

**U.S. Board on Geographic Names  
Domestic Names Committee**

Six Hundred Ninety-fourth Meeting  
Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., Room 2642  
December 13, 2007 – 9:30 a.m.

Members and Deputy Members in Attendance

Chick Fagan	Department of the Interior (National Park Service)
Michael Fournier	Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census)
Bonnie Gallahan	Department of the Interior (U.S. Geological Survey)
Tony Gilbert	Government Printing Office
Susan Hawes	U.S. Postal Service
Robert Hiatt	Library of Congress
Elizabeth Kanalley	Department of Agriculture (Forest Service)
William Logan	Department of Homeland Security (U.S. Coast Guard)
Curtis Loy	Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey) (Chair)
Douglas Vandegraft	Department of the Interior (Fish and Wildlife Service)
Meredith Westington	Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey)

Ex-Officio

Lou Yost, Executive Secretary, U.S. Board on Geographic Names/Domestic Names Committee

Staff

Jennifer Runyon, U.S. Geological Survey

Guests

Douglas Caldwell	Department of Defense (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
Rebecca Diaz-Cartagena	Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census)

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 9:30 a.m.

2. Minutes of the 693<sup>rd</sup> Meeting

The minutes of the November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved pending two corrections. Logan noted that he was not in attendance at the meeting. The phrase “that data” in the second sentence of 3.3 should read “those data.”

3. Communications and Reports

3.1 Chairman’s Report (Kanalley)

Kanalley reported that the BGN's revised bylaws, which were approved at the October full BGN meeting, were forwarded to the DNC members. The bylaws are now awaiting the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

A sign-up sheet, asking for volunteers to staff the BGN booth at the upcoming ESRI Federal User Conference, has been distributed by e-mail. Some individuals have signed up but more are needed. It has been suggested that the Foreign Names Committee (FNC) might be willing to staff the booth during the DNC meeting, if the DNC is able to schedule its February meeting to coincide with the conference. The BGN staff also needs to finalize the display panels. Leo Dillon of the FNC has provided the Secretariat with a draft copy of a new BGN brochure and has requested that comments be sent to him as soon as possible. Kanalley will forward a copy by e-mail to the DNC members. It was also noted that Westington has prepared a draft abstract for the BGN panel discussion at the ESRI-FUC. The members thanked Westington for her efforts.

### 3.2 BGN Executive Secretary's Report (Yost)

The membership reappointment letters for the 2007-2009 term have been finalized and have left the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, and so members and deputies should be alert to them arriving in their agencies shortly. The Committee was reminded that since the letters are still pending, the current appointments will continue.

Representatives of the DNC and FNC are scheduled to meet with the British Permanent Committee on Geographical Names (PCGN) in London in late April/early May. Two members of the PCGN were in Washington in late November to continue the ongoing review of the Afghan names policy.

### 3.3 Executive Secretary's Report (Yost)

Yost reported that he had received a telephone inquiry from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science at the Department of the Interior regarding an inquiry that office had received from an Idaho Congressman on the issue of naming geographic features for individuals. The Congressman was advised to pursue the efforts through the BGN's established procedures.

On December 10<sup>th</sup>, Yost and Dwight Hughes of the USGS Geographic Names Office met with representatives of the FNC and the Federal Geographic Data Committee to discuss the need for a common front end for the GNIS and GNS websites. It is clear that developing a consistent cross-reference table for the two committees' different feature classes will be a major challenge.

### 3.4 Staff Report (Runyon)

Staff asked whether the February and March DNC meetings should be combined due to the lateness of the February meeting at the ESRI Conference. A motion was made and seconded to

cancel the regular February and March meetings, and to combine all issues for the two months into the meeting at ESRI.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

A letter has been received announcing that the proposal to name an unnamed summit in Colorado Galaxy Peak is withdrawn. The proponent expressed frustration that the name seemed to have very little chance of approval.

As was reported at the last meeting, Runyon informed the Committee that a proposal has been submitted to change officially the name of Mount Rainier in Washington to Mount Tacoma. In view of the fact that the DNC has been asked on at least two previous occasions to change the existing name and both attempts were unsuccessful, the staff has asked whether the case should be processed. The National Park Service has determined that the management of Mount Rainier National Park has not received any objections to the current name and has asked that the proposal not be processed until such time as the proponent develops a stronger case. The Washington Board on Geographic Names has also spoken with the proponent, advising him that they would prefer to see more evidence of support for the change before considering the case. The proponent has indicated he will work toward building a stronger proposal. Staff reminded the Committee that once a proposal is added to the Quarterly Review List, there is an obligation to bring it forward for a vote, unless it is withdrawn by the proponent. Citing the recommendations of the NPS and the State, the DNC members agreed no action should be taken at this time, but that they might be willing to review the case in the future.

Yost announced that he had received an inquiry from a reporter regarding the current application of the names Kit Carson Mountain and Crestone Peak in Colorado, specifically that the application of the two names does not reflect current usage and should be reversed. The reporter suggested that the BGN might be receiving a proposal in the near future.

### 3.5 GNIS and Data Compilation Program (Yost)

The four year “46 Key Cities” contract has ended, resulting in 75,000 new names being entered into GNIS.

Yost reported that the GNIS staff continues to address the issue of abbreviations for such words as Mount, Saint, etc. The database query tool needs to be able to find a name whether it is abbreviated or spelled out. Hawes offered to provide a copy of the Postal Service’s list of official abbreviations.

### 3.6 Daley Lake vs. Winema Lake, Oregon

In May 2005, the DNC rejected a proposal to change officially the name of Daley Lake to Winema Lake for a lake in Tillamook County, Oregon. Although the proposal had the support of the County government and the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB), the DNC

members voted 8-6 not to eliminate a long-standing name that is presumed to be commemorative. The members once again reviewed the evidence, including new letters provided by the proponent and the OGNB, and suggested there seemed to be a stronger argument for the change than last time. It was noted that there was evidence that the proposed name had been used locally since the 1940's and therefore it was not truly a new name. A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal.

Vote: 7 in favor  
3 against  
0 abstentions

The negative votes were cast in the belief that there was still no compelling reason to eliminate a commemorative and historical name. The members also asked that the OGNB contact the proponent to suggest that a proposal be submitted to change Daley Lake Creek to Winema Lake Creek or Winema Creek.

#### 4. Docket Review (Runyon)

Please refer to the attached Docket for a description of each proposal. For new names approved at this meeting, the newly-assigned GNIS Feature ID Number (FID) has been noted following the name.

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

Change Williamstown (FID 463065) to Frytown, Iowa (Review List 394)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this name change.

Vote: 9 in favor  
1 against  
0 abstentions

The negative vote was cast in the belief that it was not appropriate to eliminate a long-standing published name that is presumed to be commemorative.

Change Squaw Creek (FID 1127477) to Mulak Creek; West Branch Squaw Creek (FID 1128812) to West Branch Mulak Creek, Oregon (Review List 396)

A motion was made and seconded to approve these name changes.

Vote: 10 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

Change **Squaw Lakes** (FID 1150281) to **Tumala Lakes**; **Squaw Meadow** (FID 1150284) to **Tumala Meadow**; and **Squaw Mountain** (FID 1150290) to **Tumala Mountain**, Oregon (Mount Hood National Forest) (Review List 396)

A motion was made and seconded to approve these name changes, along with the proposal to change **Squaw Creek** (FID 1150242) (BGN 1958) to **Tumala Creek**, listed under Category IV.

Vote: 10 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

Change **Surrey Mountain** (FID 1348108) to **Sirls Mountain**, Texas (Review List 394)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this name change.

Vote: 10 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

Change **Grundy Canyon** (FID 1565927) to **Gundys Canyon**, Wisconsin (Review List 375)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this name change.

Vote: 10 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

## **II. Disagreement on Docketed Names**

**Rejection Point**, Colorado (San Isabel National Forest) (Review List 394)

A motion was made and seconded not to approve this proposal, citing the negative recommendations of the U.S. Forest Service and the Colorado Board on Geographic Names.

Vote: 9 in favor  
1 against  
0 abstentions

The negative vote was cast in the belief that the name would be an appropriate reference for the feature.

**Rainwater Mountain**, Montana (Flathead National Forest/Glacier National Park) (Review List 389)

A motion was made and seconded to defer a decision on this proposal, citing some confusion regarding the location of the summit relative to a feature known locally as “Strawberry Mountain” as well as the issue of whether or not the summit was or was not in a Wilderness. Fagan offered to clarify the feature’s location with the staff at Glacier National Park, while Kanalley stated that she would investigate the Wilderness issue.

Vote: 10 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

At this point, Gallahan left the meeting.

### **III. New Commemorative Names and Changes agreed to by all interested parties**

#### **McDaniel Creek, Oregon (Review List 396)**

A motion was made and seconded to approve this new name.

Vote: 8 in favor  
1 against  
0 abstentions

The negative vote was cast in the belief that the proposal could be construed to honor a living person, as the proponent’s surname is McDaniel and the property is still owned by the McDaniel family.

#### **Lake Eleanor, Washington (Review List 392)**

A motion was made and seconded to approve this new name.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

### **IV. Revised Decisions**

Change **Boulder Island** (FID 1246937) (BGN 1986) to **Bowles Island**, South Carolina (Review List 394)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this name change.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

**V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties**

**Shadow Mountain**, Arizona (Review List 396)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this new name.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

**Little Bear Creek**, Michigan (Manistee National Forest) (Review List 392)

A motion was made and seconded to defer a vote on this proposal, citing the need to solicit comments from the U.S. Forest Service.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

**Spring Lake**, Washington (Review List 392)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this new name.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

5. Location and Time of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Domestic Names Committee will be held January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 at the Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., in Room 7000B.

(signed) *Louis A. Yost*

---

Louis A. Yost, Executive Secretary

APPROVED  
(signed) *Curtis Loy*

---

Curtis Loy, Chairman  
Domestic Names Committee

**U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES  
DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE  
DOCKET  
December 2007**

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

Change Williamstown (FID 463065) to Frytown, Iowa  
(Review List 394)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=41.57001&lon=-91.73239&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

This proposal is to change officially the name of Williamstown, a small unincorporated community in Johnson County, 16 km (10 mi) southwest of Iowa City, to Frytown. The existing name has appeared on Federal maps since 1938 and is also shown on the official Johnson County highway map; however, the proponent, a resident of Cedar Rapids, reports that the community has long been known locally as Frytown.

An online search shows numerous references to both names, although virtually all occurrences of Williamstown originate from the GNIS listing. Examples of those that refer to the community as Frytown include a description of historical stagecoach trails in Iowa, and a volume entitled *Frytown, Iowa 1854-1984, the First 130 years* (Kinsinger, 1984). The Johnson County Conservation Board manages the Frytown Conservation Area, while the Johnson County Planning and Zoning Department includes a map of Frytown in a recent zoning report (although within the text of the same report, the community is listed as “Williamstown (Frytown)”). The same office, in a 2002 planning report, refers to the creation of a master plan for Frytown. The website of a local farm electric cooperative refers to its location as Frytown, and another site lists an auto show to be held in Frytown. An online genealogy of the Fry family includes a reference to Jacob Fry, a native of Virginia who moved to Iowa in 1839 and who “died in 1842 in Frytown”; Mr. Fry is buried in Frytown Cemetery. A list of Johnson County placenames found on the Iowa GenWeb site includes “Frytown: Another name for Williamstown, located in Section 11, Washington Township. It was called Frytown because the elder Mr. Fry and his large family of sons settled near there.”

There is further evidence that the community might also have had other names in the past. The name Frank Pierce was labeled in the approximate vicinity of present-day Williamstown on G.W & C.B. Colton’s 1862 Map of Iowa, and was also shown as an alternate name for Frytown on the aforementioned stagecoach trail map. The volume *Abandoned Towns, Villages and Post Offices of Iowa* (Mott, 1973) includes an entry for Williamstown, noting “Another name by which was known the hamlet of Frank Pierce. Williamstown was platted as a village in 1854.” Yet another volume, *From Ackley to Zwingle: The Origins of Iowa Place Names* (Dilts, 1993), includes entries for both Frytown and Williamstown. The first reads, “John, Jacob, William and T.R. Fry came to Washington Township when it was first settled in 1839. The name is linked with this family of pioneers,” while the second says, “Williamstown was



first called Forest City. It was later named after William Grant, who applied for the post office.”

According to GNIS, the aforementioned Frytown Cemetery is the only other feature in Johnson County named “Fry.” There is one other community in the State, in Chickasaw County, named Williamstown, as well as two others named Williamson and Williamsburg, and two more both named simply Williams. Williamsburg is located in Iowa County and lies just 24 km (15 mi) from the community in question.

The Johnson County Board of Commissioners conducted a public hearing to discuss the proposed name change. Several longtime residents reported that they had always known the community to be named Frytown, with one representative of the Johnson County Historical Society noting she “would not have recognized the name Williamstown.” A newcomer to the community commented that when she first arrived in the area, “people had difficulty finding her house because Frytown was not on the map.” The County’s Planning and Zoning Director noted that his department was working on “a master plan for the village of Frytown,” and that “the County road map says Frytown.” The Chairman of the County Commissioners, in recommending approval of the proposal, added “No one expressed opposition to the change and much more history came to light through the conversations and meetings.”

The Iowa State Geographic Names Authority has no objection to the change, but notes that he would defer to local opinion. A copy of this proposal was forwarded to the following Federally-recognized Tribes for comment: the Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska; the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma; the Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri; the Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma; and the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

Change Squaw Creek (FID 1127477) to Mulak Creek; West Branch Squaw Creek (FID 1128812) to West Branch Mulak Creek, Oregon  
(Review List 396)

Squaw Creek:

Mouth: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.95298&lon=-123.4357&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

Source: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.97961&lon=-123.46386&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

West Branch Squaw Creek:

Mouth: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.95298&lon=-123.4357&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

Source: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.97961&lon=-123.46386&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

These proposals were submitted by the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB) on behalf of the Oregon Department of Forestry, to change officially the names of two streams that flow through Clatsop State Forest in Clatsop County. The proponents believe the names Squaw

Creek and West Branch Squaw Creek are derogatory and should be changed. The proposed replacement word “Mulak” is reported to be the Chinook word for elk.

The Clatsop County Commissioners, the Clatsop County Historical Society, and the OGNB are all in support of the change from Squaw Creek to Mulak Creek and West Branch Squaw Creek to West Branch Mulak Creek. The Chinook Indian Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community also support the proposal. There are no other geographic features in Oregon known to be named “Mulak.”

Change **Squaw Lakes** (FID 1150281) to **Tumala Lakes**; **Squaw Meadow** (FID 1150284) to **Tumala Meadow**; and **Squaw Mountain** (FID 1150290) to **Tumala Mountain**, Oregon  
(Mount Hood National Forest)  
(Review List 396)

Squaw Lakes: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.22467&lon=-122.02275&size=l&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG25>

Squaw Meadow: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.22262&lon=-122.02258&datum=nad83&u=5&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

Squaw Mountain: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.23037&lon=-122.04102&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

These proposed changes comprise three of four requests submitted by the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB) on behalf of Cultural Resources Department of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community, to change officially the names of four geographic features in Clackamas County that currently contain the word “Squaw” (the fourth change is for Squaw Creek, a name approved by the BGN in 1958, so it is listed under category IV below). The features also lie within Mount Hood National Forest. The OGNB, acting in response to the Oregon Legislature’s effort to rename features throughout the State that are named “Squaw”, suggested the word “Tumala” might be appropriate and the Grand Ronde Tribes agreed. The replacement name is reported to be from Chinook Wawa (also known as Chinook Jargon), and means “tomorrow” or “after life.” The proponents also report that a song entitled “Tumala, Tumala” is commonly sung by many of the Tribes along the Columbia River.

The Clackamas County Commissioners are in support of the proposed change from Squaw Creek to Tumala Creek, while the Clackamas County Historical Society has no objection. The OGNB and the U.S. Forest Service support the change.

As part of its research, the OGNB also contacted the following Federally-recognized Tribes: the Burns Paiute Tribe; the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians; the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Coquille Indian Tribe; the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians; the Fort McDermitt Shoshone-Paiute Indians; and the Klamath Tribes. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

Change **Surrey Mountain** (FID 1348108) to **Sirls Mountain**, Texas  
(Review List 394)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=31.91545&lon=-94.79799&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

This proposal would change officially the name of Surrey Mountain, a 190 m (622 ft) summit in south-central Rusk County, to Sirls Mountain. It was submitted by a former resident of the area who now volunteers for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Map Corps program. In researching the history of a small cemetery known locally as the Sirls Family Cemetery, he noticed what he believes to be an error on the topographic map. The name Surrey Mountain has appeared on USGS maps since 1943, but there is no evidence that there has ever been a family named Surrey in the area. The USGS field notes stated only that the name was found to be in local use when the map was compiled, but the proponent believes the fieldman simply misunderstood the local pronunciation. His research has determined that the summit lies on property acquired in the late 1800's by Abraham and Amanda Sirls; descendants of the Sirls family still reside in Rusk County today. All online references to the name Surrey Mountain appear to originate from the entry in GNIS.

According to an article published in the local newspaper, one of the Rusk County Commissioners stated he knew "several families in the area surnamed Sirls and had always thought the area was named for the original Sirls families who moved to the area in the 1800s." The article added, "The name change is not expected to meet with any local resistance, as most of the people contacted by [the commissioner] already know the area as Sirls Mountain." The assistant appraiser for Rusk County, who lives in the vicinity of the summit, provided a copy of the Sirls family genealogy and a "hand drawn ownership map" showing that the Sirls family owned property in the area; when asked for the name of the summit, he said he believed it was Sirls Mountain.

Citing the widespread support for the change, the Rusk County Commissioners voted to recommend approval of the proposal. The Texas State Names Authority also supports the proposal, stating, "Local usage is a legitimate reason for the change." There are no Federally-recognized Tribes within fifty miles of the feature.

Change **Grundy Canyon** (FID 1565927) to **Gundys Canyon**, Wisconsin  
(Review List 375)

Mouth: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.48746&lon=-91.53155&datum=nad83&u=5&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

Source: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.49063&lon=-91.52598&size=l&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG>

This proposal was submitted by a resident of Arena, to change the name of a valley from Grundy Canyon to Gundys Canyon in an effort to recognize local use. The feature in question is 0.8 km (0.5 mi) long and is located in the Blue Hills of Rusk County. According to the proponent, the valley was named Gundys Canyon for Carl Gunderson, who owned land adjacent to the feature, and who led horse-drawn hay rides and sleigh rides through the area. The feature is referred to as Gundy's Canyon [sic] in the volume *Wisconsin Through 5 Billion*

*Years of Change* (Crowns, 1976), but has been labeled Grundy Canyon on U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps since 1978. It is also referred to as Grundy Canyon on a website of a Geology Professor at the University of Wisconsin at River Falls. The field notes compiled in 1976 for the USGS topographic maps indicated that the field investigator confirmed the spelling of Grundy Canyon with four long-term residents, and that there was also a sign on which the name appeared; however, it has been suggested that the "r" may have been inadvertently added to the name in the field notes.

The Town of Wilkinson Board of Supervisors and the Rusk County Board of Supervisors have both submitted letters in support of the proposed change and the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council recommends approval as well. A copy of the proposal was forwarded to the following Federally-recognized Tribes for comment: the Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, the Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin, the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, the Lower Sioux Indian Community, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation, Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, the Santee Sioux Nation, the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community of Minnesota, the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate of the Lake Traverse Reservation, the Upper Sioux Community of Minnesota, and the Yankton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota. Of these, the Keweenaw Bay Community responded that they did not have an opinion on the issue, while the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate stated they supported the proposed change. The lack of response from the other Tribes is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

## **II. Disagreement on Docketed Names**

**Rejection Point**, Colorado  
(San Isabel National Forest)  
(Review List 394)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=38.78385&lon=-106.36247&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

This proposal is to apply the new name Rejection Point to an unnamed 3,974 m (13,038 ft) summit located at the west end of Gladstone Ridge, in the San Isabel National Forest in Chaffee County. The proposal was submitted by a resident of Nederland, who believes the name would be an appropriate way to honor “all people who shunned or were shunned by the Ivy League and those who chose a less conventional and more adventurous path in life.” This somewhat remote summit receives far fewer visitors than the more well-known named peaks, and she adds, “The world is filled with people who all do the same thing, go the places people tell them, and never set off on their own path. That is the way it’s always seemed to me in terms of Colorado’s 14-thousand-foot peaks. Because they’re 14ers, or “Ivy League” mountains, everyone flocks to them, leaving all the lesser but no less beautiful mountains unvisited.”

According to the proponent, this proposal has the support of the owner of a local outdoors store, who also serves as the chair of the Chaffee County Visitors Bureau. When asked for comments, the Chaffee County Commissioners responded that they were also in support of the name. However, both the Colorado Board on Geographic Names and the U.S. Forest Service

are opposed to the proposal. The State Board stated, “All present [at the meeting] discussed the merits of the proposal. [A motion was made and seconded], and voted for unanimously to not endorse the proposal for the following reasons: 1) the feature does not need a name; 2) the word “rejection” has no overwhelming relationship to the feature, only an obtuse association/relationship; 3) by attracting attention to the feature by naming the feature, there will be an increase in usage of trails leading to the peak thus taking away from the now current natural beauty.” The Forest Service cited a lack of local support and a lack of need to name the feature. A copy of this proposal was sent to the Northern Cheyenne Tribe and the Northern Arapaho Tribe, both of which are Federally-recognized, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. According to GNIS, there are no other geographic features in Colorado known to be named “Rejection Point.”

A BGN decision on this proposal was deferred at the November 2007 meeting, citing a need for clarification of the State Board and Forest Service’s reasons for recommending disapproval. Further correspondence from the State Board suggested, “1) the name is frivolous; 2) the particular event in the person in question’s life may have been important for that person, but neither the person herself, nor the particular event, are in any way associated with the location in question. The person was not rejected at this particular point, nor is the person notable in any way in the local area or otherwise associated with this particular feature; 3) the proposal is not based on any particular person, or any particular event, in fact, but on the “general concept” of being rejected - a shared communal experience. Vague, shared communal experiences seem like very iffy bases for naming specific geographical features, unless the experience is intimately associated with the specific place in question (as in “lover's leap” or “inspiration point”); 4) this proposal invites random, unknown individuals to begin proposing “joke names” for all kinds of random places on the landscape, in relation only to the names of nearby places.... There’s no end to where this might lead, in principle.”

**Rainwater Mountain**, Montana  
(Flathead National Forest/Glacier National Park)  
(Review List 389)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=12&n=5372247.00038029&e=283112.999679827&u=2>

This proposal is to make official the name Rainwater Mountain for an unnamed summit in central Flathead County. The summit has an elevation of 2,088 m (6,850 ft), and lies along the boundary between Flathead National Forest and Glacier National Park, at the northwest end of the Flathead Range, and approximately 4 km (2.5 mi) southeast of the community of West Glacier. According to the proponent, whose family has lived in West Glacier for almost 100 years, many longtime area residents refer to the summit as Rainwater Mountain because two generations of a family named Rainwater lived at its base until approximately 50 years ago. She adds that more recent residents and visitors sometimes call the summit Strawberry Mountain “because of its shape,” but as the proponent points out, there is another summit with that name just 29 km (18 mi) to the south and also within Flathead County. She suggests the summit needs an official name because it is a prominent landmark in the scenic corridor to West Glacier, and to have it named officially Rainwater Mountain would eliminate the confusion caused by having two “unofficial” names.

The proponent was asked to provide letters of support for the proposal, which resulted in the receipt of four letters from local organizations; the Flathead County Sheriff and the Coram-West Glacier Volunteer Fire Department both stated they were in support of efforts to eliminate a duplicate Strawberry Mountain but neither mentioned the proposed name. The Glacier Outdoor Center and a local trading post/restaurant also submitted letters of support for giving the summit an official name, but again, no specific name was mentioned. A follow up letter to the proponent, copied to each of these organizations, asked for further clarification but no response was received.

A book on Glacier National Park place names states: “Strawberry Mountain: This elongated mountain or ridge looms over Belton/West Glacier just outside Glacier National Park but at the main entrance. However, the name seems to have been applied locally by mistake. The mountain used to be called Rainwater Mountain after a family from Wisconsin who once lived near its base, whereas Strawberry is actually a little butte that squats snugly between Rainwater and Desert Mountains. Clearly seen from the highway...this little mountain does indeed resemble a strawberry.”

The Flathead County Commissioners provided a letter expressing opposition to the proposal. The County stated “We concur with the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service that there is no evidence the mountain needs to be named.” The Montana State Names Authority also does not endorse the name, citing “uncertainties about the proposal and lack of evidence of support.” The State agreed that the change could lead to confusion, as some residents and businesses do still refer to the feature as Strawberry Mountain, and also questioned the historical significance of the Rainwater family. Despite the proponent’s claim that the name Rainwater Mountain appears in State data files, the State Names Authority was unable to find any evidence of that.

The National Park Service also does not support the proposal, although it noted that because the feature lies just outside the Glacier National Park boundary, the official recommendation ought to come from the U.S. Forest Service. The Park’s Wilderness Manager spoke with several local residents, noting “[they] were very sensitive to the renaming [sic] and usually quite upset because it has always been known as Strawberry. There is [another] Strawberry Mtn. down in the Southfork but it has never been confusing with anyone. I believe the uproar from the locals would be huge. If it needs to be named then Strawberry should be the only choice.” The Park’s Historian added, “Formally naming and subsequently replacing the local name of Strawberry Mountain to Rainwater Mountain because someone named Rainwater lived in the vicinity at some time in the past, seems frivolous and totally unnecessary. I have never heard this name used.” The U.S. Forest Service, in choosing not to support the proposal, cited the restrictions of the Wilderness Naming Policy. No proposal was received to formally name the summit Strawberry Mountain.

A copy of the proposal for Rainwater Mountain was forwarded to the following Federally-recognized Tribes for comment: the Blackfoot Tribe of the Blackfoot Reservation; the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; the Crow Tribe of the Crow Reservation; and the Fort Belknap

Indian Community. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

### **III. New Commemorative Names and Changes agreed to by all interested parties**

#### **McDaniel Creek**, Oregon (Review List 396)

Mouth: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=43.5913&lon=-123.27847&size=1&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG>

Source: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=43.57145&lon=-123.32027&size=1&u=2&datum=nad27&layer=DRG>

This proposal, to name an unnamed tributary of Yoncalla Creek, McDaniel Creek, was submitted by the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB) on behalf of a resident of Yoncalla. The proponent reports that the property through which the stream flows has been owned by his family since 1943, and that it would be appropriate to name the stream for his grandfather William Earl McDaniel (1905-1999), the original owner. A road that parallels the stream is already named McDaniel Road. The Douglas County Board of Commissioners is in support of this proposal, as is the OGNB. The OGNB suggests this is an associated name rather than a commemorative name “as the family has lived there since the 1940’s.”

As part of its research, the OGNB contacted the following Federally-recognized Tribes: the Burns Paiute Tribe; the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians; the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon; the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Coquille Indian Tribe; the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians; the Fort McDermitt Shoshone-Paiute Indians; and the Klamath Tribes. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

#### **Lake Eleanor**, Washington (Review List 392)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=11&n=5271894&e=457001&size=1&u=6&datum=nad83>

This proposal, to make official the name Lake Eleanor for a one acre body of water in central Spokane County, was submitted by a resident of Spokane who reports that the name has been in local use for at least 80 years. She notes that the lake lies on property owned by her family for many years, but even prior to their ownership, her parents would visit the area and always knew the lake to be named Lake Eleanor. When asked about the origin of the name, she responded, “it is [for] Eleanor Roosevelt.” There are four other geographic features in Washington named “Eleanor,” including a locale in Lincoln County, two streams in Grays Harbor County and Pierce County, and a lake, also in Pierce County. No information has been located to explain the origin of any of these names. The adjacent lake is proposed to be named officially Spring Lake (q.v.).

After determining that the Spokane County Commissioners were in support of the proposal, the Washington Board on Geographic Names voted to recommend approval. As part of its

research, the State Board contacted the Spokane Tribe of Indians, a Federally-recognized Tribe, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

#### IV. Revised Decisions

Change **Squaw Creek** (FID 1150242) (BGN 1958) to **Tumala Creek**, Oregon  
(Mount Hood National Forest)  
(Review List 396)

Mouth: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.20105&lon=-122.02251&size=1&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG>

Source: <http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=45.22866&lon=-122.02494&size=1&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG>

This is the fourth of the four proposals submitted by the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB) on behalf of the Cultural Resources Department of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community. The Tribes wish to eliminate the word “Squaw” as applied to four geographic features in Clackamas County and within Mount Hood National Forest.

This proposal would change the name of Squaw Creek, a 3.5 km (2.2 mi) long tributary of the Roaring River, to Tumala Creek. The existing name was the subject of a BGN decision in 1958; that proposal was initiated by the U.S. Forest Service in an effort to make official a name for an unnamed feature. Although a 1927 General Land Office plat had labeled the stream Clemens Creek, the USFS determined that “local residents never heard of [that name] and this name has no acceptance.” Although the name Squaw Creek was submitted in 1957 as a new name, further research shows it had been listed in the Oregon State Engineer’s Office *Inventory of Streams and Lakes in Oregon* published in 1939. The BGN approved the name, citing its association with other local features already named “Squaw.”

The Clackamas County Commissioners are in support of the proposed change from Squaw Creek to Tumala Creek, while the Clackamas County Historical Society has no objection. The OGNB and the U.S. Forest Service support the change. As part of its research, the OGNB also contacted the following Federally-recognized Tribes: the Burns Paiute Tribe; the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians; the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; the Coquille Indian Tribe; the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians; the Fort McDermitt Shoshone-Paiute Indians; and the Klamath Tribes. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

Change **Boulder Island** (FID 1246937) (BGN 1986) to **Bowles Island**, South Carolina  
(Review List 394)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=32.56546&lon=-80.51372&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG25&size=1&s=50>

This proposal is to change officially the name of Boulder Island, an island located at the southern end of Colleton County, to Bowles Island. The proponent, a resident of Folly Beach,



reports that the island was named for the Bowles family who lived on the island in the early nineteenth century and whose descendants still live in the area today. The island was shown as Bowles Island on a map of Colleton County published in Robert Mills' 1825 *Atlas of South Carolina* (GNIS lists Bowles Island as a variant name as a result of this source). The 1850 Federal Census of South Carolina also listed a family named Bowles in Colleton County. An article discussing the history of Colleton County placenames, published in 1965 in *Names in South Carolina*, also listed Bowles Island, but did not provide any details regarding the name other than to note the name was one of many "that need no further explanation."

According to the proponent, "The current name bears no relation to the area or region. There is not a rock much less a boulder within 200 miles of the coast of South Carolina." The earliest USGS topographic map of the area, published in 1885, labeled the island Bolders Island, and that name continued to appear on all Federal maps and charts through the 1980's. However, in 1986, the BGN was asked by the National Ocean Service to change the spelling to Boulder Island to recognize the name shown on the 1975 Colleton County highway map. Despite the BGN's decision to approve this change, the 1990 USGS 1:100,000-scale map labeled the island Bolder Island. GNIS lists no other geographic features in South Carolina named "Bowles."

When asked to comment, the Colleton County Council and the Colleton County Museum both responded that the proponent's evidence is accurate and that the name should be Bowles Island. The South Carolina State Names Authority has no objection to the change. There are no Federally-recognized Tribes within fifty miles of the feature.

## **V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties**

### **Shadow Mountain, Arizona** (Review List 396)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=33.61333&lon=-112.02722&datum=nad83&u=6&layer=DRG&size=l&s=50>

This proposal is to make official the name Shadow Mountain for a 588 m (1,928 ft) summit located within the Phoenix Mountains Preserve and a few miles north of the center of the City of Phoenix. It was submitted by the Arizona Board on Geographic and Historic Names (AZBGHN) on behalf of a local resident, who reports that the name has been in local use for many years. She adds that her great-grandfather, who settled in the Paradise Valley in the 1940's, came to refer to the summit as Shadow Mountain "because he said it took 32 minutes for the shadow to cover his ranch once the sun set on the mountain crest." She provided a copy of a 1984 newspaper article in which her great-grandfather was interviewed and in which he confirmed the story of the name. The proponent notes that the name has been widely used since then, with several local businesses and neighborhoods using the name. The community located immediately to the southeast of the summit is named Shadow Mountain, and both Shadow Mountain High School and Shadow Mountain Baptist Church are located within two miles of the summit.

The Assistant Director for the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation Department, which manages the Phoenix Mountains Preserve, confirms local usage of the name and reports that the name is already published on park maps. The 1972 Master Plan for the establishment of the preserve labeled the feature Shadow Mountain. The name is also published on the 1990 and 2006 editions of the Phoenix Metro Street Atlas. Letters of support were submitted by the Chair of the City of Phoenix Parks and Recreation Board, the Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council, and the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors.

The AZBGHN, as part of its research, forwarded the proposal to the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation, the Gila River Indian Community, the Ak Chin Indian Community, and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, all of which are Federally-recognized. However, no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. Citing the evidence of overwhelming local support and published usage, the State Board recommends approval of this proposal. There is one other summit in the State named Shadow Mountain; it is located in Coconino County, approximately 260 km (160 mi) from the summit in question.

**Little Bear Creek**, Michigan  
(Manistee National Forest)  
(Review List 392)

Mouth:<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=16&n=4825671&e=617001&s=50&size=l&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG25>

Source:<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=16&n=4825508&e=614283&s=50&size=l&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG25>

The new name Little Bear Creek is proposed for a 3.2 km (2 mi) long tributary of Bennett Creek. The stream heads in Goodwell Township in eastern Newaygo County and then flows east into Mecosta Township in Mecosta County. It also lies within the boundaries of Manistee National Forest. The proponent, a local resident, reports that he has found no name for the stream on any local or State maps, and since the majority of the stream flows through his property, he would like to apply an official name. He notes that he and his family have named a recently-constructed lodge on the property, "Bear Creek Lodge."

This proposal was submitted and review listed as Bear Creek, but after the government of Newaygo County expressed concern that the name could be confused with another stream in the county also named Bear Creek, the proposal was amended to Little Bear Creek (the proponent also notes that the stream in question is smaller than the previously-named one). When asked to comment on the amendment, the governments of both Newaygo County and Mecosta County, as well as the Mecosta County Road Commission and the Newaygo County Drain Commissioner, all indicated they would support the new name. According to GNIS, there are 47 streams in Michigan in which the word "Bear" is found, including 31 named Bear Creek and four named Little Bear Creek. The stream in Newaygo County that is named Bear Creek is located approximately 26 km (16 mi) to the northwest of the stream in question. The Michigan State Names Authority has stated it would not have any objection to the amended name provided the local governments were in support.

A copy of the proposal was forwarded to the following Federally-recognized Tribes for comment: the Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe; the Bay Mills Indian Community; the Chippewa-Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation; the Citizen Potawatomi Nation; the Fond du Lac Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; the Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin; the Grand Portage Reservation Business Committee; the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians; the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council; the Hannahville Indian Community; the Ho-Chunk Nation; the Huron Potawatomi, Inc; the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community; the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; the Lac du Flambeau Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; the Leech Lake Reservation Business Committee; the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians; the Little Traverse Bay Bands Of Odawa Indians; the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians; the Menominee Indian Tribe; the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Indians; the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma; the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians; the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation; the Quechan Tribe; the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians; the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians; the Saginaw Chippewa Indians; the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians; the Sokaogon Chippewa Community; the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; the Boise Forte Band of Chippewa Indians; the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, and the Wyandotte Nation. Of these, the Keweenaw Bay Community, the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Indians, and the Saginaw Chippewa Indians responded that they did not have an opinion on the issue. The lack of response from the remaining Tribes is also presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

**Spring Lake**, Washington  
(Review List 392)

<http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=11&n=5271884&e=456788&size=1&u=6&datum=nad83>

The name Spring Lake is proposed for a 0.5 acre lake located in central Spokane County, approximately 11 km (7 mi) southwest of Spokane and 8 km (5 mi) east-northeast of the community of Medical Lake. The proponent, a longtime resident of the area, reports that the lake lies on property owned by her family and that it has been known by the proposed name since at least 1925. The lake is spring fed and includes a small island where Canada geese have nested for many years. There are eight lakes and reservoirs in Washington in which the word "Spring" appears in the name, including four named Spring Lake. None are in Spokane County, with the closest being in Columbia County, approximately 141 km (88 mi) to the south of the lake in question.

After determining that the Spokane County Commissioners were in support of the proposal, the Washington Board on Geographic Names voted to recommend approval. As part of its research, the State Board contacted the Spokane Tribe of Indians, a Federally-recognized Tribe, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.