

**U. S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES**  
**DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE**  
Seven Hundred and Thirtieth Meeting  
Department of the Interior, Room 7000B  
June 9, 2011 – 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 (Acting Chair – not voting)
Bruce Johnson	Library of Congress
Elizabeth Kanalley	Department of Agriculture (U.S. Forest Service)
Curtis Loy	Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey)
Douglas Vandegraft	Department of the Interior (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement)
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  
Gregory Winters, U. S. Geological Survey

Guests

William McNulty, National Geographic Maps

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 9:35 a.m. In the chair's absence, Gilbert served as chair for the meeting.

2. Minutes of the 729<sup>th</sup> Meeting

The minutes of the 729<sup>th</sup> meeting, held May 12<sup>th</sup>, were approved with minor editorial corrections. The vote for Sam Clemens Cove was corrected to show the chair voted to break a tie.

3. Reports

3.1 BGN Chairman (Hébert)

In Chairman Hébert's absence, Yost reported there were no items for the BGN Chairman's report.

### 3.2 BGN Executive Secretary (Yost)

The full Board on Geographic Names meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 19<sup>th</sup>, most likely at the State Department. Further details are to follow.

### 3.3 Special Committee on Communications (Westington)

Caldwell, reporting for Westington, informed the Board there were no items to report.

### 3.4 Executive Secretary (Yost)

After further examination, the proposal for Clovis Crater, Michigan proposal (Review List 403) was sent by DNC staff to NOAA for clarification. Specifically, staff questioned whether the feature exists, and whether it was conceivable that it was created by an impact meteor as the proponent claims. Several USGS geologists were also consulted, all of whom disputed the proponent's theory. NOAA determined that the appearance of a crater-like feature on Google Earth was in fact an anomaly in the bathymetric dataset, and that the feature does not actually exist. The "crater" does not appear on NOAA charts. The proponent has been informed of the discovery and has been advised that the case is closed unless he can provide a justification to continue with the case.

The Saguache County (Colorado) Commissioners have informed the Board that they no longer wish to provide input on geographic name issues in their county.

At the April meeting, it was decided that the DNC could not accept a proposal, submitted by the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB), that included a non-Roman character from the Umatilla language. Several DNC members questioned why the proposal was not simply amended to the alternative form suggested by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, which had submitted the name with the non-Roman character to the OGNB. Yost explained that the DNC cannot amend a proposal and because the name was submitted by the OGNB, it was appropriate to return it to them with an indication that the name cannot be accepted as submitted. The OGNB has not yet responded, but is scheduled to meet on June 25<sup>th</sup>.

Following the decision by the DNC in May to reject the proposal for Sam Clemens Cove in Nevada, the staff has received feedback from the proponent and other supporters of the name, including the Nevada Board on Geographic Names, expressing their displeasure with the decision. There were also several articles in the media recounting the decision. At his request, a copy of the case summary was forwarded to the proponent. All parties were advised that the proposal cannot be revisited unless new evidence is submitted.

Yost thanked the DNC members who participated in the DNC meeting held at The National Map Users Conference in person and by teleconference. It was noted that this teleconference was the first meeting of its type by the DNC.

Yost asked for a show of hands of how many members believe they will be able to attend the Council of Geographic Names Authorities meeting in Hawaii in October. Three members expressed a good likelihood they will be there and one or two others indicated

they were hopeful. The COGNA Executive Committee must decide by late July whether there is a significant enough commitment to proceed. Yost urged those who are planning to attend to make their hotel reservation.

### 3.5 Staff Report (Runyon)

The 2011 cycle for the Department of Justice (DOJ) Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grant program recently closed. The program, which is in its third year, was initiated as part of the economic stimulus program. The DOJ requires the GNIS Feature ID number be listed in the grant application. It was noted that the inquiries were fewer than in previous years. Yost and Runyon thanked the Census Bureau for their assistance in processing municipal updates in support of the COPS grant applications. The members discussed the need to forward GNIS instructions to the DOJ should the program be repeated in the future.

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

Yost reported the USGS National Geospatial Program (NGP) hopes to schedule a geographic names technical exchange meeting sometime this summer, with a focus on the inclusion of administrative feature names in The National Map via GNIS. Yost provided a brief description of the NGP Structures dataset, and noted that by definition there is some duplication but that the GNIS and Structures teams, both staffed in Denver, have developed processes to coordinate their efforts and ensure data integration. Nonetheless, there seems to be a desire within NGP to incorporate new datasets from data partners at the expense of existing GNIS data. It is possible this new data does not comply with BGN naming standards, nor is there an effective means to verify coordinates and other attributes. In addition, a considerable amount of historical information would be lost if existing entries are “flushed” from GNIS. A lengthy discussion of the implications ensued. Several DNC members expressed concerns regarding the addition of data without adherence to established standards. They also questioned the role of the Federal Geographic Data Committee and the National Archives in preserving historical data. Other concerns that were raised involved the importance of the FEMA Hazus data and the availability of data in Freedom Web. Yost suggested it would be helpful if some DNC members could attend the NGP meeting to represent the BGN and to explain its toponymic policies.

Vandegraft reported he will be attending the ESRI Users Conference in July, where he will specifically discuss boundary issues with the USGS Boundaries representative and working group. Caldwell will also be at the conference, which is scheduled to take place the same week as the next DNC meeting. Vandegraft also reported that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will have a new DNC member; Sean Killen, who has attended previous DNC meetings while on detail in the DC office, has assumed the position of FWS chief cartographer, and will start in his new position on June 20<sup>th</sup>.

### 3.7 Principles, Policies, and Procedures (PPP) Review (Logan)

The Acting Chairman reviewed Chapter 2 of the PPP, specifically Principles II, III, IV, and VI. Minor editorial changes were noted. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to accept the aforementioned principles in concept. After some discussion, it

was agreed that the DNC would hold a regular meeting in July, but dedicate its August meeting to an extensive PPP review in lieu of a docket.

### 3.8 Special Committee on Native Names and Tribal Consultation (Kanalley)

The Special Committee did not meet in May, but is scheduled to hold a meeting later today. The Committee is close to completing a draft document that describes policies related to geographic features located wholly on tribal lands, and is also drafting a policy for features that exist on both tribal and non-tribal lands. A Q&A document is also close to completion.

### 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 (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 Docketed Names**

**Deadman Peak**, Colorado (Rio Grande National Forest/Sangre de Cristo Wilderness, and Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve) (Review List 403)

A motion was made and seconded not to approve this proposal, citing a lack of need to override the wilderness policy.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

**Golden Lotus Mountain**, Colorado (San Isabel National Forest) (Review List 403)

A motion was made and seconded not to approve this proposal, citing a lack of need to override the wilderness policy.

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

A motion was made and seconded to group together the proposals for **Frontier Visions Peak** and **Padre Peak**, Colorado (Rio Grande National Forest/Sangre de Cristo Wilderness) (Review List 401)

Vote: 6 in favor  
1 against  
2 abstentions

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

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

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

#### Jeffords Peak, Arizona (Review List 404)

A motion was made, seconded, and passed by consensus to defer a decision on this proposal, citing a need to review a map of the feature. The staff will prepare a map and include this proposal on next month's docket.

### IV. Revised Decisions – none

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

#### Willow Waters, Florida (Review List 390) (FID 2680823)

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

Vote: 7 in favor  
2 against  
0 abstentions

The dissenting votes cited the lack of widespread support for the name.

#### Ashokan Ridge, New York (Review List 403) (FID 2680824)

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

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

#### Wolf Run, Ohio (Review List 405) (FID 2680825)

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

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

#### Newtown Creek, Virginia (Review List 406) (FID 2680827)

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

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

Old Wharf Cove, Virginia (Review List 405) (FID 2680828)

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

Vote: 9 in favor  
0 against  
0 abstentions

5. Closing

Location and Time of Next Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 11:57 a.m. The next meeting of the DNC will take place Thursday, July 14, 2011, at the Main Department of Interior Building in Washington D.C.

(signed) *Louis A. Yost*

---

Louis A. Yost, Executive Secretary

APPROVED  
(signed) *William G. Logan*

---

William G. Logan, Chairman  
Domestic Names Committee

U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES  
DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE  
DOCKET  
June 2011

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

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

Deadman Peak, Colorado

(Review List 403)

(Rio Grande National Forest/Sangre de Cristo Wilderness, and Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=37.896090&p\\_longi=-105.555310](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=37.896090&p_longi=-105.555310)

This proposal is to make official the name Deadman Peak for a 13,384 foot summit located in the Sangre de Cristo Mountains in Saguache County, and along the boundary between Rio Grande National Forest and Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve, both of which are designated wilderness areas. The proposed name refers to the summit's proximity to Deadman Lakes. According to the proponent, there are four unnamed peaks with an elevation over 13,000 feet that overlook the lakes, with this being the most prominent and the least accessible (hence the appropriateness of the name). The proposed name was posted recently on the [summitpost.org](http://summitpost.org) and [pikespeakphoto.com](http://pikespeakphoto.com) websites; however, one other source applies the name to a different peak: the Fall 2008 edition of *The Colorado Bird Atlas Quarterly* applies "the unofficial name Deadman Peak" to another nearby summit that is proposed to be named Golden Lotus Mountain (q.v.). (Despite the proponent's claims, the latter peak is actually closer to Deadman Lakes.)

Although both summits lie within an area designated as wilderness, the proponent suggests the names are warranted in order to eliminate confusion between names that have come into use within the mountain climbing community, and to aid in search and rescue efforts. He adds, "I think that your section 1 of the policy is not constructive, and in fact, may be dangerous for the hikers who get lost in the wilderness areas. This is not about building roads or any other infrastructure in those protected areas. This is about giving names to unmarked features in wilderness so that it is easier to describe a specific geographical point other than giving GPS coordinates."

When asked to comment, the Saguache County Commissioners responded, "We [no longer] wish to comment on new name or name change requests." The Colorado Mountain Club (CMC) does not recommend approval of the proposed name, stating, "The CMC generally supports the BGN's policy of not naming features in wilderness areas unless an overriding need exists. There is no overriding need." The CMC also disputes the proponent's claim that the name Deadman Peak is appropriate, given that it overlooks Pole Creek Lake rather than Deadman Lakes. Finally, "[It] is not necessary to put a name on 'peak 13,384' to identify where someone is located for search & rescue, etc. In essence, 'peak 13,384' is a name."

The Colorado Board on Geographic Names, the U.S. Forest Service, and the National Park Service also do not support the proposal, all citing a lack of evidence that the name warrants an exception to the BGN's Wilderness Policy. According to the NAGPRA Native American Consultation Database, there are no Federally-recognized tribes with an interest in Saguache County.

The Geographic Names Information System (GNIS) lists 63 features in Colorado with the words "Deadman" or "Deadmans" in their names, including six in Saguache County (three streams, a valley, a camp, and the aforementioned lakes). Four of the features in the State are summits: two named Deadman Hill, one Deadmans Hill, and Deadman Butte.

**Frontier Visions Peak**, Colorado

(Review List 401)

(San Isabel National Forest)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=38.753447&p\\_longi=-106.267576](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=38.753447&p_longi=-106.267576)

The new name Frontier Visions Peak is proposed for an unnamed 13,626 foot summit in west-central Chaffee County, 9 miles southwest of the community of Buena Vista, and 1.9 miles west of Mount Princeton. The summit also lies within the San Isabel National Forest.

The name is intended "to recognize the contributions of the artists and photographers of the American West, ranging from the more well-known Charles M. Russell, Frederic Remington, Albert Bierstadt, Thomas Moran, William H. Jackson, and Ansel Adams to the less recognized Samuel Seymour and Titian Peale. The latter two individuals produced the first drawings of the Rocky Mountains in 1819, while the Missouri River paintings of another early artist, Karl Bodmar, were so accurate that for many years they were used by pioneers traveling west." As the proponent reports, "[Bodmar's] depictions of the Mandan Indian tribe recorded a way of life before they were decimated by a smallpox epidemic." Another early painter of Indian culture was Alfred Jacob Miller. Also during the 1840's, "Seth Eastman, a soldier/artist produced a monumental collection of 275 illustrations pertaining to Indian life on the plains." Numerous other artists and photographers are cited in the proposal as having made contributions to the early knowledge of the West, many of them having accompanied the early explorers and surveyors. "[Their] photography... proved to be instrumental in capturing amazing images of that unspoiled land." William Jackson "amassed a collection that included images of railroads, mining camps, and the growth of boomtowns such as Leadville, Georgetown, and Denver."

As the proponent notes, "These individuals headed west armed, not primarily with rifles and ammunition. On the contrary they outfitted themselves with canvas, pencil, paintbrush, and cameras. Their work was hard, at times quite dangerous, and very time consuming. But the results of their incredible efforts have endowed us with a priceless panorama of the old West. To honor their work with the naming of Frontier Visions Peak would be a most fitting gesture." An additional proposal, by the same

proponent, would apply the new name Padre Peak (q.v.) to another summit in the area.

The Chaffee County Board of Commissioners recommends approval of the proposed name Frontier Visions Peak. However, the Colorado Board on Geographic Names does not support it, citing a lack of “a justifiable reason to name the peak, as well as there is no Colorado or even county connection.” The U.S. Forest Service also does not support the proposal, citing a lack of a need to name the feature. A copy of the proposal was sent to the following tribes, each of which is Federally recognized: the Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, the Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

**Golden Lotus Mountain**, Colorado  
(Rio Grande National Forest/Sangre de Cristo Wilderness)  
(Review List 403)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=37.907265&p\\_longi=-105.559087](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=37.907265&p_longi=-105.559087)

This is the second of two proposals submitted to make official names for two summits in Saguache County (the first is Deadman Peak (q.v.)). This 13,050 foot peak, proposed to be named Golden Lotus Mountain, also lies in the Rio Grande National Forest/Sangre de Cristo Wilderness, 0.8 miles north of the peak proposed to be named Deadman Peak.

The proponent reports that both names have come into use by the mountain climbing community and both are published at websites such as summitpost.org and pikespeakphoto.com. The name also appeared in a 2003 volume entitled *The Essential Guide to Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve* (Winger and Winger); it states, “This appealing little summit has the unofficial name of Golden Lotus Mountain and has a perfect, pyramidal shape, with a lovely lake nestled beneath each of its three identical faces.” Because there is some confusion regarding which name applies to which peak, and in order to assist with search and rescue efforts, the proponent believes official names are needed. He does not know the origin of the name Golden Lotus Mountain, although presumably it is a descriptive reference.

The Saguache County Commissioners do not have an opinion on the proposal. The Colorado Mountain Club (CMC) does not recommend approval of the proposed name, citing the Wilderness Policy, as well as a belief that the casual reference to “Deadman Peak” is sufficient, and there is no historical precedent for Golden Lotus Mountain. Finally, “it is not necessary to put a name on “peak 13,050” to identify where someone is located for search & rescue, etc. In essence, “peak 13,050” is a name.”

The Colorado Board on Geographic Names and the U.S. Forest Service also do not support the proposal, citing a lack of evidence that the name warrants an exception to the BGN’s Wilderness Policy. According to the NAGPRA Native American

Consultation Database, there are no Federally-recognized tribes with an interest in Saguache County.

**Padre Peak**, Colorado

(Review List 401)

(San Isabel National Forest/ Rio Grande National Forest)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=38.3486&p\\_longi=-106.1925](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=38.3486&p_longi=-106.1925)

The new name Padre Peak is proposed for a 12,228 foot peak located along the boundary between San Isabel National Forest and Rio Grande National Forest. It is intended to recognize the priests who accompanied the Spanish explorers of early America, such as Francisco Coronado, Joao Cabrillo, and Juan Bautista de Anza. Some of the individuals named in the proposal are Frey Marcos de Niza, “who explored the areas that would be Arizona and New Mexico as early as 1539. His inspiration encouraged Coronado to explore the Southwest for the fabled seven gold cities of Cebola.” Friar Bartolome de Las Casas was the first priest ordained in the New World. “For several decades he petitioned the Spanish crown to treat the native populations with kindness rather than hostility. He earned the title Protector of the Indians.” Others who contributed to the development of the west included Father Eusibio Francisco Kino, who brought cattle and seeds as a way to promote friendship with the O’odham tribe. Father Salvatierro established a mission at Baja, California. In 1769, Father Junipero Serra accompanied a journey known as the “Sacred Expedition” to found the missions of Alta California and San Diego de Alcalá. Many other priests are mentioned in the proposal, all of whom “endured numerous hardships in an unforgiving and uncharted land. Armed with simple faith and humility their efforts continue to shape our modern history. The naming of Padre Peak would be a most appropriate gesture of thanks to them.”

The proponent reports that the peak is sometimes known informally as Sheep Mountain Northeast (it lies at one end of Sheep Mountain, an approximately three mile long ridge), and that name does appear in one online listing of “Colorado Peak Statistics.” The government of Saguache County responded that it does not support the proposal for Padre Peak, citing a lack of evidence the summit needs to be named. The county also does not see a need to make official the name Sheep Mountain Northeast.

The U.S. Forest Service also does not support the proposal, citing a lack of a need to name the feature. The Colorado Board on Geographic Names also does not support the name, citing the U.S. Forest Service’s recommendation; the lack of input from the county or the Colorado Mountain Club (which did not respond to three requests for comment); a belief that there is no need to name the sub-peaks; the name Sheep Mountain is sufficient for the entire feature; and no historical or commemorative tie to the feature.

A copy of the proposal was sent to the following tribes, each of which is Federally recognized: the Arapaho Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, the Southern Ute Indian Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation,

the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah & Ouray Reservation, and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation. 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

#### Jeffords Peak, Arizona

(Review List 404)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=32.529587&p\\_longi=-111.040684](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=32.529587&p_longi=-111.040684)

The new name Jeffords Peak is proposed for a 4,696 foot summit in the Tortolita Mountains approximately 20 miles north of Tucson. The new name is intended to honor Thomas Jeffords (1832-1914), the U.S. Army scout, Indian agent, and stagecoach driver in the Arizona Territory. According to the proponent, “Jeffords enabled the US government to negotiate a peace treaty with the Apache chief Cochise in 1872. This is significant because Cochise was the only native American to come to terms with the US without having been defeated on the field of battle. Jeffords showed great courage and initiative in first having a relationship with Cochise, and then in being willing to bring US Army officers into the Dragoon Mountains to actually propose and negotiate the peace treaty. This agreement resulted in peace and stability for Southeast Arizona for the very first time, and lasted through the death of Cochise in 1874 until the revolt and defeat of Geronimo many years later. Tom Jeffords was widely vilified as an Indian lover by the Tucson press...” He later became deputy sheriff in Tombstone.

The unnamed summit is a few miles southeast of Owl Head Buttes, where Jeffords acquired a homestead and prospected for gold during the last 22 years of his life. The 1950’s film and television series *Broken Arrow* portrayed the lives of Cochise and Jeffords. Jeffords Point, 260 miles away in Coconino County, was named by the BGN in 1932 and also honors Jeffords. The proponent believes it is appropriate to name a second feature in the area where he spent so many years.

The Arizona Board on Geographic and Historic Names (AZBGHN) recommends approval of the proposal. As part of its research, the AZBGHN contacted the Pinal County Supervisors on two occasions, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. The Arizona State Land Department does not have any objections. The AZBGHN also forwarded the proposal to the AkChin Indian Community, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Apache Nation, the Gila River Indian Community, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe and the Tohono O’odham Nation, all of which are Federally recognized. However, no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

### IV. Revised Decisions - none

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

#### Willow Waters, Florida

(Review List 390)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=27.79083333333333&p\\_longi=-80.50083333333333](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=27.79083333333333&p_longi=-80.50083333333333)

The new name Willow Waters is proposed for a three-acre body of water located in the unincorporated community of Sebastian in the northeastern corner of Indian River County. The proponent, a local resident, suggests the feature needs a name because she and her neighbors have no other way to refer to it. She reports that she chose the name because of the willow trees that line the feature.

The Indian River County Commissioners were asked on two occasions to comment on the proposal, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion. The Florida State Names Authority has no objection, but citing the lack of county input recommended that the proponent solicit additional local support. She was advised of this request, after which two neighbors submitted e-mails endorsing the name. When advised of the county's lack of input, the proponent commented, "The lack of response could also be interpreted as a lack of objection. These governmental bodies simply may not care. Should the name have been objectionable, you can be certain that you would have gotten an expedited response." Finally, "This pond now has a playground for children [which] serves as a meeting place for children and families." One of the neighbors added, "A name is a great way to differentiate this pond from all the others."

A copy of the proposal was sent to the Seminole Tribe of Florida, which is Federally recognized. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

If approved, this would be the first occurrence of the generic term "Waters" for a geographic feature in Florida. There are five others nationwide, four lakes and one reservoir, with that generic.

**Ashokan Ridge**, New York

(Review List 403)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=41.968744&p\\_longi=-74.138210](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=41.968744&p_longi=-74.138210)

This proposal is to apply the new name Ashokan Ridge to an unnamed ridge in the Town of Hurley in Ulster County. The three mile long ridge has an elevation of 942 feet and overlooks Ashokan Reservoir. It also lies within the boundaries of Catskill State Park. Other features in the immediate area named "Ashokan" include a small unincorporated community directly across the reservoir, as well as Ashokan Dam that forms the reservoir. The Ashokan Center, a 372-acre outdoor and environmental education facility, is located a short distance to the southwest of the southern end of the ridge. "Ashokan" reportedly means either "Place of many fishes" or "Where waters converge."

The Town of Hurley Board of Supervisors and the Ulster County Legislature both support the proposal. The New York Geographic Names Committee has no objection, but defers to local opinion. The Regional Director of the New York Department of

Environmental Conservation/Office of Natural Resources, which manages the State Park, supports the proposal. According to the NAGPRA Native American Consultation Database, there are no Federally-recognized tribes with an interest in Ulster County.

**Wolf Run**, Ohio  
(Review List 405)

Mouth:[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=41.3476400000&p\\_longi=-82.3467500000](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=41.3476400000&p_longi=-82.3467500000)

Source:[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=41.3366998140&p\\_longi=-82.3672842240](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=41.3366998140&p_longi=-82.3672842240)

This 2.8 mile long stream, proposed to be named officially Wolf Run, heads in Florence Township in Erie County; it flows north, turns northeast, then finally southeast to enter the Vermillion River 5.4 miles south-southeast of its confluence with Lake Erie. According to the proponent, the name Wolf Run has been in local use for 60 years. Wolves have been seen in Florence Township and Erie County since the first settlers arrived.

The Florence Township Supervisors were asked to comment on the name but did not respond which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue. The Erie County Board of Commissioners responded in support of the name. The Ohio Geographic Names Authority has no objection. A copy of the proposal was sent to the Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Delaware Nation, the Forest County Potawatomi Community, the Hannahville Indian Community, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma, and the Wyandotte Nation, all of which are Federally recognized. Of these, only the Delaware Nation responded, in support of the name. The lack of response from the other tribes is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

According to GNIS, there are 77 geographic features in Ohio with the word “Wolf” in their name. None of these are in Erie County. 41 are streams with “Wolf” in their name; of these 16 are named Wolf Run. The closest is in Wayne County, approximately 30 miles distant.

**Newtown Creek**, Virginia  
(Review List 406)

Mouth:  
[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=36.851552&p\\_longi=-76.183491](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=36.851552&p_longi=-76.183491)

Source:  
[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=36.8304847&p\\_longi=-76.200729](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=36.8304847&p_longi=-76.200729)

This 1.9 mile long stream, proposed to be named Newtown Creek, heads in the neighborhood of Newtown in the City of Norfolk and flows south-southwest to enter the Elizabeth River at Pleasant Point. The proponent, an environmental scientist with an architecture and engineering firm in Norfolk, reports that his company

recently adopted the stream as part of the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation's Adopt-A-Stream Program. He believes it is fitting that it should be named in association with the community through which it flows.

The City of Norfolk conducted extensive research into the history of the stream. The City Historian uncovered a 1919 index to a map of Norfolk and Princess Anne Counties that referred to the stream as Newtown Creek. The same source described the town of Newtown as having been "established in 1697 with a church, courthouse and several other houses and stores." The index also referred to the stream as Hoskins Creek. Another map, entitled "Map of Norfolk and Vicinity" (Lathrop, 1860), labeled the stream Mosleys' Creek. Yet another name, Mill Creek, appeared on a 1944 subdivision plat. In conclusion, the City stated, "It is our opinion that the proper historical and geographic names [sic] of the Creek should be "Newtown Creek"." The Virginia Geographic Names Board, after confirming that no other names are applied to State maps or deeds, and after determining that the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries has no opinion, recommends approval of the proposed name. According to the NAGPRA Native American Consultation Database, there are no Federally-recognized tribes with an interest in the City of Norfolk.

A search of GNIS revealed 220 features in Virginia using the word "Newtown" in their name or variant name. None are streams nor are any located within the City of Norfolk.

**Old Wharf Cove, Virginia**  
(Review List 405)

[http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p\\_lat=36.85111111111111&p\\_longi=-76.49527777777778](http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=36.85111111111111&p_longi=-76.49527777777778)

The new name Old Wharf Cove is proposed for a small bay located along Bennett Creek, 3.2 miles upstream of its confluence with the Nansemond River, and adjacent to the community of Bennett Harbor in the City of Suffolk. The proposed name refers to that of the road that runs along the south side of the bay. According to the proponent, Old Wharf Road provided access to the wharf that was used by traders traveling through the area. He reports that local residents are working to dredge and restore this body of water.

The government of Nansemond Borough, speaking on behalf of the City of Suffolk, responded that it does not have an opinion on the issue. The Virginia Geographic Names Board confirmed that there is no name for the stream on any local or State maps, and also determined that the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries has no opinion on the issue. Citing an apparent lack of local opposition, the State Board recommends approval of the name. According to the NAGPRA Native American Consultation Database, there are no Federally-recognized tribes with an interest in the City of Suffolk. GNIS does not list any other features in Virginia with "Old Wharf" in their names.