket 383)

This proposal, submitted by the Montana House Bill 412 Advisory Committee on behalf of a resident of Crow Agency, is to change a name believed to be derogatory. The proposed new name is the translation of *Uuxialattash*, the traditional Crow name for the feature (see Attachment A, #1). A motion was made and seconded to approve the change.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

Change Squaw Creek to Girl Creek, Montana (Docket 383)

This proposal, also submitted by the Montana House Bill 412 Advisory Committee on behalf of a resident of Crow Agency, is to change a name believed to be derogatory. The proposed new name is the translation of *Biakaataashkaatash*, the name traditionally used by the Crow Indians for this feature (see Attachment A, #2). A motion was made and seconded to approve the change.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

Change Squaw Buttes to Twin Peaks, Montana (Docket 383)

This proposal, also submitted by the Montana House Bill 412 Advisory Committee on behalf of a resident of Crow Agency, is to change a name believed to be derogatory. The proposed new name is the translation of *Attalúupkaate*, the traditional Crow Indian name for the feature (see Attachment A, #3). A motion was made and seconded to approve the change.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

Limber Lake, Alaska (Docket 382)

This new name was submitted by an individual who owns land adjacent to the lake. He reports that the proposed name was used by a surveyor working in the area in the early 1980's and believes it to be appropriate because of the "distinct curvature" of the lake (see Attachment B, #1). It was noted that the Alaska State Names Authority does not recommend approval of this name because there is not sufficient local use and because the proponent has not made an effort to solicit input from other area residents. Citing the support of the Borough's Planning Commission and the positive responses from other local authorities, a motion was made and seconded to approve the name.

Vote: 6 in favor
2 against
0 abstentions

The opposing votes were cast in the belief that although the rationale of the State Names Authority was flawed, the members chose not to vote against the recommendation of the State.

Puzzle Piece Lake, Alaska (Docket 382)

This proposal was submitted by resident of Colorado who owns property at the lake. She reports that the lake is shaped like a puzzle piece, and believes the feature needs to be named for reference purposes (see Attachment B, #2). Once again, it was noted that the State Names Authority does not recommend approval of this name because of an apparent lack of local usage and local support. Citing the responses of several local authorities, a motion was made and seconded to approve the name.

Vote: 6 in favor
2 against
0 abstentions

The opposing votes were cast because the members chose not to vote against the recommendation of the State.

Sea Horse Lake, Alaska (Docket 382)

This proposal was submitted by an individual who owns property at the lake. She suggests the shape of the lake resembles the head of a seahorse, and believes the feature needs to be named for reference purposes (see Attachment B, #3). Once again, it was noted that the State Names Authority does not recommend approval of this name because of an apparent lack of local usage and local support. Citing the responses of several local authorities, a motion was made and seconded to approve the name.

Vote: 6 in favor
2 against
0 abstentions

The opposing votes were cast because the members chose not vote to against the recommendation of the State.

Following the discussion of these three cases in Alaska, it was suggested that the DNC should reaffirm to the Alaska State Names Authority that its policy regarding the consideration of new names states that the name should be in local use *or* have local support. A new name, by its very nature, will likely not have any local usage yet.

Mount Orange Shasta, Idaho (Docket 383)

The proposal was submitted by an individual who reports that when he and his brother climbed the summit several years ago, they found near the peak an old Orange Shasta soda can (see Attachment B, #4). Citing the potential commercial implications of the name and the negative recommendations of the Idaho State Names Authority and the U.S. Forest Service, a motion was made and seconded not to approve the name.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

III. New Commemorative Names agreed to by all interested partiesCantrell Creek, Texas (Docket 379)

This new commemorative name, for an unnamed stream in Palo Pinto County, would honor James T. Cantrell (1870-1946), a businessman, teacher, and long-time resident of property along the stream (see Attachment C, #1). A motion was made and seconded to approve the new name.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

Connor Island, Vermont (Docket 384)

This name was submitted by The Nature Conservancy to name a small island located within Newark Pond for Byron Connor Roosa, the deceased infant son of a couple who established an endowment to preserve the area (see Attachment C, #2). A motion was made and seconded to approve the name.

Vote: 7 in favor
1 against
0 abstentions

The negative vote was cast in the belief that the intended honoree did not satisfy the requirements of the Commemorative Naming Policy.

IV. Revised Decisions – noneV. New Names agreed to by all interested partiesPacific Tarn, Colorado (Docket 382)

This new name, submitted by a resident of Boulder, would apply a new name to a glacial lake that is believed to be the highest lake in the United States (see Attachment D, #1). A motion was made and seconded to approve the name.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

5. Closing

5.1 The next meeting of the Domestic Names Committee will be held Thursday, February 12, 2003, at 9:30 a.m., at the Department of the Interior, Room 3004.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

(signed Roger L. Payne)

Roger L. Payne, Executive Secretary

APPROVED

Chick Fagan, Chairman
Domestic Names Committee

ATTACHMENT A

U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES
DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE
DOCKET REVIEW LIST
January 2004

I. Staff-Processed New Names, and Name and Application Changes agreed to by all interested parties

#1 Change **Squaw Nipple** to **Deer Point**, Montana
(Docket 383)

<<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=12&n=5095698.73536713%20&e=708796.767492973&u=6&datum=nad83>>

A resident of the community of Crow Agency, who believes the name Squaw Nipple is derogatory, submitted this proposal to Montana's House Bill 412 "Squaw Name Change" Advisory Committee. The proposed new name for the 1,005 m (3,297 ft) summit is Deer Point. The proponent, who describes herself as "an Apsáalooke (Crow Indian) woman and educator" at Little Big Horn College, reports that Deer Point is the English translation of *Uuxialattash*, the traditional Apsáalooke name for the feature. The name Squaw Nipple first appeared on U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps in 1956. The summit is located approximately 9.2 km (5.7 mi) north of Huntley and 1.5 km (0.9 mi) north of Razor Creek, in Yellowstone County. There are no other features in the state that are known to be named Deer Point.

The Legislative Branch of the Crow Tribe of Montana, which is Federally-recognized, has stated that it "strongly supports" the change to Deer Point, and the Yellowstone County Commissioners also "fully support" the change. The Montana Board on Geographic Names, after receiving a letter of support from the State's Department of Natural Resources and Conservation Trust Land Management Division and a letter of no objection from its Water Resources Division, wrote a letter in support of the proposal. A letter seeking input was sent to the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council, which is also Federally-recognized, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. The Montana HB 412 Committee supports this proposal.

#2 Change **Squaw Creek** to **Girl Creek**, Montana
(Docket 383)

<<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=12&n=5083620.5238311%20&e=709826.801601502&u=6&datum=nad83>>

This is the second proposal submitted to the Montana HB 412 Advisory Committee by a member of the Crow Tribe, to change a name considered to be derogatory. The 11 km (6.8 mi) long stream that is named currently Squaw Creek flows northwest through Yellowstone County into Pryor Creek; the mouth of the stream lies approximately 2.4 km (1.5 mi) southeast of the community of Huntley. The proposed name, Girl Creek, is the translation of *Biakaataashkaatash*, the name traditionally used by the Apsáalooke (Crow Indians) for this feature. The name Squaw Creek first appeared on U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps in 1967, and was also applied to the 1973 Yellowstone County highway map.

The Commissioners of Yellowstone County recommend approval of the proposed change. No other geographic features in the County include the word “Girl” in their names. The Legislative Branch of the Crow Tribe of Montana, which is Federally-recognized, has stated that it “strongly supports” the change to Girl Creek, and the Montana Board on Geographic Names also wrote a letter in support of the proposal. A letter seeking input was sent to the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council, which is also Federally-recognized, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. The Montana HB 412 Committee supports this proposal.

#3 Change Squaw Buttes to Twin Peaks, Montana
(Docket 383)

<[http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=13&n=5038707.49394539%20&e=267174.574968542&u=6&d
atum=nad83](http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=13&n=5038707.49394539%20&e=267174.574968542&u=6&datum=nad83)>

This proposal was also submitted by the Montana HB 412 Advisory Committee, on behalf of the Crow Tribe, to change a name considered to be derogatory. The proposed name, Twin Peaks, is reportedly the translation of *Attalúupkaate*, the traditional Apsáalooke (Crow Indian) name for the feature. The 1,079 m (3,539 ft) summit is located approximately 8.4 km (5.2 mi) northwest of the community of Camp Four. The name Squaw Buttes first appeared on U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps in 1969.

The Big Horn County government has recommended approval of the change to Twin Peaks. The Legislative Branch of the Crow Tribe of Montana, which is Federally-recognized, has stated that it “strongly supports” the change to Twin Peaks, and the Montana Board on Geographic Names also wrote a letter in support of the proposal. A letter seeking input was sent to the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council, which is also Federally-recognized, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. There are five features named Twin Peaks in Montana, but none are in Big Horn County. The Montana HB 412 Committee supports this proposal.

ATTACHMENT B

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names**#1 Limber Lake, Alaska
(Docket 382)**

<<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=5&n=6928228.000768&e=623905.000072826&u=2>>

An individual who owns land adjacent to this 10-acre lake in the Safari Lake subdivision proposed this name. He has discovered that a surveyor working in the area in the early 1980's referred to the feature as Limber Lake, which he believes to be an appropriate name due to the "distinct curvature" of the lake. The lake is located 11 km (7 mi) southeast of the community of Petersville and 1.3 km (0.8 mi) northwest of Safari Lake. The Matanuska-Susitna Borough Planning Commission passed a resolution in support of the name, but other local organizations, including various native groups and the Talkeetna Historical Society, did not respond to the Alaska Historical Commission's request for input. The Historical Commission, which serves as the State Names Authority, then rejected the proposal based on their "guidelines regarding local usage and said the proposal did not show that others supported the proposed name". The DNC staff sent follow-up letters to the Knik Tribe and the Chickaloon Native Village, both of which are Federally-recognized, but again, no response was received which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion. No other features in Alaska are known to apply the name "Limber".

**#2 Puzzle Piece Lake, Alaska
(Docket 382)**

<<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=62.3588888888889&lon=-146.3644444444444&u=2>>

This proposal was submitted by resident of Colorado, who owns property on the lake in question. She reports that the 1 km (1.6 mi) long lake is shaped like a puzzle piece, and suggests that the feature needs to be named for reference purposes. The lake lies within the Valdez-Cordova Census Area, approximately 6.4 km (4 mi) northeast of Lake Louise, and 60 km (37 mi) northwest of Glennallen. The Alaska Historical Commission, which serves as the State Names Authority, contacted several local and regional entities for comment, including the following native groups: the Gakona Village Council, the Gulkana Village, and the Native Village of Tazlina (all Federally-recognized), as well as the Ahtna Regional Corporation. The Historical Commission indicated that if no response was received, it would be presumed that there was no opinion. The Lake Louise Community Non-Profit Corporation indicated it had no objection to the name. The Greater Copper Valley Chamber of Commerce stated the name was "fine", and the Copper Valley Community Library Association stated it would be beneficial to have "defined locations" for back-country travelers to orient themselves in this heavily used area and "this name would fill that purpose". However, the State Names Authority did not recommend approval of the proposal, citing a lack of evidence that the name meets its guidelines for local usage. The DNC staff subsequently contacted the Native Village of Chistochina and the Native Village of Kluti-Kaah, both of which are Federally-recognized, but no response was received. No other features in Alaska are known to be named "Puzzle Piece", although there are two streams and a valley elsewhere in the State named "Puzzle".

#3

Sea Horse Lake, Alaska

(Docket 382)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=62.3705555555556&lon=-146.379166666667&u=2>

A resident of Eagle River, who owns property on this lake, submitted this proposal for Sea Horse Lake. She suggests that the shape of the lake resembles the head of a seahorse (even including an island where the seahorse's eye would be), and that it needs to be named for reference purposes. The lake, which is approximately 1.3 km (0.8 mi) by 1.3 km (0.8 mi) in size, lies 6.4 km (4 mi) northeast of Lake Louise and 60 km (37 mi) northwest of the community of Glennallen, in the Valdez-Cordova Census Area. According to the proponent, the proposed name has come into recent local usage. The only other feature in Alaska applying a similar name is the Seahorse Islands, which are located over 1,000 km (600 mi) to the northeast, in North Slope Borough. The Alaska State Names Authority solicited input from various local authorities; although letters indicating no objection were received from the Greater Copper Valley Chamber of Commerce, the Copper Valley Community Library Association, and the Lake Louise Non-Profit Corporation (a native group), the State Board rejected the proposal, suggesting "the proposal did not meet their guidelines for local usage". The DNC staff subsequently contacted the Native Village of Chistochina and the Native Village of Kluti-Kaah, both of which are Federally-recognized, but no response was received.

#4

Mount Orange Shasta, Idaho

(Challis National Forest)

(Docket 383)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=44.1144444444444&lon=-113.6697222222222&u=2>

This proposal is to name an unnamed summit in east-central Custer County, Mount Orange Shasta. The summit has an elevation of 3,614 m (11,857 ft), and lies within Challis National Forest, in the Lost River Range. The proponent, a resident of Idaho Falls, reports that when he and his brother climbed the summit several years ago, they found near the peak an old Orange Shasta soda can. As a result, they have referred to it informally since then as "Orange Shasta" and are asking the Board to make official the name for Federal use.

Letters were sent to the Commissioners of Custer County, as well as to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation of Idaho and the Northwestern Band of the Shoshoni Nation, both of which are Federally-recognized, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. Letters were also sent to Shasta Beverages, Incorporated, and to the National Beverage Corporation, advising them of the proposal and asking whether there would be any concerns regarding the use of a trademarked name, but no response was received. The USDA Forest Service and the Idaho Geographic Names Advisory Council have both indicated they are not in support of the name.

ATTACHMENT C

III. New Commemorative Names agreed to by all interested parties

#1

Cantrell Creek, Texas

(Docket 379)

<<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=32.6180555555556&lon=-98.1980555555556&u=2>>

This new commemorative name was proposed by a resident of the community of Mineral Wells, for an unnamed 8 km (5 mi) long tributary of Palo Pinto Creek in southeastern Palo Pinto County. The proposed name would honor the proponent's grandfather, James Thomas Cantrell, who was born in 1870 in Georgia and who migrated to Texas in 1892. Mr. Cantrell was first employed as a foreman on the Texas & Pacific Railroad, but later he taught school and then opened a general store in Santo, which is still in operation today. As the business prospered, he acquired 2,000 acres of land and began ranching. The Cantrell ranch was located at the head of the stream now proposed to be named in his honor. Mr. Cantrell also served on the local school board and was president of a local bank, and during the Depression when men could not find employment, he hired many to construct stock ponds on his ranch. Mr. Cantrell died in 1946. The County Commissioners of Palo Pinto County have indicated that they are in support of naming the stream for James Cantrell, and the Texas Board on Geographic Names recommends approval of the proposal. A copy of the proposal was sent to the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, the Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, the Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, and the Comanche Nation, all of which are Federally-recognized, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion. There are currently four other geographic features in Texas named "Cantrell", the closest being Cantrell Slough, located approximately 127 km (80 mi) east-northeast, in Denton County.

#2

Connor Island, Vermont

(Docket 384)

<<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=44.7166666666667&lon=-71.985&u=2>>

This new commemorative name proposal was submitted by the Vermont State Names Authority on behalf of The Nature Conservancy of Vermont. The proposed name would honor Byron Conner Roosa (August 1990-December 1990), and would apply to a 200-foot long island in The Nature Conservancy's Newark Pond Natural Area, in Caledonia County. The infant's ashes were spread on the island, and the family established an endowment for the preserve in their son's name. The preserve was acquired to protect a historic loon nesting area. Letters of support for the name were submitted by the Vermont Board of Libraries, which serves as the State Names Authority, as well as the governments of the Town of Newark and Caledonia County, and the Roosa family. No other geographic features in Vermont or in neighboring counties in New Hampshire are known to apply the name "Connor".

IV. Revised Decisions – none.

ATTACHMENT D

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

#1

Pacific Tarn, Colorado
(Arapaho National Forest)
(Docket 382)

<<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=39.41944444444444&lon=-106.11944444444444&u=2>>

This new name, proposed by a resident of Boulder, would apply to a glacial lake that the proponent believes to be the highest lake in the United States. The lake lies at an elevation of 4,090 m (13,420 ft), within the Tenmile Range, and 0.5 km (0.3 mi) to the southeast of Pacific Peak, hence the choice of name. The proponent first visited the lake in 1993, and since then has been attempting to verify his claim that it is the highest lake in the U.S. According to GNIS, the *named* lake having the highest elevation currently is Lake Waiau in Hawaii, at 3,969 m (13,020 ft). Letters of support for this proposal were received from the governments of the Town of Breckenridge and Summit County. The Colorado Board on Geographic Names and the USDA Forest Service also recommend approval of this name. Copies of the proposal were sent to the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation and the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, both of which are Federally-recognized, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.