U.S. Board on Geographic Names Domestic Names Committee

Six Hundred Eightieth Meeting
Department of the Interior, Room 3004
July 13, 2006 – 9:30 a.m.

Members and Deputy Members in Attendance

Robin Bellmard Department of the Interior (Bureau of Indian Affairs)
Robert Bewley Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management)

Chick Fagan Department of the Interior (National Park Service)
Mike Fournier Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census)

Tony Gilbert Government Printing Office

Robert Hiatt Library of Congress

Elizabeth Kanalley (Chairwoman) Department of Agriculture (Forest Service)

William Logan Department of Homeland Security (U.S. Coast Guard)
Curtis Loy Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey)
Doug Vandegraft Department of the Interior (Fish and Wildlife Service)
Meredith Westington Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey)

Ex-Officio

Trent Palmer, Department of Defense (National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency) Lou Yost, Executive Secretary, U.S. Board on Geographic Names/Domestic Names Committee (U.S. Geological Survey)

Staff

Jennifer Runyon

Guests

Geoffrey Hatchard, National Geographic Society Maps

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 9:35 a.m. Chairwoman Kanalley had announced previously that her arrival would be delayed, so in her absence, the meeting was chaired by Mike Fournier, Deputy Member for the Department of Commerce. Fournier welcomed everyone to the 680th meeting of the Domestic Names Committee (DNC).

2. Minutes of the 679th Meeting

The minutes of the June 5-6 meeting were approved with some corrections. It was noted that the correct name of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service facility in Shepherdstown is the National Conservation Training Center. There were questions regarding some of the vote counts and the members offered to forward any corrections to the staff. It was noted that the second occurrence of the name Braggtown under item 3.3 should read Bragtown. The

Committee also approved the revised wording for the <u>Winema Lake/Daley Lake</u>, Oregon decision that took place at the May meeting.

3. <u>Communications and Reports</u>

3.1 <u>Chairman's Report</u> (Kanalley for Boughton)

The Chairman's report was deferred until later in the meeting.

3.2 <u>BGN Executive Secretary's Report</u> (Yost)

Yost announced that he has been appointed Acting BGN Executive Secretary until the position can be filled permanently. The BGN is scheduled to meet on Tuesday, July 18th at the U.S. Geological Survey in Reston and all DNC members are encouraged to attend. Yost also announced that Lesley Levi, former BGN Administrative Assistant, has accepted a permanent position elsewhere at USGS, so the DNC staff will take on her duties until a replacement can be found.

3.3 Report of the Publicity Committee (Yost for Wood)

An article and subsequent editorial commentary appeared in *The Columbian* (Vancouver, Washington) regarding the DNC's decision in June to approve the name <u>Crater Glacier</u> rather than <u>Tulutson Glacier</u>, the name supported by the State Names Board and the Federal land management agency. The articles stated that the State was not pleased with the Federal decision, and that an appeal might be forthcoming. A subsequent discussion between DNC staff and the State Board confirmed that the State was disappointed with the outcome. It was noted also that the proponent for <u>Crater Glacier</u> had attended the State Board's July 7th meeting to explain his rationale for submitting that name. The State has indicated that the name <u>Tulutson Glacier</u> will continue to appear on State products, although if the feature melts soon, as is anticipated, this may not be a great concern. Staff noted that the DNC has also just received a follow-up proposal to name the two arms of the glacier, <u>East Crater Glacier</u> and <u>West Crater Glacier</u>.

Yost received an inquiry regarding the legitimacy of two names listed in the Geographic Names Information System (GNIS), specifically <u>Bonnie</u> and <u>Clyde</u> in Utah. The inquirer indicated that she had been unable to locate any communities in the State with those names and questioned where GNIS had derived its information. Further research indicated that the names were compiled in 1989 from a file provided by the National Institute of Standards and Technology in support of the FIPS55 project. The Utah State Geographic Names Committee has been asked to investigate the matter, and if the names cannot be verified independently, staff agreed they should probably be removed from the database.

Staff distributed an article that appeared in the *South Florida Sun-Sentinel* regarding the DNC's decision in June to approve the proposal to change the name of <u>Japanese Rock</u> to <u>Yamato Rock</u>.

3.4 Executive Secretary's Report (Yost)

The Annual Conference of the Council on Geographic Names Authorities (COGNA) is scheduled for October 17-21 in Boulder, Colorado. A preliminary agenda has been distributed electronically. Some members indicated they did not receive a copy, so staff offered to resend it. The details are also available at the COGNA website, http://www.cogna50usa.org/06boulder/2006_Boulder_Colorado.htm. Members were reminded to forward possible State-Federal Roundtable topics to Tim Norton of the Arizona Board on Geographic and Historic Names.

The DNC staff met on July 6 with Kanalley, Gallahan, and Bellmard to discuss the issue of Tribal consultation. Bellmard, representing the BIA, has offered to assist in this effort and to seek out the appropriate individual(s) at each Tribal office who might be able to provide input on BGN issues. It was suggested that it would be appropriate to establish a Memorandum of Understanding between the BIA and USGS to outline the new procedures.

Yost reported that in June he attended the annual meeting of the Geographical Names Board of Canada (GNBC) in Ottawa. As always, this is a worthwhile effort, as it allows both countries to share issues of mutual interest. The GNBC has undertaken a project that will delineate the boundaries of natural features, and with the help of the provincial names boards is making good progress.

As reported at the June meeting, a proposal has been received to rename the <u>Gulf of Mexico</u>. The proposed replacement is <u>Gulf of America</u>, a name that the proponent suggests is more appropriate as "Mexico is not the major border of this gulf." After an e-mail dialogue among members and staff, it was determined that this is an issue for the full BGN, with input from both the domestic and foreign names committees. The topic will be on the agenda for discussion at the July 18th meeting. The DNC members were asked at this meeting how they wished to proceed. It was noted that this is an international high seas feature and therefore beyond the DNC's sole purview. Yost asked whether each State Names Authority along the Gulf Coast should be asked to provide a formal recommendation, to which several members responded that this would not be necessary. A motion was made and seconded <u>not</u> to place the issue on a DNC Review List but to forward it to the full BGN for review. The motion carried unanimously. A motion was then made and seconded <u>not</u> to recommend approval of the proposed name change, citing long-standing local, regional, national, and international use and historical significance of the existing name. The motion passed unanimously.

3.5 Staff Report (Runyon)

Quarterly Review List 392, containing 134 new proposals, was released June 27, and will be posted at the BGN website shortly. Staff noted that one proposal has already been amended; Go2Church Creek, a new name for a stream in Georgia, has been changed to Rehoboth Baptism Branch, after the State Names Authority suggested the former name might be viewed as hortatory.

Staff asked for clarification regarding how to proceed with several proposals for features in the State of Washington, which the State Names Authority has "denied for initial consideration." The State believes the names are not worthy of further review and so they will not be sending out the customary county or Tribal letters, nor will they conduct any additional research. The DNC members agreed that since the proposals were submitted initially to the DNC, they must be processed and the staff should make the necessary contacts. When the names are brought forth for a vote, it will be noted in the case briefs that the State declined to offer a recommendation.

As noted previously, the staff was interviewed by the media on the <u>Crater Glacier</u> decision. The reporter wished to know how each member had voted, but it was noted that this information is not recorded in the proceedings. The members were asked to confirm that this is the appropriate policy, to which they indicated that was the case.

3.6 GNIS and Data Compilation Program (Yost)

Yost noted that two proposals have been received in response to the solicitation to conduct Phase II GNIS data compilation for the State of Michigan.

Dwight Hughes of the Geographic Names Office made a presentation via the web to the USGS Central Region Geographic Liaisons on the role of GNIS in their activities. The importance of GNIS in State and Federal GIS projects was reinforced. The session was monitored by Claire DeVaughan, formerly of the DNC staff and now the Geospatial Liaison for the State of Texas. The information was well received, with several participants indicating an interest in attending this year's COGNA Conference.

3.1 <u>Chairman's Report</u> (Kanalley for Boughton) (deferred from earlier)

At this time, Chairwoman Kanalley arrived, and thanked Fournier for chairing the meeting in her absence. In providing the Chairman's Report, she reported that the BGN Executive Committee held an ad hoc meeting in June to discuss the future of the BGN Executive Secretary position. The Chair of the BGN had asked that the Executive Secretaries for Domestic Names and Foreign Names provide input regarding how their respective agencies were positioned to support the Secretariat in the future. It was also noted at that meeting that Randy Flynn, recently appointed as Department of Defense member, has relinquished that role and once again assumed his previous position as Executive Secretary for Foreign Names. After reviewing the situation, the Chair has appointed Lou Yost as Acting BGN Executive Secretary until the position can be filled permanently.

It was suggested at the Executive Committee meeting that there is a need to review the BGN's by-laws, with a particular emphasis on the role and responsibilities of the various executive positions. The E.C. hopes to meet soon, and if it is determined that the by-laws need to be edited, the membership of the BGN will be given a minimum of 30 days for review and comment.

4. Docket Review (Runyon)

Please refer to the attached docket for a detailed 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 <u>Ward Creek</u> (FID 792811) to <u>Gold Creek</u>, Montana (Bitterroot National Forest) (Review List 389)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this change.

Vote: 11 in favor 0 against 0 abstentions

Change the application of **Baker Pond** (FID 942841), New York (Review List 387)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this change.

Vote: 11 in favor 0 against 0 abstentions

Change <u>East Fork Squaw Creek</u> (FID 1141604) to <u>East Fork Sru Creek</u>, <u>Squaw Creek</u> (FID 1150230) to <u>Sru Creek</u>, <u>Squaw Lake</u> (FID 1150279) to <u>Sru Lake</u>, and <u>West Fork</u> <u>Squaw Creek</u> (FID 1152117) to <u>West Fork Sru Creek</u>, Oregon (Siskiyou National Forest) (Review List 392)

A motion was made and seconded to consider these proposals as a group.

Vote: 11 in favor 0 against 0 abstentions

A motion was made and seconded to approve the changes.

Vote: 11 in favor 0 against 0 abstentions

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

The Tegoseak Site, Alaska (National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska) (Review List 391)

A motion was made and seconded <u>not</u> to approve this new name, citing the lack of unanimous support for the name, as well as concerns that the feature did not need a formal name. That is, the site of a paleontological find might be regarded as an administrative feature but not an identifiable *geographic* feature.

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against 0 abstentions

Chileno Camp, California (Review List 385)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this name.

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against 0 abstentions

Change <u>Negro Creek Bay</u> (FID 008301) to <u>Carteret Bay</u>, North Carolina (Cape Lookout National Seashore Park) (Review List 388)

A motion was made and seconded <u>not</u> to approve this change, citing evidence that the feature no longer exists and that it is not necessary to rename a historical feature.

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against

0 abstentions

Staff noted that in the course of reviewing this issue, it was learned that the geography of the area has changed significantly over the years and that new geographic features (barrier islands and inlets) have been formed. The National Park Service, as the administrator of the Cape Lookout National Seashore Park, has suggested that official names are needed for these features and has submitted several new names for BGN consideration. The names in question are Old Drum Inlet, New Drum Inlet, Ophelia Inlet, Middle Core Banks, and Ophelia Banks. After some discussion, it was agreed that all interested agencies should solicit comments from their respective field offices and be prepared to vote on these names as an undocketed agenda item at the August meeting. Staff will forward the pertinent details to the appropriate members and deputies.

Royal Valley Creek, Washington (Review List 390)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this name.

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against 0 abstentions

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

Potter Brook, Pennsylvania (Review List 392)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this name.

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against 0 abstentions

IV. Revised Decisions

Change Anderson Hill (BGN 1978) (FID 1425106) to Andersen Hill, Utah (Review List 387)

A motion was made and seconded <u>not</u> to approve this name, citing the lack of support by the State Names Authority.

Vote: 10 in favor

0 against 1 abstention

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Paradise Lake, Florida (Review List 388)

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

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against 0 abstentions

<u>Middle Fork Gold Creek</u>, <u>North Fork Gold Creek</u>, Montana (Bitterroot National Forest) (Review List 391)

A motion was made and seconded to approve these new names.

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against 0 abstentions

Tannery Run, Pennsylvania (Review List 392)

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

Vote: 11 in favor

0 against

0 abstentions

5. Location and Time of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Domestic Names Committee will be held August 10, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., at the Department of the Interior, Washington D.C., Room 3004.

The meeting was adjourned at 12 noon.

U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE DOCKET July 2006

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

Change Ward Creek (FID 792811) to Gold Creek, Montana (Bitterroot National Forest)
(Review List 389)

Mouth: http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=11&n=5117992&e=718164&s=50&size=l&u=2&layer=DRG 25

Source: http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=11&n=5116270&e=710600&s=50&size=l&u=2&layer=DRG25

This proposal is to change the application of the name <u>Gold Creek</u> and apply it to the stream that is currently named <u>Ward Creek</u>. The name <u>Gold Creek</u> is applied currently to a 5.6 km (3.5 mi) long stream that heads within the Bitterroot National Forest and flows east, the southeast, then northeast before entering the Bitterroot River. Another branch that enters this stream from the south is labeled <u>Ward Creek</u>. However, the proponent reports that this latter branch is in fact the correct course of <u>Gold Creek</u>. As evidence, she notes that the name <u>Gold Creek</u> was applied to the proposed location on 1904 and 1949 U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps. An 1888 water rights document also referred to <u>Gold Creek</u> as proposed.

It is not known why the name Gold Creek was moved to the more northerly stream when the first largescale USGS map was published in 1964, but since then the State of Montana has cited those newer maps in its water rights and land survey documents. A State Engineer's Office Water Resources Survey published in 1958 labeled the southern stream Gold (Ward) Creek but did not name the more northerly one. Neither stream is shown on the official Ravalli County highway map. The proponent reports that the error has impacted her claim to water rights because any new claims refer to Ward Creek and not to Gold Creek, which is the name that still appears on her family's property deeds. The origin of neither name has been determined, although the stream that is currently labeled Ward Creek heads just east of Ward Mountain and there was once a small community in the area named Ward. The proponent suggests the name likely derives from that of George Ward, a prominent homesteader in the area. One of the proponent's neighbors has submitted a letter supporting her proposal; he also suggested that since the existing Gold Creek needs a name, the two principal tributaries should be labeled "Middle Fork" and "North Fork." The proponent concurs and has submitted additional proposals for those names (q.v.). (Note: the case briefs on Review List 391 are incorrect; initial discussions on naming the tributaries suggested the more southerly branch might also be labeled "South Fork," but the proponent believes that would be incorrect as the more historically accurate name has always been simply Gold Creek.)

The Ravalli County Commissioners have stated they have no objection to the renaming of <u>Ward Creek</u> to <u>Gold Creek</u>, provided the resulting "unnamed" branches are given official names. They concur with the two proposed tributary names. The Montana Board on Geographic Names Authority supports the names as proposed, while the U.S. Forest Service has no objection. A copy of the proposal was sent to the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation and to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, both of which are Federally-recognized, but no response was received which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

(Review List 387)

 $\underline{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=18\&n=4948832\&e=537923\&s=50\&size=l\&u=6\&datum=nad83\&laye=DRG25}$

This proposal was submitted by the Supervisor of the Town of Dickinson, to change the application of the name <u>Baker Pond</u>. This name is applied currently to a small L-shaped lake located on the east side of an esker, and has been applied as such to U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps since 1964, but the proponent reports that <u>Baker Pond</u> is in fact the almost square shaped lake on the west side of the esker, 0.5 km (0.3 mi) further to the south. He says the name dates back to the early 1800's, and that the family that has owned the land south of the esker since 1908 has always referred to it as <u>Baker Pond</u>. He adds the lake in question was called <u>Shadowmere Lake</u> by a woman who owned the surrounding property for a few years at the beginning of the twentieth century and this name is still used today by a few local residents, so he hopes that by standardizing the name <u>Baker Pond</u>, this confusion will be eliminated. He also reports that the more northerly feature is simply known locally as a beaver swamp and apparently does not have a name. He provided a copy of an 1899 land deed that referenced <u>Baker Pond</u> "on the south of the hogback." USGS maps published in 1919 and 1931 show a lake named <u>Baker Pond</u> in the general area, but do not show the esker, so it is unclear as to which of the two bodies of water the name refers.

There is one other lake in Franklin County named <u>Baker Pond</u>; it lies approximately 27 km (17 mi) to the southeast of the lake in Dickinson. In addition to the Town Supervisors, the Franklin County Legislature submitted a letter in support of the change. A copy of the proposal was sent to the St. Regis Band of Mohawk Indians of New York, a Federally-recognized Tribe, which responded that they do not have an opinion on the issue. A copy of this proposal was forwarded to the New York State Names Committee in November 2004, and four subsequent attempts have been made to solicit an opinion. To date, no response has been received, so the State was advised that the Board would be required to proceed without their input.

Change East Fork Squaw Creek (FID 1141604) to East Fork Sru Creek,

Squaw Creek (FID 1150230) to Sru Creek,

Squaw Lake (FID 1150279) to Sru Lake,

and West Fork Squaw Creek (FID 1152117) to West Fork Sru Creek, Oregon

(Siskiyou National Forest)

(Review List 392)

East Fork Squaw Creek:

 $\label{lem:mouth:http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10&n=4728902&e=416259&s=50&size=l&u=6&dat \\ \underline{um=nad83\&layer=DRG25}$

Source: http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10&n=4727866&e=417671&s=50&size=1&u=6&datum=nad83&layer=DRG25

Squaw Creek:

Mouth: http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10&n=4729934.39733121%20&e=416132.40335969 3&u=6&datum=nad83

 $\label{eq:source:http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10&n=4728902&e=416259&s=50&size=l&u=6&dat \\ um=nad83&layer=DRG25$

Squaw Lake:

 $\frac{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25}{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=}10\&n=4731472\&e=417653\&size=s\&u=5\&datum=nad83\&layer=s&u=5\&datum=nad83\&la$

West Fork Squaw Creek:

 $\label{lem:mouth:http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10&n=4728902&e=416259&s=50&size=l&u=6&dat \\ um=nad83&layer=DRG25$

 $Source: \underline{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10\&n=4726956\&e=416249\&s=50\&size=l\&u=6\&datum=nad83\&layer=DRG25$

These four changes were submitted by the U.S. Forest Service regional geographic names liaison, on behalf of the District Ranger for the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest. The Forest has suggested that the names of <u>Squaw Creek</u>, <u>Squaw Lake</u>, and two tributaries of <u>Squaw Creek</u>, all in Coos County, should be changed because of concerns that the existing names are derogatory. The District Ranger discussed the issue with a representative of the Coquille Indian Tribe, who in turn consulted with the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians. The Tribal authorities have requested that the four features be renamed from "Squaw" to "Sru," a word of Athapaskan origin that means "grandmother." The Forest prepared and distributed a news release within the local community seeking comments on the issue.

<u>Squaw Creek</u> is a 1.1 km (0.7 mi) long tributary of the South Fork Coquille River in southern Coos County. The origin of the stream's current name is not known, but the name was listed in the Oregon State Engineer's Office listing of streams and lakes published in 1939. The stream and lake have been labeled on Federal maps since at least the mid-1960's.

The proposed changes are endorsed by the Coos County Historical Society, while the Coos County Commissioners stated they have "no opinion" on the issue. The Oregon Geographic Names Board recommends approval of the proposals, as does the Forest Service.

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

The Tegoseak Site, Alaska (National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska) (Review List 391)

 $\frac{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=5\&n=7728674\&e=558172\&s=63.360\&size=x\&u=6\&datum=nad83}{\&layer=DRG50}$

The name <u>The Tegoseak Site</u> is proposed to be made official for a location in the North Slope Borough, along the Colville River and near the mouth of Kikak Creek. The feature also lies within the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, which is administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The proponent of this new commemorative name reports that in 1997 he discovered a significant collection of prehistoric dinosaur bones and fossils at this location. He now wishes to name the site in honor of his grandparents, Reuben Tegoseak (1897-1996) and Edith Tegoseak (1903-1984), who were "reindeer hunters, lived a subsistence lifestyle, and were very integrated with Inupiat culture." Reuben Tegoseak was active in the local ministry, while Edith Tegoseak taught elementary school and was instrumental in the development of the first written dictionary of the Inupiat language.

There is evidence that the proposed name has come into limited use. A report on the aforementioned fossil discoveries was published in the December 2002 edition of *Scientific American* and referred to the feature as "The Kikak-Tegoseak Site," while a Ketchikan newspaper article from 2005 includes a photograph of "the Kikak-Tegoseak dinosaur bone quarry." At least one report suggests that the paleontological find has lead scientists to reexamine long-standing theories about Arctic dinosaurs.

In researching this proposal, the Alaska State Names Authority contacted various local groups for input; of these, two expressed opposition to the name. The City of Nuiqsut noted that other local residents already

refer to the site as "Kitik," while the Kuukpik Corporation, an Alaska Native Village Corporation, suggested its members call it "Qutitaq." Neither of these names were submitted as counter-proposals. The North Slope Borough Inupiat History, Language, and Culture Commission supports the proposal for <u>The Tegoseak Site</u>. However, citing the lack of unanimous support among local residents and officials, and evidence that the feature may already have a name, the State Board recommended disapproval of the proposal. The Bureau of Land Management also does not support the name.

<u>Chileno Camp</u>, California (Review List 385)

http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?lat=36.40444&lon=-120.67528&datum=nad83&u=6

This proposal is to make official the name Chileno Camp for a locale in San Benito County, 1.6 km (1 mi) south of the community of Idria. The proponent, a Fresno County historian who recently submitted other proposals to the BGN, reports that the name has been used locally for over 100 years "because a group of Chilean families lived there in the late 1800's. They came here from the Almaden mine and were primarily employed as wood cutters for the New Idria mine and other mines in the area." He also reports that the feature is sometimes, erroneously, referred to as Mexican Flat. The proposal was submitted originally as Chilano Camp, but when a member of the California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names (CACGN) pointed out that individuals of Chilean descent are referred to as "Chilenos," the proponent agreed to modify his proposal.

The San Benito County Department of Public Works has confirmed that the name Mexican Flat is the more commonly used name for the larger area and does not support efforts "to change that name," but the CACGN believes the names apply to different features, and because of its historic significance recommends approval of the name Chileno Camp for the locale. The County has been asked if it wishes to submit a separate proposal for Mexican Flat. A copy of this proposal was sent to the Santa Rosa Indian Community of the Santa Rosa Rancheria, a Federally-recognized Tribe, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

Change <u>Negro Creek Bay</u> (FID 1008301) to <u>Carteret Bay</u>, North Carolina (Cape Lookout National Seashore Park)
(Review List 388)

http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=18&n=3857288.00008027&e=379303.999998961&datum=nad83&u=6

This is the last of the seven proposals submitted by the Chair of the North Carolina Geographic Information Coordinating Council, which has been tasked with renaming all geographic features in the State that have names that are considered "offensive or insulting." This proposal was submitted to change officially the name of a small bay in Carteret County from Negro Creek Bay to Carteret Bay, a request that the North Carolina State Geographic Names Board approved. The feature lies within the boundaries of the Cape Lookout National Seashore, so when the State conducted its initial research, the National Park Service was asked if it wished to suggest an alternate name, but it did not, citing a belief that the existing name was not considered universally derogatory. The proposed replacement name was suggested by Carteret County officials.

The proposal for <u>Carteret Bay</u> was presented to the BGN for a decision at its January 2006 meeting, but a vote was deferred after it was determined that the feature no longer exists. The name <u>Negro Creek Bay</u> was recorded in GNIS because it was depicted as an identifiable feature on the 1946 USGS topographic map (although on the map simply as <u>Negro Creek</u>; it is not clear how the GNIS entry came to include the generic term "bay"). The origin of the name is unknown.

Subsequent changes in the area's geomorphology have resulted in the feature no longer resembling a bay or a stream, and its location is now subsumed by the creation of a new opening in the barrier island between the Atlantic Ocean and Core Sound. When asked to revisit the issue, the State Board concurred with the BGN staff's recommendation that the feature simply be recorded in the database as "historical," thus preventing it from appearing on future Federal and State maps. The State has determined that the Carteret County government agrees with this suggestion.

In researching the issue, the NPS noted that as a result of the aforementioned changes to the coastline, existing features have been altered and new features created. The Park management has asked that the new names <u>Old Drum Inlet</u>, <u>New Drum Inlet</u>, <u>Ophelia Inlet</u>, <u>Middle Core Banks</u>, and <u>Ophelia Banks</u> be made official for these features.

Royal Valley Creek, Washington

(Review List 390)

 $\label{lem:mouth:http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10&n=5277861&e=527591&s=50&size=1&u=6&datum=nad \\ 83&layer=DRG25$

 $\label{eq:source:http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=10&n=5280172&e=527555&s=50&size=1&u=6&datum=nad\\83&layer=DRG25$

This proposal was submitted by the Washington Board on Geographic Names on behalf of a resident of Poulsbo, to make official the name Royal Valley Creek for a previously unnamed tributary of Crouch Creek in Kitsap County. The name is taken from that of a farm that was once located in the area; a nearby street is also named Royal Valley Road. After determining that the name has the support of a Kitsap County Commissioner, the Kitsap County Historical Society, and a local community group, and that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife has no objection, the State Board recommended approval of the proposal.

However, following this action, another local resident contacted the State Board to express concern over the name. She noted that the name Royal Valley Creek should not have been permitted because it has commercial overtones (the proponent represents a local land development corporation named Royal Valley, LLC), and further, she claims the stream has already been known for many years as Steele Creek. She provided evidence that a family named Steele resided in the area approximately one hundred years ago, and claims that signs labeling the stream "Steele Creek" were removed following the State's approval of Royal Valley Creek. She asked the State Board to consider a proposal for Steele Creek and provided some additional evidence of published usage, including a map of the "Steele Creek Watershed" prepared by the Kitsap County Department of Community Development. A road that crosses the more southerly of the stream's two tributaries is named Steele Creek Drive NE, and Steele Creek Mobile Home Park is also located nearby. After the State Board noted that the name Steele Creek seems to have been applied collectively to what are two distinct tributaries, the opponent agreed to amend her counter-proposal to North Fork Steele Creek (for the stream already approved by the State as Royal Valley Creek) and South Fork Steele Creek. The State Board reviewed this new information but deferred a decision until such time as the proponent could submit two separate application forms for the latter names.

When asked to comment on the controversy, the proponent of <u>Royal Valley Creek</u> responded that her proposal was appropriate because a farm of that name was located nearby "for years"; and also "there is no land development being done with the Royal Valley name"; and finally, "<u>Steele Creek</u> is another creek and is located south of <u>Royal Valley Creek</u>." She added, "The name [<u>Royal Valley Creek</u>] came from a historic dispute between two neighbors," and concluded by saying, "The Royal Valley name seems to have started as an argument and is still an argument." When asked to elaborate on this statement, the State Board explained that the name first came into local use around World War I, after two neighbors, one English and

one German, accused each other of being "a Queen" and "the Kaiser." The references to these titles of royalty persisted and reportedly led to the neighborhood being known as "Royal Valley."

The Washington Board reports that the issue has been resolved to its satisfaction; the individual who objected to the <u>Royal Valley Creek</u> proposal did not submit any additional paperwork, nor a formal proposal for the "Steele" names. Citing the overwhelming support from the community for <u>Royal Valley Creek</u>, the State has asked that the BGN render a decision on that name. The State has indicated it is still willing to entertain a request for <u>Steele Creek</u> for the more southerly tributary, but does not believe the issue should be prolonged any further.

As part of its routine investigation into all name proposals, the State Board contacted the appropriate Tribal authorities for input on the issue. Although the State is unable to provide copies of its correspondence, it reports that none of the Tribes offered any objections to the proposed name.

IV. New Commemorative Names and Changes agreed to by all interested parties

Potter Brook, Pennsylvania (Review List 392)

Mouth: http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=18&n=4521044&e=268707&size=1&u=6&datum=na d83

 $Source: \underline{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=18\&n=4522207\&e=267203\&size=1\&u=6\&datum=nad83$

This proposal is the first of two submitted by a conservation biologist with ClearWater Conservancy, "a Centre County based land trust and natural resource conservation organization." The 2.2 km (1.4 mi) long stream flows through the Potter farm, which was established in 1792 by Fergus Potter, a relative of Revolutionary General James Potter, who had farmed and owned many acres of land in the area. Fergus Potter, the intended honoree of this new name, established a leather tannery near the stream, and one of his grandsons later became Centre County District Attorney. The Potter family still owns the property today. There are two other streams in Centre County named Potter Run, one located 11 km (7 mi) to the east of the stream in question, and the other 32 km (20 mi) to the north-northwest. A small community along the first of these streams is also named Potters Mills. Potter County is named for General Potter, as is Potter Township in Centre County. The Harris Township Board of Supervisors and the Centre County Planning Department have both submitted letters of support for the proposal for Potter Brook. The proponent does not believe the similar names will lead to any confusion because the generic terms are different. The Pennsylvania Geographic Names Board has no objection to the proposal.

V. Revised Decisions

Change <u>Anderson Hill</u> (BGN 1978) (FID 1425106) to <u>Andersen Hill</u>, Utah (Review List 387)

http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=12&n=4630380.00012535&e=380414.999997867&u=2

This proposal, submitted by a resident of Billings, Montana, is to change officially the spelling of the name of <u>Anderson Hill</u>, a summit in Box Elder County, to <u>Anderson Hill</u>. The summit has an elevation of 1,638 m (5,373 ft) and lies in the Blue Creek Valley and inside the corporate boundaries of the Town of Howell. The BGN voted in 1978 to make official the name <u>Anderson Hill</u>, but it appears the only issue at the time was a discrepancy between the singular form of the name as shown on U.S. Geological Survey maps and the plural form that appeared on Army Map Service products; no information was included in the case file regarding the derivation of the name.

The proponent of the change to <u>Andersen Hill</u> did not provide any details regarding the history of the Andersen family, but a search of the web yielded a reference to an individual named William Andersen who was farming in the Blue Creek Valley around 1906. Several other websites refer to families named Andersen in the county, but it has not been determined if they are related to the naming of the summit.

The governments of the Town of Howell and Box Elder County both submitted letters of support for the change to Andersen Hill, however, the Utah State Names Committee does not recommend approval. The State found evidence that families with both spellings have lived in the area, and without definitive evidence that the summit was named for the proponent's ancestor, they do not wish to change a long-standing published name. A copy of the proposal was sent to the Northwestern Band of the Shoshoni Nation of Utah, a Federally-recognized Tribe, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

VI. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Paradise Lake, Florida

(Review List 388)

http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=17&n=3108349.99998604&e=347406.999997468&datum=nad83&u=6

This new descriptive name was submitted by a resident of the Mandarin Lakes subdivision in northwestern Hillsborough County, who reports that the six acre manmade body of water next to his house does not have a name but should be given one, as "every lake should have a name and this one is special to us." The Hillsborough County Board of Commissioners was asked on two occasions to provide an opinion on the issue, with a follow up e-mail stating that if the County did not respond, the BGN would presume the Commissioners did not have an opinion on the issue. No response was forthcoming. The Florida State Geographic Names Authority has expressed support for the name provided there is no local opposition. A copy of this proposal was sent to the Seminole Indian Tribe of Florida, a Federally-recognized Tribe, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

There is one other geographic feature in Hillsborough County known to be named "Paradise"; a small island named <u>Paradise Key</u> lies in the southwestern corner of the county, approximately 45 km (25 mi) from the feature proposed to be named <u>Paradise Lake</u>.

Middle Fork Gold Creek, North Fork Gold Creek, Montana

(Bitterroot National Forest) (Review List 391)

Middle Fork Gold Creek:

Mouth: http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=11&n=5116451&e=715993&s=50&size=1&u=6&datum=nad 83&layer=DRG25

 $\label{eq:source:http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=11&n=5116421&e=712534&s=50&size=1&u=6&datum=nad\\83&layer=DRG25$

North Fork Gold Creek:

 $\label{lem:map:asp?z=11&n=5116670&e=717162&size=1&u=6&datum=nad83} \\ \textbf{Source:} \underline{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=11\&n=5116985\&e=713951\&s=50\&size=1\&u=6\&datum=nad83} \\ \textbf{83\&layer=DRG25} \\$

These names were submitted in association with the aforementioned proposal to change the application of the name <u>Gold Creek</u>. Although the name <u>Ward Creek</u> is applied to the southernmost branch of <u>Gold Creek</u>, the proponent believes that name should be changed so that the name Gold Creek applies to this branch. The County government, the State Names Authority, the U.S. Forest Service, and one of the proponent's neighbors all concur with the proposal as submitted provided the stream that would become "unnamed" is given an official name. After consultation with her neighbor and with the Forest Service regional geographic names liaison, the proponent agrees that the names <u>Middle Fork Gold Creek</u> and <u>North Fork Gold Creek</u> are appropriate designations for the two tributaries.

<u>Tannery Run</u>, Pennsylvania (Review List 392)

 $\label{lem:map:asp?lat=40.77694&lon=-77.78889&datum=nad83&u=6} \\ \textbf{Source:} \underline{\text{http://www.topozone.com/map.asp?z=18\&n=4517631\&e=264957\&size=1\&u=6\&datum=nad83} \\ \textbf{d83}$

The new name <u>Tannery Run</u> is proposed by the ClearWater Conservancy for a small unnamed tributary of Spring Creek in Harris Township. The 0.5 km (0.3 mi) long stream flows past the site of a tannery that operated in the late eighteenth century and which appeared on an 1874 map of the Centre County. The Conservancy reports that an official name is needed for the stream to eliminate confusion that is occurring because local residents believe it is "simply a stormwater ditch." There are two other streams and a valley in Pennsylvania named "Tannery"; <u>Tannery Creek</u> is in Carbon County, 173 km (107 mi) away; <u>Tannery Hollow Run</u> is in Cambria County, 80 km (50 mi) away, and <u>Tannery Hollow</u> is in Westmoreland County, 129 km (80 mi) from the stream in question.

The Supervisors of Harris Township and the Centre County Planning Department have both submitted letters in support of this proposal, while the Pennsylvania Geographic Names Board has no objection.