

U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE

Seven Hundred and Forty-Sixth Meeting

Department of the Interior, Room 7000A

October 11, 2012 – 9:30 a.m.

Members and Deputy Members in Attendance

Eric Berman	Department of Homeland Security (Federal Emergency Management Agency)
Douglas Caldwell	Department of Defense (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
Jon Campbell	Department of the Interior (U.S. Geological Survey)
Michael Fournier	Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census)
Tony Gilbert	Government Printing Office (Chairman) (not voting)
Bruce Johnson	Library of Congress
Betsy Kanalley	Department of Agriculture (U.S. Forest Service)
Sean Killen	Department of the Interior (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service)
Patrick Mahoney	Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management)
William Logan	Department of Homeland Security (U.S. Coast Guard)
Michael Shelton	Department of the Interior (National Park Service)
Doug Vandegraft	Department of the Interior (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management)
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

Maria McCormick, U.S. Geological Survey (via teleconference)

Jane Messinger, U.S. Geological Survey (via teleconference)

Jennifer Runyon, U.S. Geological Survey

Greg Winters, U.S. Geological Survey

Guests

Paul Holeva, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Matt Murdock, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 9:34 a.m. The Chair announced he would not be voting, except in the case of a tie.

2. Minutes of the 745th Meeting

The Minutes of the 745th meeting of the Domestic Names Committee, held September 13, 2012, were approved as submitted.

3. Reports

3.1 BGN Chairman (Logan)

A letter has been sent by the Domestic Names Committee to the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey National Geospatial Program (NGP), expressing the DNC's concerns regarding the new NGP policy

directive on the maintenance of administrative features in the Geographic Names Information System (GNIS). No response has yet been received although it is understood that one may be forthcoming.

The next meeting of the full BGN will take place October 23rd at the Department of the Interior at 1:30 p.m. Logan invited member agencies to offer meeting sites for 2013; several locations have been put forth and are being considered. The October 2013 meeting is likely to take place at the State Department to coincide with the BGN's annual meeting with the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names for British Official Use.

Caldwell reported that the BGN Executive Committee met at the U.S. Geological Survey on September 25th to discuss commemorative naming by the advisory committees on Antarctic Names and Undersea Features. The committee agreed that ACUF and ACAN should submit case material five business days prior to the full BGN meeting to allow sufficient time for review and possible questions. The issue will be further discussed at the forthcoming BGN meeting.

The Executive Committee also asked that the BGN's bylaws be reviewed prior to their transmittal to the Secretary of the Interior for concurrence; Caldwell will distribute a copy and provide a deadline for final comments.

Logan has also proposed that the BGN prepare an annual report on its activities for the Secretary; the DNC agreed this was a good idea.

3.2 BGN Executive Secretary (Yost)

Yost reported on ongoing issues with the increased use of third party vendor software by Federal agencies. In many instances, it has been demonstrated that names shown on these products do not comply with BGN standards, which leads to unofficial names being applied to Federal products. The Foreign Names Committee noted that this is also an issue for its member agencies. It was recommended that a letter be written to the Secretary of the Interior asking him to remind all Federal departments and agencies of BGN principles and policies. Westington expressed concerns that many agencies are developing their own Web mapping services with their own background map layers and that there is little attention paid to geographic names. Caldwell suggested that once educated, most agencies are willing to correct the problem, and that this further highlights a general lack of awareness of the importance of toponymic standardization. It was further noted that names in GNIS were collected primarily for gazetteer purposes and that there is a perception that the data is not precise enough for map placement. If errors are uncovered, agencies and contractors should be encouraged to provide feedback.

3.3 Communications Committee Report (Westington)

Westington reported that the BGN has a very limited supply of its tri-fold brochures. Berman offered to print more copies, and noted that they will be distributed at the Department of Homeland Security GIS Expo, scheduled to take place at the U.S. Department of Agriculture on November 16th. He added that all Federal agencies are invited to attend the Expo. The BGN staff will also provide The National Map geographic names factsheets for distribution at the Expo.

3.4 Executive Secretary's Report (Yost)

Yost informed the Committee that the proposal to name a barrier island in Brevard County is awaiting final comments and should be ready for presentation to the Committee for a vote next month.

Yost distributed an article from *The Washington Post* regarding a possible name change for Tysons Corner, an unincorporated community in Fairfax County, Virginia (to simply Tysons). Another article described the ongoing dispute between Japan and South Korea regarding the official name of Liancourt Rocks.

The BGN staff received a telephone inquiry regarding U.S. Senator Murkowski's bill to change the name of Mount McKinley to Mount Denali. There are two conflicting bills in Congress regarding the feature, one to retain the name Mount McKinley and another to change the name of the summit to Mount Denali. The members were reminded that as long as the issue is pending before Congress, the BGN cannot act on it.

Noting that the January meeting of the DNC coincides with the last week of the Federal leave year, it was suggested that the meeting be canceled. A motion was made and seconded to cancel the meeting; the motion was approved unanimously.

Yost reported that he and Trent Palmer of the Foreign Names Committee had attended the annual meeting of the Geographical Names Board of Canada, held in late September in Québec City. As always, it was a worthwhile and informative meeting. One of the reports presented at the meeting addressed the use of only Inuit names on maps and how this has resulted in some "pushback," primarily because most map users cannot determine to what type of feature the name refers without the inclusion of a recognized generic term.

Yost confirmed that the aforementioned USGS National Geospatial Program policy directive was signed on September 24th with an effective date of October 1st. The NGP Director has requested that the BGN Executive Secretary for Domestic Names and the Director of the USGS National Geospatial Technology Operations Center (NGTOC) work together to develop a transition plan for implementation of the policy.

3.5 Staff Report (Runyon)

Review List 411, comprising 41 new name and name change proposals, was released and posted at the BGN Web site on September 20th. Review List 412 is expected to be released shortly, as the staff has already received a proposal for 40 new stream names in Tennessee, 19 name changes in Oregon from the Burns Paiute Tribe, and several counterproposals to Umatilla names, also in Oregon.

Regarding the aforementioned counterproposals, the staff has been informed that a representative of the Grant County (Oregon) Court is considering attending the next DNC meeting to once again present his concerns regarding the Oregon Geographic Names Board's approval of native names that he contends do not have local support (the same individual attended the April 2012 DNC meeting). Kanalley reported that the Forest Service regional geographic names coordinator has prepared an informational briefing for the agency's employees on how to respond to requests for support for the counterproposals.

Runyon asked the Committee whether recently received proposals for Students Branch, Veterans Island, Patriots Peak, and Heroes Creek, should be considered commemorative, and if so, whether the five-year waiting period should apply. It was the sense of the Committee that these names should not be considered commemorative in nature.

3.6 GNIS and Data Compilation Program (McCormick)

Efforts to update Hawaii names and locations are ongoing, citing a need to provide current and accurate data for new USTopo maps. Initial data submissions from Washington and Montana have been received. Sandy Hoyle of the GNIS staff in Denver is retiring at the end of the year.

As a result of a recent inquiry regarding the correct spelling of the name of a National Forest, it was noted that "authoritative datasets" often include inconsistent names and spellings, and that caution should be used

when relying on such sources. Even the legislation that establishes forests, parks, etc. does not necessary follow toponymic guidelines. An example is the name of the St. Joe National Forest; Shelton offered to investigate the original legislative wording. Kanalley noted that the Forest Service is working closely with the USGS NGTOC to incorporate files into The National Map but that names are rarely a priority.

Caldwell suggested that the BGN and its staff should compile a list of examples of the use of unofficial geographic names for inclusion in the aforementioned policy transition plan. Also, the BGN needs to be proactive in addressing the issues. Fournier reiterated that the Census Bureau continues to have concerns regarding the directive and will forward those to the NGP Director.

3.7 Special Committee on Native Names and Tribal Consultation (Kanalley)

Kanalley reported that the special committee had not met during the previous month. A meeting has been scheduled following the November DNC meeting to discuss the DNC's recent approval of the draft interim Policy X. The committee will also identify authoritative source(s) to be used to determine Tribal lands and to develop procedures on how the source(s) will be used. An agenda will be forthcoming.

3.8 Update on Revision of Principles, Policies, and Procedures (Logan)

Appendices D and E were distributed to the members and a considerable amount of feedback has been received. A vote on these appendices is scheduled for the November meeting.

Committee members interested in discussing the use of the Roman Character Set are invited to meet following the DNC meeting, and consider what constitutes the Roman character set and whether a special committee needs to be formed to address the issue.

3.9 Point Robinson

An undocketed proposal to affirm the name Point Robinson for a cape in King County, Washington, was submitted by NOAA in order to resolve inconsistencies between NOAA and USGS products, which have shown Robinson Point and Point Robinson for the same feature. A motion was made and seconded to reaffirm the name of the cape as Point Robinson.

Vote: 11 in favor
 0 against
 0 abstentions

Another member arrived at the meeting.

3.10 Hawaii Corrections

An undocketed proposal was submitted by the Hawaii Board on Geographic Names to correct the spellings of 16 names in Hawaii. A civil entity and a forest feature were among the list, so these were not presented for a decision. A motion was made and seconded to accept the Hawaii Board corrections as submitted.

Vote: 12 in favor
 0 against
 0 abstentions

One member left the meeting.

4. Docket

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 (FID) has been noted following the name.

I. Staff-Processed New Names, and Name and Application Changes agreed to by all interested parties - none

II. Disagreement on Docket Names

Change **West Branch Baron Fork** (FID 1099513) to **West Branch Barren Fork** and change **Baron Fork** (BGN 1971) (FID 70518) to **Barren Fork**, Oklahoma and Arkansas (Review List 405)

A motion was made and seconded to not approve the proposed changes, citing the lack of support by the State Names Authorities of Oklahoma and Arkansas and a lack of a compelling reason to change two longstanding names.

Vote: 11 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

A motion was made and seconded to reaffirm the name **Baron Fork** and affirm the name **West Branch Baron Fork** as 2012 BGN decisions.

Vote: 8 in favor
3 against
0 abstentions

Angel Island vs. **Kingbird Island**, **Bird Island** vs. **Osprey Island**, **Coconut Island** vs. **Cormorant Island**, and **Dyke Island** vs. **Marsh Wren Island**, Virginia (George Washington Memorial Parkway/Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve) (Review Lists 409, 410)

A motion was made and seconded to consider each set of name proposals separately.

Angel Island (FID 2741705) vs. **Kingbird Island**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the name **Angel Island**.

Vote: 10 in favor
1 against
0 abstentions

The vote against the motion cited a belief that neither name was preferable.

Bird Island (FID 2741706) vs. **Osprey Island**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the name **Bird Island**.

Vote: 7 in favor

4 against
0 abstentions

The votes against the motion cited a belief that the name Bird Island was overly generic.

Coconut Island (FID 2741707) vs. **Cormorant Island**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the name Coconut Island.

Vote: 7 in favor
4 against
0 abstentions

The votes against the motion cited a belief that the name did not appear appropriate for the feature.

Dyke Island (FID 2741708) vs. **Marsh Wren Island**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the name Dyke Island.

Vote: 9 in favor
2 against
0 abstentions

The votes against the motion cited a belief that the name did not appear appropriate for the feature.

III. New Commemorative Names and Changes agreed to by all interested parties - none

IV. Revised Decisions

Change **Baron Fork** (BGN 1971) (FID 70518) to **Barren Fork**, Oklahoma and Arkansas --- see category II above

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Pond of Our Lady, Connecticut (Review List 408) (FID 2741709)

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

Vote: 11 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

5. Other Business

A meeting regarding the Roman Character Set was to follow after lunch.

6. Closing

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

The next Domestic Names Committee meeting will be held November 8, 2012, at 9:30 a.m. at the Department of the Interior.

(signed) Louis A. Yost

Louis A. Yost, Executive Secretary

APPROVED
(signed) Tony Gilbert

Tony Gilbert, Chairman
Domestic Names Committee

**U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES
DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE
DOCKET
October 2012**

I. Staff-Processed New Names, and Name and Application Changes agreed to by all interested parties – none.

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

Change West Baron Fork (FID 1099513) to West Barren Fork, Oklahoma and Arkansas
(Review List 405)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglemap?p_lat=35.9142497&p_longi=-94.5427196&fid=1099513

See Category IV: Barren Fork, Oklahoma and Arkansas

Angel Island vs. Kingbird Island, Bird Island vs. Osprey Island, Coconut Island vs. Cormorant Island, and Dyke Island vs. Marsh Wren Island, Virginia
(George Washington Memorial Parkway/Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve)
(Review Lists 409, 410)

These four competing proposals were submitted in an effort to apply official names to four small islands located along the western shore of the Potomac River and within the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve. The preserve is administered by the National Park Service and managed as part of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

A research geologist with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) has proposed the names Angel Island, Bird Island, Coconut Island, and Dyke Island. The USGS first published these informal names in 2009 in Open File Report 1269, a synoptic study completed for the National Park Service. The geologist seeks to make the names official.

The President of the Friends of Dyke Marsh (FODM) has counterproposed the names Kingbird Island, Osprey Island, Cormorant Island, and Marsh Wren Island. The FODM “strongly opposes” the names submitted by the USGS geologist, stating, “We believe that the islands’ names should reflect the flora and fauna that are typically present as observed by those who frequent the area and know the preserve most intimately.” She adds, “...we are most likely the people locally most familiar with the Dyke Marsh environment, in addition to National Park Service officials. We fully agree with your view that ‘local acceptance of a name is important.’” The names proposed by FODM reflect bird populations that are found on the islands in question.

The Fairfax County Supervisors support the FODM proposals, stating, “Their proposed names, Angel, Bird, Coconut, and Dyke do not reflect the names commonly used by local residents and members of the Friends of Dyke Marsh... the Friends of Dyke Marsh recommend the following names: Osprey, Kingbird, Marsh Wren and Cormorant which reflect the names conventionally used based on the inhabitants of those islands.” The Virginia State Names Authority, following the county recommendation, supports the FODM proposals. U.S. Congressman of Virginia Jim Moran also supports the FODM proposals, though makes no mention of the USGS proposals in his letter of support. A follow-up to the Congressman was sent informing him of the two sets of proposals, but no reply was received. The Potomac Riverkeepers initially supported the USGS proposals, but after being informed of the counterproposals, the organization declared support for the FODM proposals.

The National Park Service, which manages the land that includes all four islands, supports the USGS proposals, citing local and published usage; a lack of evidence the FODM names are in local use; continuing multi-agency restoration efforts of the site; and “needless confusion” that would arise if the FODM names were adopted. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which assisted in site studies, has no opinion on either set of proposals. The Virginia Department of Inland Fisheries has no objection to either set of proposals and has no preference for either. According to NAGPRA, there are no federally recognized tribes with an interest in Fairfax County.

Angel Island vs. Kingbird Island

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=38.76&p_longi=-77.04805555555556

The name Angel Island was selected by the geologist due to conditions at this site during field studies. He states the name was chosen because “the area is filled with soft areas (mires) in which one frequently sinks knee-to-waist deep within several steps. The last island we visited for the study was not at all “hellish” or devilish to work on, but “angelic,” as it was entirely firm ground. No twisted ankles, wrenched knees, or lost boots. Field-named for a welcome change of state, rather like a far more modest version of John Wesley Powell’s naming of Bright Angel Creek in Grand Canyon.”

According to the FODM president, the name Kingbird Island was chosen because, “This island, close to shore at the gas pipeline crossing, has been observed to host breeding kingbird pairs over several years.”

Bird Island vs. Osprey Island

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=38.761944444444444&p_longi=-77.04555555555556

This permanently vegetated island is 0.1 acre in size. The USGS geologist states, “Bird Island was named for the prominent osprey nest on it; one of the FODM [Friends of Dyke Marsh] members told me it originally housed a pair of eagles.”

In proposing Osprey Island, FODM states, “This island, near the mouth of the largest gut in the marsh, contains several tall trees in one of which is a long-standing and highly visible osprey nest that has produced new clutches of osprey young in most years.”

Coconut Island vs. Cormorant Island

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=38.771111111111111&p_longi=-77.04527777777778

This island is 2.9 acres in size, and according to the USGS geologist, the name Coconut Island was selected because “a piece of flotsam (jetsam?) found on our first coring site on that island. That eponymous coconut is still at the Park, with one of the rangers. Finding such an extremely out-of-place object on the island made that particular island memorable.”

FODM proposed the name Cormorant Island because “The northeastern-most island in the marsh contains several tall trees used as roosts for dozens of double-crested cormorants every summer.”

Dyke Island vs. Marsh Wren Island

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=38.772222222222222&p_longi=-77.04666666666667

This 10-acre island is proposed to be named Dyke Island by the USGS geologist because “As we began the study in the north and took a series of cores across the marsh, we named the largest island parcel Dyke Island, to distinguish it from the (Dyke Marsh) main marshland west of it, that was attached to the shoreline and adjacent to Haul Road.” Additionally, the proponent notes, “Regarding the spelling of Dyke, it is the official spelling used by the Park Service, and presumably is an older 18th or 19th century spelling.” According to historical records, a dike was previously located in this vicinity. Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve contains the island in question.

FODM proposed Marsh Wren Island because “This large triangular island at the north end of the marsh is one of the very few remaining habitats in the marsh where the marsh wren is observed to nest. The presence there of the marsh wren is a major indicator of the health of the marsh. The marsh wren population in Dyke Marsh has declined significantly. Dyke Marsh supports the only known nesting population of marsh wrens in the upper Potomac River tidal zone, a species once found all along the marshes of the Potomac River.”

III. New Commemorative Names and Changes agreed to by all interested parties – none

IV. Revised Decisions

Change Baron Fork (BGN 1971) (FID 70518) to Barren Fork, Oklahoma and Arkansas
(Review List 405)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglemap?p_lat=35.85083&p_longi=-94.91398&fid=70518

Change West Baron Fork (FID 1099513) to West Barren Fork, Oklahoma and Arkansas
(Review List 405)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglemap?p_lat=35.9142497&p_longi=-94.5427196&fid=1099513

This proposal is to change the name of Baron Fork to Barren Fork, and change West Baron Fork to West Barren Fork.

Baron Fork is 35 miles long, heads in Arkansas, and flows westward into Oklahoma. The proposal to change its name to Barren Fork was proposed by the Administrator of the Oklahoma Scenic Rivers Commission, who reports that his agency is using the proposed name, most notably in its 2003 Special Report on the Scenic Rivers of Oklahoma. West Branch Baron Fork is a 3.6-mile-long tributary of the main stream. It heads in Washington County, Arkansas, before flowing across the state line into Adair County, Oklahoma. The tributary first appeared on the 1980 USGS topographic map.

The official name for Federal use is Baron Fork, having been approved by the BGN in 1971. That decision was made citing research conducted by the USGS field crew, who reported, “Local people agree to the recommended name and application.” The field crew also determined that most usage of the “Barren” spelling “came from old published maps,” and that the stream was most likely named for the community of Baron, which lies midway along the stream. However, they noted that an 1839 land plat had labeled the community Barron. Finally, it was noted, “One of the highway bridges on State Highway 45 has a sign calling it Baron Fork while a copper plate on the same bridge has the name Barren Fork on it.”

According to the BGN’s 1971 research, both spellings appear to have been in local and published use over the years, with USGS maps published in 1898 and 1948 showing the name Barren Fork. Other sources that labeled the stream Barren Fork included a 1953 (revised 1968) aeronautical chart, the 1967 Cherokee County (Oklahoma) highway map, and a 1968 USGS Water Supply Paper. The 1966 Ozark National Forest map labeled it Barren Fork of Illinois River, as did the Washington County (Arkansas) highway map.

Earlier sources that applied the name Barren Fork include the 1870's Asher & Adams map of Arkansas, an 1887 Map of Indian Territory, and the 1898 Atlas of the World. One source, Colton's 1855 map of Arkansas, named the stream Barrow Fork.

The "Baron" spelling has also appeared in various sources, including the 1941 American Guide Series volume on Oklahoma, which cites Baron Fork Creek. George Shirk's 1965 volume *Oklahoma Place Names* lists the community of Baron, noting "[It] was originally called Barren Fork, named for the Barren Fork of the Illinois River." Henry Gannett's 1905 *Gazetteer of Indian Territory* includes entries for: "Baron: post village in Cherokee Nation; Barren: station in Cherokee Nation; Barren Fork: left hand branch of Illinois River; and Barren Fork: station on Kansas City Southern Railroad." The Baron Post Office operated from 1895 to 1942.

In 1971, despite the more predominant use of "Barren," the USGS recommended and the BGN approved the name Baron Fork. The U.S. Forest Service also endorsed that name, noting, "The name, as locally used, is according to the proposal. The Ranger states, 'This stream takes its name from the Town of Baron, Oklahoma. Local people have always used the proposed spelling.'"

In 2006, the BGN staff was copied on an inquiry from the Oklahoma Scenic Rivers Commission, which was attempting to determine why the spelling differed between State and Federal sources. A representative of the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry noted, "The Oklahoma Scenic Rivers legislation spells it Barren Fork, but the USGS quad maps have Baron Fork. It appears that both terms are in equally common use, although possibly Baron Fork may have been the original spelling." The Oklahoma Board on Geographic Names continued to research the issue and advised the State agencies on the Federal (re) naming process, but a formal request was not submitted until recently.

Research indicates present-day usage continues to be divided. In addition to the USGS, other Federal agencies that use the name Baron Fork include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the National Weather Service. State agencies that refer to Baron Fork include the Oklahoma Conservation Commission, the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, and the Oklahoma Geological Survey. Others, however, use the name Barren Fork, including the Oklahoma Water Resources Board. A 2002 Oklahoma Senate press release referred to the stream as one of the State's six designated Scenic Rivers and named it Baron Fork River. A Web site dedicated to Oklahoma Bridges lists the Baron Fork Creek Bridge. The Web site HikerCentral.com lists a facility named Baron Fork Creek Campground. The Cherokee Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America describes one of its camps as being on the Barren Fork River.

A majority of the stream lies in Oklahoma, and so references to the section in Arkansas are fewer. In addition, there are four other streams in that State named Barren Fork. GNIS lists 25 features throughout the State of Arkansas with the word "Barren" in their current or variant names; only the stream in question plus Brush Creek, which has a variant name of Barren Fork of Illinois River, are in Washington County. In an effort to be consistent, the second proposal, to change the name of West Branch Baron Fork to West Branch Barren Fork, was initiated.

The commissioners of Adair County and Cherokee County, both in Oklahoma, were contacted by the Oklahoma State Board but did not respond, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. The Oklahoma Department of Transportation, the Oklahoma State Geographer, and the Oklahoma Water Resources Board all support the proposed change to Barren Fork and West Branch Barren Fork, while the Oklahoma Historical Society has no objection. In recommending approval of the change, the State Geographer noted that although there is a community named Baron and several businesses use that spelling, "I strongly suspect that 'Baron' is not the original name in Oklahoma. I have found reference to a Washington County, Arkansas court record of 1829 referring to Barren Creek."

However, the Oklahoma Biological Survey does not support the proposed change. The Washington County (Arkansas) Commissioners also do not support the change. The County Judge reports, “about 30 yrs ago the rivers were spelled Barren but the [Barron] family petitioned to have them [the streams] renamed Barron but it got misspelled – it was originally named after a Barron ancestor who had a farm in the area and was killed there – so the Judge would like to see the name stay as is or corrected to reflect the proper spelling of the Barron family.” When asked if they wished to submit a proposal at this time to restore the Barron spelling, the County declined to do so at this time. There is no evidence in the BGN’s files that this name change effort was submitted to the BGN, nor is there any mention of a Barron family in the 1971 case file.

The Arkansas State Names Authority and Oklahoma Board on Geographic Names do not support the proposed changes, both citing a lack of a compelling reason to change the existing names. The Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma, the Osage Nation, the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians, the Otoe-Missouria Tribe of Indians, the Sac and Fox Nation, the Cherokee Nation, and the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, all of which are federally recognized, were contacted for comments. The United Keetoowah Band do not support the proposed changes, citing historic pre-statehood use of spelling “Baron.” No other responses were received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also opposes the proposals citing potential confusion that would result from the changes and the fact that “Baron Fork is used in USACE scientific databases, hydrologic models, and water control systems.” Although not in a National Forest, the name Baron Fork appeared on the 1966 Ozark National Forest map. The U.S. Forest Service has no opinion on the proposals.

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Pond of Our Lady, Connecticut (Review List 408)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=41.5475481&p_longi=-72.0577061

This proposal is to apply the new name Pond of Our Lady to a 0.1-acre reservoir located on property owned by the proponent. The proponent states that the previous owners informed her that the pond became a swamp after a hurricane in 1938, but that it was restored in 2004 to be used as a retention area in times of flooding. The proposal was originally submitted as The Rose of Our Lady Pond. This name was chosen because the City of Norwich is often known as “the Rose of New England,” and the proponent also intends to have an area for peace and prayer. She adds, “Our nation’s greatest Marian Shrine is located in Washington, DC and dedicated to the Patroness of the US – the Blessed Virgin Mary, and Our Lady of the Guadalupe in Mexico is known as the Queen of the Americas. Dedications to our Lady is [sic] a very common practice.”

The Connecticut State Names Authority (SNA) contacted the Town of Norwich government, which supported the proposal for The Rose of Our Lady Pond. The Town Historian was unable to locate the pond on any historic maps of the area, and did not find evidence of any existing name. As such, he recommended honoring the owner’s request in naming the pond. However, the SNA did not support the name, believing it violated the BGN’s Long Names Policy.

A decision on The Rose of Our Lady Pond was deferred by the DNC in July 2012, citing the SNA’s objections and a belief that the name was indeed too long. The staff contacted the proponent to ask if a shorter name would be acceptable. She amended the name to Pond of Our Lady. In August 2012, the proposal was once again deferred by the DNC to solicit input from the Town of Norwich. The Town

Selectmen considered the amended proposal in September and has no objection. The SNA supports the amended proposal.

A copy of the proposal was sent to the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe of Connecticut and the Mohegan Indian Tribe of Connecticut, both of which are federally recognized. The Mohegan Tribe responded as having no opinion, while no response was received from the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.