

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

Seven Hundred and Eighth Meeting
Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., Room 7000B
April 9, 2009 – 9:30 a.m.

Members and Deputy Members in Attendance

Douglas Caldwell	Department of Defense (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
Mark DeMulder	Department of the Interior (U.S. Geological Survey)
Chick Fagan	Department of the Interior (National Park Service)
Lee Fleming	Department of the Interior (Bureau of Indian Affairs)
Michael Fournier	Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census)
Tony Gilbert	Government Printing Office
Robert Hiatt	Library of Congress (Chairman; not voting)
Elizabeth Kanalley	Department of Agriculture (U.S. Forest Service)
Douglas Vandegraft	Department of the Interior (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
Meredith Westington	Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey)

Ex-Officio

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

Staff

Jennifer Runyon, U.S. Geological Survey

Guests

Robert Francis, U.S. Forest Service
Steven Gardner, National Geographic Society
Nicholas Rosenbach, National Geographic Society
Michael Shelton, National Park Service

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 9:30 a.m. Kanalley introduced Robert Francis, who serves as the U.S. Forest Service Geographic Names Program Coordinator for Region 10 (Alaska). The members, deputy members, and staff introduced themselves.

2. Minutes of the 707th Meeting

The minutes of the 707th meeting, held March 12th, 2009, were reviewed, and a few corrections noted. In the fifth paragraph of 3.4, it was noted that LaSalle is in Illinois not Indiana. Item 3.6 should read "... actively to encourage," and each occurrence of "e-mail" should be corrected in accordance with GPO guidelines, to "email." The minutes were then approved as amended.

3. Communications and Reports

3.1 Chairman's Report (Kanalley)

Kanalley thanked the guests from the National Geographic Society for providing copies of surplus NGS maps for the members.

The full BGN will meet on Tuesday, April 21st at 1:30 p.m. at the U.S. Geological Survey in Reston. The NGA/State Department Tiger Team report was released to members, and the matter of the possible formation of a Senior Steering Group to review the Foreign Names Committee's procedures will be addressed. Also in attendance at the meeting will be Mr. Sungjae Choo, Associate Professor of Geography at Kyung-Hee University, who has an interest in geographic names.

3.2 BGN Executive Secretary's Report (Yost)

The Annual Conference of the Council of Geographic Names Authorities (COGNA) will take place in Charleston, South Carolina, September 8-12. A request has been received from the hosts of the conference for funds to help defray some of the conference costs. As always, there are concerns that because of budgetary and travel restrictions many States are already reporting that they will be unable to send a representative to the conference.

The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN) will meet May 5-12, 2009 in Nairobi, Kenya. Yost, Kanalley, Dillon, and Palmer are expected to participate.

The Annual Meeting of the Geographical Names Board of Canada will take place August 6-7 in Nunavut.

The Annual Geographic Names Training Course, held under the auspices of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History (PAIGH) is expected to take place in early fall in Spain.

On Monday, April 6, Ralph Ehrenberg, former BGN member from the Library of Congress paid a brief visit to the U.S. Geological Survey.

3.3 Communications Committee Report (Westington)

The Committee has not met since the last DNC meeting. However, as reported last month, the newly-created BGN poster will be displayed at the U.S. Forest Service-Bureau of Land Management Geospatial '09 Conference, to be held in Utah in late April. Kanalley, Fournier, and Runyon, as well as Joan Steber, Forest Service Geographic Names Liaison for Region 5, will present a panel discussion on geographic names, with a particular focus on how Federal agencies are involved in the naming process and how they might become more involved in GNIS maintenance.

Kanalley noted that Bonnie Gallahan will likely be attending the Summer Meeting of the National Congress of American Indians, scheduled for mid-June, where she will distribute some of the new BGN brochures. Gallahan is also developing a brief overview of the BGN

and its responsibilities for an upcoming Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) newsletter.

3.4 Executive Secretary's Report (Yost)

Fagan reported that he has received a telephone call following the DNC's rejection last month of the proposal to change the names of two drainage ditches in Illinois to Upper Salt Fork and West Salt Fork. The proponents of the change were seeking guidance as to whether they should resubmit the proposal, to which Fagan responded they would need to provide new evidence that would warrant reopening the case. Yost reported that he had also spoken with one of the proponents, and at his request had directed him to the FTP site where the BGN staff had posted copies of the material relevant to the case.

There was some discussion regarding the consequences of posting BGN material, particularly work in progress, to the USGS FTP site, which is not password-protected and thus accessible by the public. The Committee recognizes that the current Administration has asked that information produced by Federal agencies be made more available to the public and so for now it seems the FTP site should not be a concern. However, items that are in development are probably best shared via email.

The DNC staff has been kept busy over the past few weeks responding to calls and emails requesting the GNIS Feature ID (FID) for communities, tribal reservations, and other jurisdictions. This is in response to a Department of Justice Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Hiring Recovery Program (CHRP) grant, part of the Federal stimulus package, for which the application form requires the inclusion of the FID. A customized "help screen" was posted to the GNIS website. Because most of the applicants were seeking the FID for incorporated places (classified as "civil" in GNIS), staff appreciates the recent efforts by the Census Bureau to do a complete review and update of these entries in GNIS.

As has been reported in recent months, the BGN's subject files are being scanned, both for preservation and for future posting to the BGN website. There is some concern that the project is falling behind schedule, but discussions are underway with the contractor to rectify the situation. Meanwhile, during the course of preparing the files for scanning, some interesting situations have been uncovered. For example, it seems there are names in Alaska that were submitted to but rejected by the BGN, yet were published in *The Dictionary of Alaska Place Names* (USGS Professional Paper, 1967) and thus have been entered into GNIS as official names. Other names, also rejected by the BGN, have been applied to Forest Service maps and National Ocean Service charts. Staff inquired of the Committee whether these should be marked "Not Official" in GNIS. One member asked how many names were at issue (unknown), and another indicated he would like to see a list. Staff will attempt to provide additional details.

The Committee discussed whether it still wished to hold an off-site meeting in June, primarily to discuss outstanding policy issues and to allow more time for a lengthier docket. It was agreed that past meetings held at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's National Conservation Training Center in Shepherdstown have been worthwhile, and so Vandegraff will check on available dates.

3.5 Staff Report (Runyon)

At last month's meeting, Runyon reported that the newly-released Quarterly Review List had included 73 new names submitted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Omaha District for unnamed streams and lakes in the Omaha area. Since then, the staff has received another list of 73 proposed names, submitted by the Pawnee Indian Nation, and presumed to be counter-proposals to the Corps of Engineers names. These will be shared with all interested parties for comment.

The recently-passed Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 has designated an additional two million acres in nine States as "wilderness." Staff asked whether this would have any impact on proposals that are already pending on land that was not previously classified wilderness, or should these names be "grandfathered"? The Committee determined this issue should be discussed at the Shepherdstown meeting.

3.6 GNIS and Data Compilation Program (Yost)

Domestic and Foreign Names Committee staff continue to participate in discussions with the FGDC and the State of Montana regarding the development of a Web Feature Service-Gazetteer Protocol.

The General Services Administration recently submitted to the USGS Geographic Names Office a large file of GSA Codes, which will be incorporated into GNIS. GSA has indicated it will broadcast its use of GNIS amongst its partners and will continue to participate in GNIS maintenance.

On April 7th, Yost attended a meeting of the USGS Geospatial Liaisons at the NCTC in Shepherdstown. Discussions focused on data integration among the various layers of *The National Map*, and presentations were made on the updated USGS graphics program. One issue that was discussed is the development of a "cartographic database" which will store the location of text placement at a scale of 1:24,000. Comparisons were made to the Forest Service's INFRA database. USGS is planning to produce and release new graphics on a three-year revision cycle.

3.7 Review of Tribal Consultation Letter (Yost/Fagan)

The Committee continued its review of the letter that will be sent to each of the Federally-recognized Tribes, informing them of the online availability of the BGN's Quarterly Review List. As before, some of the discussion focused on how to process proposals for features located wholly on Tribally-owned lands. Fagan welcomed DNC deputy member Fleming to the meeting, and the Committee thanked him for being available to provide input to the discussion.

Fleming reported that he had brought with him a copy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' guidelines, which are quite extensive regarding policy development. It is generally agreed that wherever possible Tribal authorities should be involved in policy development as early in the process as is feasible. The basic question to be asked is whether the BGN is informing Tribes of an existing policy, or involving them in the development of a new policy? If the former, the letter as written is essentially good, as it reaffirms existing

procedures. Citing the docket for this meeting, Fleming continues to be impressed by the staff's efforts at soliciting Tribal input. He suggests the proposed new procedure should be formalized in the DNC's *Principles, Policies, and Procedures* (PPP) document.

Fagan, once again citing Executive Order 13175, noted that it is appropriate for the letter to distinguish between features in which a Tribe might have a general interest and those located on Tribally-owned land. In the latter situation, he believes the BGN should always defer to the Tribal government. There is still the ongoing issue of how to refer to these lands, and thus the BGN should try to locate a definitive source for such information. Fournier reminded the Committee that the Census Bureau has maps showing current Tribal lands. One representative of the Department of the Interior's legal staff does not believe it is appropriate to grant "carte blanche" to the Tribes, but instead Tribal authorities should be encouraged to develop their own toponymic policies and procedures. Westington reiterated her concern that if the BGN is treating each Tribal government on a Nation-to-Nation basis, will it simply accept whatever name the Tribe proposes? For example, what if the name is commemorative for a living person, or in conflict with the Duplicate Names Policy? Yost asked whether these names should even be placed on a Review List? Fournier reminded the members these names are being proposed for use on *Federal* maps and products, and so they should comply with Federal-naming policies. Fagan disagreed, contending the BGN should accept the names without exception.

It was agreed that the new consultation procedures are for Federally-recognized Tribes only, although as stated in the PPP, staff will continue to consult State-recognized Tribes and other entities if it determines they might have a specific interest in the geographic feature in question. Fleming offered to provide the most recent Tribal mailing list, including the official points of contact for each Tribe, to which Runyon noted the staff has worked diligently to develop its own list, and based on its experience, the BIA Tribal Leaders' Directory is woefully outdated and inaccurate. Fleming noted that Daisy West at the BIA is responsible for tracking updates to the contact list. Fagan asked how often there are changes, to which Fleming responded there are some pending currently.

Kanalley asked how the Committee would handle proposals from non-Tribal individuals or groups for features wholly on Tribal lands? Yost responded the DNC receives very few of these, but in accordance with Fagan's request, the Committee would still defer to the preferences of the Tribe. Caldwell noted that one potential consequence of deferring to the Tribe on all names on their reservation is that they could propose to change all non-indigenous names within their boundaries.

Kanalley noted that the new letter will put the onus on Tribal authorities to consult the online Review List and to determine which features might be in their area of historical interest. This will eliminate the large numbers of letters and emails that the staff is currently sending. Vandegraft responded that his agency appreciates being notified directly by staff of each new proposal, and wondered if in the future the new procedure might be applied to Federal and State agencies as well. The staff did not address this concern. Fleming reminded the Committee that the letter should be considered simply informational; that is, it advises the Tribes of a new procedure, not a new policy. He suggested it should state in the first paragraph that the existing process of sending a letter for each proposal would be discontinued.

After Fagan incorporates the latest suggestions into the draft letter, Fleming offered to share it with the solicitor's office at the BIA, and then he will report back to the Committee.

3.8 Review of Policy I: Names Being Considered by Congress (Yost)

Policy I reads currently, "The U.S. Board on Geographic Names will not render a decision on a name or its application if the matter is also being considered by the Congress of the United States." The Secretary of the Interior has received a letter from Alaska Representative Scott Kawasaki, requesting that the DNC revisit this policy and revise it to state that if Congress does not act on the issue by the end of six years, the DNC will proceed with a vote. This question has arisen because of the increased interest in changing the name of Mount McKinley to Denali. It is not clear whether Policy I was developed as a result of that issue, although recent staff research suggests it was already in place before the Denali proposal was initiated.

One member asked whether the current policy requires that a bill simply be introduced in to Congress or must it reach the floor for a vote? Another noted that simply by rewording the legislation essentially keeps the issue active. The Secretary of the Interior has asked the BGN to respond to Rep. Kawasaki's letter, but the consensus of the Committee is that this needs further analysis, presumably at the Shepherdstown meeting in June. Yost will compile a response accordingly.

Vandegraft offered to prepare for the June meeting a brief synopsis of the history of the naming of Mount McKinley and the State's approval of Denali; the members agreed this would be of interest.

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

Change Lake Eleanor (FID 1619841) to Lake Elinor, Michigan (Manistee National Forest) (Review List 395)

A motion was made and seconded to approve this change.

Vote: 8 in favor
 0 against
 1 abstention

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

Ursinus Glacier, Alaska (Chugach National Forest) (Review List 400)

A motion was made and seconded not to approve this proposal, citing the negative recommendations of the Alaska State Names Authority and U.S. Forest Service, and a lack of an association between the glacier and Ursinus College.

Vote: 8 in favor
1 against
0 abstentions

The negative vote was cast in the belief that the name would continue the theme of college names in the area.

Cherokee Creek, Georgia (Review List 392)

A request was made to defer a vote on this proposal, pending consultation with the Creek Indian Tribes which are believed to have had a historical interest in the area.

Davis Lake, Wisconsin (Review List 399)

A motion was made and seconded not to approve this name, citing the Duplicate Names Policy. It was suggested the name might be reconsidered if a directional, such as “North,” were to be added to the name to differentiate it from the other Davis Lake in the county.

Vote: 4 in favor
4 against
1 abstention

In order to break the tie, the Chair then voted in agreement with the motion, so the proposal is disapproved. The negative votes were cast in support of the Town government and State Names Authority, and in the belief that the two lakes were far enough apart not to cause any confusion.

At this point, one member left the meeting.

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

Odums Branch, Georgia (Review List 399)

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

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

Farnandis Branch, Maryland (Review List 400)

A request was made to defer a vote on this proposal, pending a request by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for additional time to conduct local investigation.

Moody Island, Oregon (Review List 400)

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

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

Kocmoud Lake, Wisconsin (Review List 399)

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

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

IV. Revised Decisions

Change **Swatara Creek** (FID 1189149) (BGN 1932) to **Swatara River**, Pennsylvania (Review List 397)

A motion was made and seconded not to approve this name change, citing a lack of a compelling reason to change a name in longstanding use.

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

The Committee agreed that the staff should note in the record that the existing name had been reaffirmed with a 2009 decision.

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Geese Chant Creek, Georgia (Review List 392)

A request was made to defer a vote on this proposal, pending consultation with the Creek Indian Tribes which are believed to have had a historical interest in the area.

Farmers Creek, Oregon (Review List 400)

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

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against

0 abstentions

Connor Mill Creek, Wisconsin (Review List 399)

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

Vote: 8 in favor
0 against
0 abstentions

5. Location and Time of Next Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m. The next meeting of the Domestic Names Committee will be held May 14th, 2009, at the Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Room 7000B.

(signed) *Louis A. Yost*

Louis A. Yost, Executive Secretary

APPROVED
(signed) *Curtis Loy*

Curtis Loy, Chairman
Domestic Names Committee

U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES
DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE
DOCKET
April 2009

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

Change Lake Eleanor (FID 1619841) to Lake Elinor, Michigan
(Manistee National Forest)
(Review List 395)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglemap?p_lat=44.3055603&p_longi=-86.0123026&fid=1619841

This proposal is to change the spelling of the name of Lake Eleanor in Dickson Township in Manistee County to Lake Elinor. The 15-acre lake also lies on private land within the boundaries of Manistee National Forest. The name Lake Eleanor has appeared on USGS topographic maps since 1982 and on National Forest maps since at least 1971. A 1949 Manistee National Forest lake directory also listed Lake Eleanor. The proposed change was submitted by a local realtor, who reports that the name that appears on local plat maps is Lake Elinor and that having a different spelling on Federal maps is causing confusion.

A search of the Internet suggests both spellings are in local use. The Manistee Area Chamber of Commerce has published both names, as have many area real estate companies. The Michigan Department of Natural Resources refers to the lake as Lake Eleanor, as do the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, the Dickson Township Community Park, and the Brethren Heritage Museum. However, the Arts and Culture Alliance of Manistee County reports that its annual arts festival takes place at "Lake Elinor," and the 2007 Manistee National Forest Festival was held at "Lake Elinor."

The Dickson Township Supervisors submitted a letter of support for the change to Lake Elinor, while the Manistee County Commissioners responded that they had no opinion but that the County Equalization Department should be consulted. The latter office stated it had no objection to the change, confirming that the proposed name was applied to the original land plats. The Manistee Area Chamber of Commerce supports the proposal. None of these offices were able to offer any information on the origin of either "Eleanor" or "Elinor." The Michigan State Names Authority was asked on three occasions to comment, but no response was received; the final letter noted that no response would imply "no opinion" and that the BGN would proceed with its vote.

Although the lake lies on private land within National Forest boundaries, the Regional Forester and Heritage Program Leader conducted extensive research into the naming of the lake and were able to provide an extensive chronology. A 1903 County Atlas labeled the lake Lake Kidner, while a 1934 newspaper article called it Lake Eleanor. A Manistee National Forest "Acquisition Map" from the mid-1930's showed Lake Elinor, as did a hand drawn township map from the same period. A CCC report from 1937 noted Lake Ellinor [sic] in the title, but used Lake Eleanor throughout the document. In 1938, a USFS plan referred to Lake Eleanor, as did the 1940 general highway map of Manistee County. A 1941 Geographic Name Report prepared by the Forest Supervisor described a camp on Lake

Elinor, but the letter “i” was later typed over with “ea,” and another from the same year listed “Lake Eleanor (not Lake Elinor).” The “Eleanor” spelling continued on a timber survey map in 1956, but in 1957 a Michigan Department of Conservation map reverted to Lake Elinor. A 2003 land atlas and plat book has Lake Eleanor.

In conclusion, the Regional Forester indicated the Forest Service did not have a “specific position” but suggested the BGN should consult with the Manistee County Historical Society. A representative of that organization was contacted; he responded that while he had no official opinion, evidence showed that the name on a 1904 subdivision map had been Lake Elinor. He speculated that the spelling may have been changed when Eleanor Roosevelt became First Lady.

A copy of this proposal was sent to the following Federally-recognized Tribes: the Grand River Bands of the Ottawa Nation, the Grand Traverse Band of the Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians, the Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, and the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians. In addition, a copy was forwarded to the Burt Lake Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, a State-recognized Tribe. Only the Keweenaw Bay Community responded, noting they had no opinion on the issue. The lack of response from the other Tribes is presumed to also indicate a lack of an opinion.

There are no other lakes in Michigan named “Eleanor,” while there are two others named “Elinor”; Lake Elinor is in Marquette County, and Elinor Lake is in Iron County, both on the Upper Peninsula.

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

Ursinus Glacier, Alaska
(Chugach National Forest)
(Review List 400)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=61.42&p_longi=-147.550556

This proposal is to apply the new name Ursinus Glacier to an unnamed glacier in the College Fjord area. The glacier is approximately 14 km (9 mi) long and trends generally in a southwest direction to join Harvard Glacier. The proponent is a long-time Alaska resident and alumnus of Ursinus College in Pennsylvania. He suggests assigning an official name to the feature would serve as a better reference for pilots than simply a latitude and longitude. The proposed name would continue the theme of naming glaciers in the area for colleges and universities, which began with the Harriman Expedition of 1899 (in addition to Harvard, glaciers were named “Yale,” “Vassar,” “Bryn Mawr,” “Amherst,” and “Smith”). In 1910, the BGN approved additional names for the colleges of Williams, Holyoke, Dartmouth, and Barnard, and in 1950, Lafayette Glacier was named by the BGN for Lafayette College in Pennsylvania.

Eight letters of support for the proposal for Ursinus Glacier were included with the application, primarily from colleagues of the proponent and fellow Ursinus College alumni. In addition, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the School of Environmental Studies at Ursinus support the proposal, suggesting the new name might

encourage future college field trips to the glacier, “to study ecological changeand the science, policy, ethics, and expression of human-environment interactions.”

However, the Alaska Historical Commission (AHC), which serves as the State Geographic Names Authority, does not support the proposal, noting, “[we do] not see evidence that the college had a program that brought people to Alaska, or that the college had ever had a group on the glacier proposed to be named for it. The proposed name is not descriptive, commemorative, or in local use. [We are] unable to find a convincing reason to vote for the name.”

As part of its research, the AHC sent a copy of the proposal to four Native Alaskan groups and to the City the Whittier, the City of Valdez, the Matanuska-Susitna Borough government, and to a local museum; no response was received from any of these organizations. The U.S. Forest Service also does not support the proposal, citing a lack of evidence that the name is needed for safety, a lack of an association between the college and the glacier, and a lack of local usage.

Cherokee Creek, Georgia
(Review List 392)

Mouth:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=33.552778&p_longi=-84.438889

Source:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=33.581111&p_longi=-84.451667

The new name Cherokee Creek is proposed for a 3.8 km (2.4 mi) long tributary of Camp Creek at the western edge of Clayton County. It was submitted by a water resources engineer with the Clayton County Water Authority, who suggests a name is needed “to provide identity to the stream and create public awareness of stream water quality.” The County conducted a stream-naming contest; the winning entry, submitted by a local resident, was chosen because “the area along the stream was occupied by Cherokee Indians. Artifacts are being discovered daily in this area.” A second proposal would apply the name Geese Chant Creek (q.v.) to another local stream.

The Clayton County Commissioners were asked on three occasions to comment on this proposal, but no response was received. The last communication indicated that if the county did not respond, the BGN would presume the Commissioners were aware of and in support of the Water Authority’s naming efforts.

The Georgia State Archives, which serves as the State Names Authority, responded that the State could not endorse the proposal, citing evidence that the area in which the stream is located was not traditionally Cherokee land, but was settled by the Creek Indians. Further, the artifacts being discovered are “commensurate with the Creek habit of camping and inhabiting areas along tributaries.” As part of its research, the BGN staff forwarded this proposal to the Cherokee Nation, a Federally-recognized Tribe, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

There are no other geographic features in Clayton County known to be named “Cherokee.” Elsewhere in the State, there are 71 features with the name, including two streams,

Cherokee Branch in Catoosa County and Cherokee Creek in Lincoln County. The latter is the closest and is located 197 km (122 mi) from the stream in question.

Davis Lake, Wisconsin
(Review List 399)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=45.685317&p_longi=-89.615393

This proposal, to make official the name Davis Lake, was submitted by the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council (WGNC) on behalf of two residents of Harshaw, who claim the name has been in local use for at least 50 years. The seven acre lake is in the Town of Cassian in central Oneida County. The proponent reports that although the lake has been known as Davis Lake ever since John Davis, Sr. sold the property in 1950 (he acquired it in 1920), no effort was made to make the name official until another landowner expressed an interest in naming it.

The Town of Cassian recommends approval of this proposal, as does the WGNC. There is one other lake in Oneida County, 17 km (11 mi) to the southeast of the lake in question, which is also named Davis Lake. This name appears on USGS topographic maps, but its origin is not known. There are three other lakes in the State with the same name, one each in Price County, Iron County, and Sawyer County, as well as East Davis Lake and West Davis Lake in Bayfield County. The one in Iron County is 66 km (41 mi) away, while the one in Price County is 69 km (43 mi) away.

A copy of the proposal was forwarded to the following Federally-recognized Tribes: the Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, the Bay Mills Indian Community, the Bois Forte Band (Nett Lake) of the Minnesota Chippewa Indians, the Chippewa-Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, the Fond du Lac Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Grand Portage Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Leech Lake Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Mille Lacs Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Michigan, the Sokaogon Chippewa Community, the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota, the White Earth Band of Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska. Of these, only the Mille Lacs Band responded, with a letter of support for the proposal, while the Bois Forte Band and the Red Cliff Band indicated they had no opinion on the issue. The lack of response from the other Tribes is presumed to also indicate a lack of an opinion.

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

Odums Branch, Georgia

(Review List 399)

Mouth:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=33.8618280000&p_longi=-83.2442670000

Source:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=33.8541763247&p_longi=%20-83.2383338333

The new commemorative name Odums Branch is proposed for a 1 km (0.6 mi) long unnamed tributary of Goulding Creek in Oglethorpe County. According to the proponent, William (Bill) Odum (1942-1991) was an ecologist who grew up in this area of Georgia. As the son of Eugene Odum, who was “the father of ecosystem ecology” and head of the Institute of Ecology at the University of Georgia, Bill Odum was also a productive ecologist. He specialized in freshwater wetlands and was especially concerned about the loss of small streams and wetlands.

The Oglethorpe County Commissioners have expressed support for the proposal, as has the Georgia State Names Authority. A copy of the proposal was sent to the Cherokee Nation, the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina, and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma, all of which are Federally-recognized. Of these, only the United Keetoowah Band responded, with a letter of support. The lack of response from the other Tribes is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

There are 17 features in Georgia with names containing the word “Odum” (a building, a cemetery, a census area, three churches, one civil decision, two dams, a locale, a populated place, a post office, four reservoirs, and a school), but none are in Oglethorpe County. The closest feature is 61 miles away.

Farnandis Branch, Maryland

(Review List 400)

Mouth:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=39.527795&p_longi=-76.317730

Source:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=39.523333&p_longi=-76.3375

This proposal is to make official the name Farnandis Branch for a 2.1 km (1.3 mi) long tributary of Bynum Run in Harford County. It was submitted by a representative of the Harford County Water Resources Engineering Office on behalf of the County Department of Public Works, the Harford County Historic Preservation Commission, and the Harford County Genealogical Society. According to the proponent, the proposed name has already appeared in two public works documents, including a 1987 Watershed Study. The name recognizes the lifetime contributions of Henry D. Farnandis (1817-1900), who for 60 years practiced law in the county. In addition, Mr. Farnandis served in the Maryland State Senate and was a member of the convention which drafted the Maryland Constitution of 1867. He also served as director of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and was counsel to the Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore Railroad. The Harford County Council endorses the proposal, while the Maryland State Names Authority has no objection. There are no

Federally-recognized Tribes with a current or historical interest within 50 miles of this feature.

Moody Island, Oregon
(Review List 400)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=45.632016&p_longi=-120.911193

The new name Moody Island is proposed for a five acre island at the mouth of the Deschutes River, at its confluence with the Columbia River. The proposal was submitted by the Sherman County Soil and Water Conservation District, on behalf of a resident of Portland who wishes to honor Zenas Ferry Moody, Governor of Oregon from 1882 to 1887 and local landowner. Also in the vicinity are Moody Rapids and a former post office and railroad station named "Moody." At the turn of the 20th century there was also a small community named Moody on the bank of the Deschutes River, which was competing with the opposite town of Miller for rights to establish a new railroad line; the route from Moody was chosen and the remains of the old "Oregon Trunk Line" are still used today.

The Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, which manages the adjacent Deschutes River Recreation Area, has no objection to the name. The Sherman County Board of Commissioners and the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB) both recommend approval. As part of its research, the OGNB forwarded the proposal to the State Legislative Commission on Indian Services, which in turn provided the information to all the Tribes in Oregon. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

Kocmoud Lake, Wisconsin
(Review List 399)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=45.912586&p_longi=-90.928173

This proposal is to make official the name Kocmoud Lake for a 35-acre lake in Sawyer County, along the boundary between the Town of Winter and the Town of Draper, and approximately one mile outside the boundaries of the Chequamegon National Forest. The name is intended to recognize the Kocmoud family's longtime ownership of property around the lake, beginning in 1934 and ending in 2002 with the death of George Kocmoud, the last of the family to live there. The proponents report that they and the Kocmouds were neighbors and that they have many fond memories of boating, fishing, and swimming in the "deep, cold, spring fed lake." The Kocmoud family raised cows and grew corn on their property. Both the Town of Winter and the Town of Draper passed resolutions in support of the proposal for Kocmoud Lake, and the Sawyer County Board of Supervisors and the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council (WGNC) also recommend approval. Following the WGNC's approval of the name, it was added to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Lake Directory.

A copy of the proposal was forwarded to the following Federally-recognized Tribes: the Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, the Bay Mills Indian Community, the Bois Forte Band (Nett Lake) of the Minnesota Chippewa Indians, the Chippewa-Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, the Fond du Lac Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Grand Portage Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, the Keweenaw Bay Indian

Community, the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Leech Lake Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Mille Lacs Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Michigan, the Sokaogon Chippewa Community, the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota, the White Earth Band of Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska. Of these, only the Mille Lacs Band responded with a letter of support for the proposal, while the Bois Forte Band and the Red Cliff Band indicated they had no opinion on the issue. The lack of response from the other Tribes is presumed to also indicate a lack of an opinion.

IV. Revised Decisions

Change **Swatara Creek** (FID 1189149) (BGN 1932) to **Swatara River**, Pennsylvania
(Review List 397)

Mouth:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=40.18537&p_longi=-76.7324

Source:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=40.68413&p_longi=-76.36479

This proposal is to change officially the name of Swatara Creek, a name made official by the BGN in 1932, to Swatara River. This 97 km (60 mi) long stream heads on Broad Mountain in Schuylkill County before flowing generally in a southwesterly direction through Lebanon County and Dauphin County to enter the Susquehanna River at Middletown. The watershed of Swatara Creek covers an area of approximately 570 square miles, within 46 municipalities and four counties. “Swatara” is an Indian word that is reported to mean “Where we feed on eels.” The name Swatara Creek has appeared on Federal maps since at least 1908, and was mentioned in various publications as early as 1794 (*The Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania 1682-1801*) and also in 1846 (*History and Topography of Dauphin, Cumberland, Franklin, Bedford, Adams and Perry Counties*; Rupp).

The proponent of the change represents the Swatara Creek Watershed Association; she believes that because of the size and significance of the feature, it should more accurately be named a River. According to a recent newspaper article on the proposed renaming, “The Swatara Creek may have missed out on being named River of the Year for the state, a recognition that could bring more money for improvements along the waterway. It’s very important. It is a river.” In 1999, the Environmental Protection Agency designated the Swatara Creek Watershed in Lebanon County as its newest green community, thus recognizing the Watershed Association’s efforts to “work cooperatively with State agencies to address acid mine drainage problems, restore streambanks, and monitor water quality.” There are five USGS streamflow gaging stations on Swatara Creek. A search of the Internet yields a few references to the stream as Swatara River, ranging from a historical account of settlement in Schuylkill County in 1755, to a report on internal navigation in the U.S. published in 1830, and a summary of legal decisions rendered in the U.S. prior to 1869. Henry Gannett’s 1905 volume *The Origin of Certain Place Names in the United States* referred to the stream as The Great Swatara River.

A copy of this proposal was forwarded to the governments of 41 local municipalities. Letters of support were received from the Lebanon County Commissioners, Lebanon County Conservation District, the Berks County Conservation District, the North Londonderry Township Board of Supervisors, the Palmyra Borough Council, the Swatara Township [Dauphin County] Board of Supervisors, the Pine Grove Township Board of Supervisors, the Borough of Jonestown Council, the City of Lebanon, and South Lebanon Township. State Senator Mike Folmer and Representative Mauree Gingrich expressed support for the proposal, as did the a representative of the Pennsylvania Department of Military and Veterans Affairs/Pennsylvania National Guard at Fort Indiantown Gap.

Letters objecting to the change were submitted by Derry Township, South Hanover Township (“If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. We will not benefit anything from the change and somebody will have to spend a lot of money to change a lot of maps”), Lower Swatara Township, North Annville Township (“the costs associated with changing the name on signs, maps, and other documents”), Swatara Township [Lebanon County] (“because of longtime local use for Swatara Creek and perceived adverse effect on local businesses”), and the Middletown Borough Council. The BGN staff also received a telephone call from a local resident who is opposed to the change, adding “the proponent is being self serving.” One other letter of objection was received from a local resident.

The Borough of Royalton Council said it had no objection to the change, while the West Hanover Board of Supervisors and North Lebanon Township responded that they had no opinion. The Pennsylvania Board on Geographic Names has no objection to the proposed change.

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Geese Chant Creek, Georgia
(Review List 392)

Mouth:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=33.386944&p_longi=-84.391111

Source:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=33.387778&p_longi=-84.385

This is the second of the two new names submitted by the Clayton County Water Authority, which suggests a name is needed “to provide identity to the stream and create public awareness of stream water quality.” The name Geese Chant Creek would be applied to a 0.6 km (0.4 mi) long tributary of the Flint River in southern Clayton County. The County conducted a stream-naming contest; the winning entry, submitted by a local resident, was chosen because “the stream provides habitat for many rare species of geese. The word *Chant* is a combination of “Chattahoochee” and “Flint,” two of the major watersheds in Clayton County.” The Clayton County Commissioners were asked on three occasions to comment on the proposal; the final letter noted that if no response was received, the BGN would presume the Commissioners had no objection to the Water Authority’s naming efforts. The Georgia State Names Authority recommends approval of the proposal. A copy was forwarded to the Cherokee Nation, but no response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion on the issue.

Farmers Creek, Oregon
(Review List 400)

Mouth:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=45.100851&p_longi=-122.834702

Source:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=45.103032&p_longi=-122.924652

The new name Farmers Creek is proposed for an 8.6 km (5.4 mi) long tributary of the Pudding River in Marion County. The name recognizes the fact that the surrounding land is primarily farmland. The proponents contacted the majority of landowners along the stream and none had any objection to the proposed name. The Marion County Commissioners also have no objection, while the Oregon Geographic Names Board (OGNB) recommends approval. During its research, the OGNB learned that the proposed name is already applied to the Marion County tax assessor maps, but the proponents were apparently not aware of this. As part of its research, OGNB forwarded the proposal to the State Legislative Commission on Indian Services, which in turn provided the information to all the Tribes in Oregon. No response was received, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

According to GNIS, there are three other streams in Oregon named Farmer Creek and four canals named Farmers Ditch; none are in Marion County.

Connor Mill Creek, Wisconsin
(Review List 399)

Mouth:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=44.803702&p_longi=-90.057163

Source:http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gnis538/getgooglecoor?p_lat=44.775438&p_longi=-90.092225

This proposal is to make official the name Connor Mill Creek for a 5.6 km (3.5 mi) long stream that flows through the Village of Stratford in Marathon County. It was submitted by the Wisconsin Geographic Names Council on behalf of the Village Board of Trustees, who wish to recognize the existence of the historic Connor Mill along the stream. The application states that the village was replacing a small culvert and bridge over the stream, which led to questions as to whether it had a name. Since proposing the name in 2001, the village has applied it to its official street map. The WGNC recommends approval of this proposal.

A copy of the proposal was forwarded to the following Federally-recognized Tribes: the Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, the Bay Mills Indian Community, the Bois Forte Band (Nett Lake) of the Minnesota Chippewa Indians, the Chippewa-Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, the Fond du Lac Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Grand Portage Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community, the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Leech Lake Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Mille Lacs Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, the Saginaw

Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan, the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Michigan, the Sokaogon Chippewa Community, the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians of North Dakota, the White Earth Band of Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska. Of these, only the Mille Lacs Band responded with a letter of support for the proposal, while the Bois Forte Band and the Red Cliff Band indicated they had no opinion on the issue. The lack of response from the other Tribes is presumed to also indicate a lack of an opinion.

There are no other geographic features in Wisconsin named “Connor Mill”, but ten named “Connor”, “Connors”, or “O’Connor”. Five of these are streams; none are in Marathon County. Approximately 136 km (85 mi) from the stream in question is Connor Mill Road in Forest County.