

U.S. BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES
DOMESTIC NAMES COMMITTEE
Seven Hundred and Thirty Ninth Meeting
Department of the Interior, Room 7000A
March 8, 2012 – 9:30 a.m.

Members and Deputy Members in Attendance

Douglas Caldwell	Department of Defense (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)
Jon Campbell	Department of the Interior (U.S. Geological Survey)
Chick Fagan	Department of the Interior (National Park Service)
Monique Fordham	Department of the Interior (U.S. Geological Survey) (via teleconference)
Michael Fournier	Department of Commerce (Bureau of the Census)
Tony Gilbert	Government Printing Office (Chairman) (not voting)
Elizabeth Kanalley	Department of Agriculture (U.S. Forest Service)
Sean Killen	Department of the Interior (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service)
William Logan	Department of Homeland Security (U.S. Coast Guard)
Curtis Loy	Department of Commerce (Office of Coast Survey)
Douglas 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

Jennifer Runyon, U.S. Geological Survey
Gregory Winters, U.S. Geological Survey
Maria McCormick, U.S. Geological Survey (by teleconference)
Jane Messenger, U.S. Geological Survey (by teleconference)

Guests

Geoffrey Sanders, National Park Service

1. Opening

The meeting opened at 9:35 a.m. Committee members introduced themselves to the guest. The Chair announced he would not be voting, except in the case of a tie vote.

2. Minutes of the 738th Meeting

The Minutes of the 738th meeting of the Domestic Names Committee, held February 9th, 2012, were approved as submitted by a vote of 8-0-1.

3. Reports

3.1 BGN Chairman (Logan)

Logan announced an upcoming meeting of the BGN Executive Committee. As chair of the Executive Committee, Caldwell reported that the issue of commemorative naming in regards

to Antarctic and Underseas features will be discussed. All committee members were invited to the meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, March 14th, at the U.S. Geological Survey in Reston.

3.2 BGN Executive Secretary (Yost)

Yost reported that Roger Payne, BGN Executive Secretary Emeritus, and George Troop, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, recently conducted the annual course in applied toponymy in Honduras, under the auspices of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History (PAIGH). A meeting will be held at USGS on March 14th to discuss a proposal to develop an online training course, and to review USGS support for the program.

Yost reported that there will be a meeting of the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) in Portland, Oregon. One topic on the agenda will pertain to the naming of undersea features off the coast of Antarctica.

The case files of the BGN's Advisory Committee on Antarctic Names (ACAN) have been scanned and will soon be available online. Yost reminded the committee that the domestic names case files are already online as attachments to the GNIS entries.

Copies of the BGN informational brochures were made available at the USGS booth during the Esri Federal GIS Conference held recently in Washington, DC. Copies were also distributed at the American Association of Geographers (AAG) annual meeting in New York. The supply of brochures has now been exhausted.

Yost reminded the Committee about upcoming conferences of interest to the toponymic community, including the meeting between the BGN staff and the Permanent Committee on Geographical Names for British Official Use (PCGN), scheduled for the end of June in London, and the 10th United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, scheduled for July 30th to August 9th in New York.

3.3 Communications Committee Report (Westington)

Westington reported that the Communications Committee has not met for some time, and now that brochure stocks have been exhausted, it may time to meet and review the brochures.

Fournier reported that the aforementioned AAG meeting was very productive, and that the AAG Senior Director approached him with an interest in doing a feature on the BGN. Fournier distributed a sign-up sheet for the committee members' contact information. He announced also that an upcoming conference in New England would include a presentation on the BGN.

On March 6th, *The Washington Post* featured an article on the BGN entitled "What's in a place name? Much deliberation from this board." The committee members discussed the article and expressed concerns over misinformation and an overall condescending tone, including within the editorial comments. Fagan noted that he had submitted a rebuttal to some of the statements that were incorrectly attributed to him, and cited the scholarly research that has been conducted regarding the etymology of the word 'squaw.' Kanalley

reported that the article generated considerable interest within the U.S. Forest Service, and that it generated a dialogue between the FS media officer and the office of tribal relations. It was generally agreed that the article highlights future opportunities to share information regarding the BGN's activities and decisions.

3.4 Executive Secretary's Report (Yost)

Yost was recently interviewed by a reporter for NPR-New Hampshire, who specifically wished to know the number of changes that the BGN has made to "insulting names." The proposal to change the name of Jew Pond has led to the posting of several YouTube videos, one of which features the chair of the New Hampshire State Names Board.

Trent Palmer, Executive Secretary for Foreign Names, suggested that the DNC submit a brief synopsis of its draft interim policy on Tribal Geographic Names for inclusion in the UN Working Group on the Promotion of Recording and Use of Indigenous, Minority and Regional Language Group Geographical Names report, to be presented at the aforementioned UN conference. As chair of the Special Committee on Native Names and Tribal Consultation, Kanalley offered to prepare a brief report.

Fordham announced that Steve Simpson of the Department of the Interior Solicitor's Office is reviewing Policy X: Tribal Geographic Names, and hopes to provide feedback during the week of March 12th. Fordham suggested UNGEGN might find the issue to be of interest.

3.5 Staff Report (Runyon)

Runyon reported that an article was recently published in *The Grio* focusing on offensive names. Another article appeared in a newspaper in the State of Washington on the proposal to change the name of Soap Lake to Lake Smokiam.

3.6 GNIS and Data Compilation Program (Yost)

A new contract has been awarded to scan the remaining BGN decision cards. The work is expected to begin shortly and be concluded within a year.

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

Logan reminded the committee that Policy X was approved at the February DNC meeting. As noted previously, the policy is now at the DOI Solicitor's Office for comment, after which it will be forwarded to the DOI Tribal Governance Officer for her review. The committee was reminded that the policy is still a draft interim policy until it is approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The entire PPP, once revised, will be sent to the Secretary for approval.

It was agreed that the Special Committee should be continued for the time being and should expect to meet as needed. It was also noted that the Special Committee should meet to discuss the appeal from the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes.

Principles I and V were also approved at the February meeting, with edits incorporated and redistributed. Policies VIII and IX were also edited and redistributed. The committee will next consider Chapter 4: Procedures and Guidelines at the April meeting. Logan thanked

Killen and Vandegraft for reserving conference space at the National Conservation Training Center in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, for August 19th to 22nd, to allow for a thorough review of the PPP document. It was agreed that there would be no August DNC meeting, but that the meeting at NCTC would include a docket, followed by the PPP review.

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

Change Negrohead Creek (FID 1407007) to Lochenyatth Creek, Alaska (Review List 409)

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

Vote: 11 in favor
 0 against
 0 abstentions

One member left the meeting.

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

Grizzly Creek or Sim-heh Creek, Montana (Flathead Indian Reservation) (Review Lists 406, 408)

A motion was made and seconded to approve Sim-heh Creek, thus disapproving Grizzly Creek.

Vote: 10 in favor
 0 against
 0 abstentions

The decision to disapprove Grizzly Creek cited a lack of local, State, and tribal support, and a preference for the name Sim-heh Creek.

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

Ogilvie Island, California (San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge) (Review List 405) (FID 2723432)

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

Vote: 9 in favor
 1 against
 0 abstentions

The vote against the motion cited a belief that the island was not a clearly discernible feature.

IV. Revised Decisions

Change application of **San Gabriel Mountains** (FID 254210) (BGN 1927), California (Angeles National Forest) (Review List 407)

A motion was made and seconded not to approve the change.

Vote: 10 in favor
 0 against
 0 abstentions

The decision to disapprove the proposal cited a lack of local and State support, as well as the negative recommendations of the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, and numerous geologists. A motion was made and seconded to reaffirm the 1927 decision and apply a 2012 decision.

Vote: 10 in favor
 0 against
 0 abstentions

One member left the room.

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Raccoon Hollow Branch, Florida (Review List 407) (FID 2723434)

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

Vote: 8 in favor
 1 against
 0 abstentions

The vote against the motion cited a lack of evidence of raccoons at the feature's location.

One member returned to the meeting.

Candle Creek, Pennsylvania (Review List 407)

A motion was made to defer a decision on the proposal, citing a need to verify the feature's existence.

Vote: 7 in favor
 3 against
 0 abstention

The votes against the motion cited a belief that there was sufficient evidence to make a decision.

The Committee adjourned for lunch, after which it reconvened to discuss the revisions to Policy XI: Trademarked and Registered Names, and Policy XII: Commercial Names.

5. PPP Review and Discussion (Logan)

Logan provided an overview of suggested edits to Policy XI and Policy XII. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that the proposed policy on Protected (trademarked, registered, internet domain, copyrighted) names should be eliminated. Thus the Commercial Names Policy has been renumbered as XI and the Animal Names Policy will become Policy XII. Logan will incorporate the changes into a new draft version and redistribute it for discussion at the April meeting.

6. Other Business

There was no other business to report.

7. Closing

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

The next Domestic Names Committee meeting will be held April 12th, 2012, at 9:30 a.m. at the Main Interior Building, Washington, D.C. in Room 7000A.

(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
March 2012

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

Change Negrohead Creek (FID 1407007) to Łochenyatth Creek, Alaska
(Review List 409)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglemap?p_lat=65.0597222&p_longi=-150.0666667&fid=1407007

This proposal is to change the name of Negrohead Creek to Łochenyatth Creek. The 19-mile-long stream is a tributary of Hutlitakwa Creek and is located approximately 70 miles northwest of Fairbanks. A portion of the stream lies within the Tanana Valley State Forest. The stream was originally named Niggerhead Creek, a word used for many years to refer to grass tussocks found in tundra areas. The name was changed in the early 1960s as part of the BGN's universal change from the pejorative form of the word, and thus became Negrohead Creek on subsequent Federal maps. However, according to the proponents, the word "negrohead" does not occur in the botanical community and so they are proposing that the stream's name be changed to reflect the Lower Tanana Gwich'in name, Łochenyatth Creek, which translates to "grass tussocks" (Łochenhyaal No' and Łochenyatth No' are already listed in GNIS as variant names for Negrohead Creek; both were compiled from Dr. James Kari's 1999 publication *Native Place Names Mapping in Denali National Park and Preserve*). The proposed spelling, including the use of the barred Ł, is consistent with the orthography established by the Alaska Native Language Center at the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. Dr. Kari and other linguists at the Language Center assisted local middle school students in submitting the proposal.

The proposed change is endorsed by the Tanana Chiefs Conference, "a consortium of interior [sic] federally recognized tribes," as well as the Alaska Historical Commission (AHC), which serves as the State Names Authority. As part of its research, the AHC contacted various Alaska Native groups for an opinion. Doyon Ltd., an Alaska Native corporation, responded that they had no objection. The Native Village of Minto, Manley Hot Springs Village, the Seth-De-Ya Corporation, the Bean Ridge Corporation, and the Manley Hot Springs Community Association did not respond, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion. The AHC also contacted the African American Historical Society of Alaska and Black Coalition Inc., but no responses were received. The AHC has asked that the name Tussocks Creek be recorded in GNIS as a variant.

II. Disagreement on Docketed Names

Grizzly Creek or Sim-heh Creek, Montana
(Flathead Indian Reservation)
(Review Lists 406, 408)

Mouth: http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=47.0711111111111111&p_lon_gi=-114.06611111111111

Source: http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=47.0761111111111111&p_lon_gi=-114.12555555555556

The names Grizzly Creek and Sim-heh Creek have both been proposed to be applied to a 2.1-mile-long unnamed perennial stream on the Flathead Indian Reservation in Missoula County. The stream heads on the southeast slope of Charity Peak and flows east into Finley Creek.

The first proposal, for Grizzly Creek, was submitted by a local resident who selected it because a portion of the stream flows alongside Grizzly Mountain Road, and according to local residents, a grizzly bear and her cub once broke into a property along the same road.

When asked to comment on the proposal for Grizzly Creek, the Federally recognized Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation (CSKT) responded that they would prefer that the stream be named Sim-heh Creek, which is an Anglicized form of Smḵe. The latter word means “grizzly bear” in the Salish language. The Tribe writes, “A non-Indian resident of the reservation who lives along the creek, submitted an official proposal [for] ‘Grizzly Creek.’ Following consideration of this proposed name by two tribal departments responsible for cultural and geographic matters, and their recent field trip to the area with members of the Salish-Pend d’Oreille Elders Advisory Council, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT) have decided upon the name Sim-heh Creek.” The CSKT added, “Whenever possible, we feel it is important to get names in our native languages restored to the landscape. This is especially important within the exterior boundaries of the Flathead Indian Reservation.”

In its role as the State Names Authority, the Montana State Library released a public notice seeking comments on the Grizzly Creek proposal. In addition, the local newspaper published an article about it. No responses in support of Grizzly Creek were received, and two local residents opposed the proposal, stating that the stream “may have been referred to as Charity Creek or Kitty Girl Creek in the past”; another message from a local resident “suggested that the stream be named Horseshoe Creek after their ranch.” The SNA asked all three individuals if they wished to submit proposals for any of those names, but none expressed any interest. The SNA also located a 1976 water rights application in which the applicant had annotated a map with the name Kitty Girl Creek for the stream. However, “the state water rights division chose to ignore this name and designated the water right source as ‘Unnamed Tributary of Finley Creek.’” In response to the Grizzly Creek proposal, the Tribe counter-proposed Sim-heh Creek.

The Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Missoula County Commissioners and the Montana State Names Authority (SNA) all recommend approval of

the name Sim-heh Creek and disapproval of Grizzly Creek. The SNA notes, “There are 8 other Grizzly Creeks in Montana, including a stream less than 20 miles away from the stream in question, which is also on the Flathead Reservation. I recommend acceptance of the Sim-heh Creek proposal because it was made by the tribal government for a stream on its reservation, because of the endorsement of the county commissioners, and because of the proximity of another stream already named Grizzly Creek.” The proponent of Grizzly Creek has asked that despite the county and tribe’s endorsement of Sim-heh Creek, that his proposal also be considered.

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

Ogilvie Island, California
(San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge)
(Review List 405)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=37.4651580000&p_longi=-122.0102620000

This proposal is to apply the new commemorative name Ogilvie Island to a 62-acre island located in the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The island lies at the southern end of San Francisco Bay, 0.7 miles northeast of the confluence of Alviso Slough with Coyote Creek and on the boundary between the City of Fremont in Alameda County and the unincorporated community of Alviso in Santa Clara County.

The proposed name would honor Arthur L. “Art” Ogilvie (1917-1997), a Santa Clara County planner who is credited with the idea for preserving the marshlands and bay by asking the U.S. Congress to create the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, the first urban wildlife refuge in the United States. According to a longtime colleague of Mr. Ogilvie, who serves as head of the Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge and who supports the proposed name, “[Art] had been to the Department of the Interior, picked up a brochure about duck stamps, and decided that with duck stamp funds we could have a National Wildlife Refuge on San Francisco Bay. For several years under his leadership we met, and with Congressman Edwards help did establish the Refuge in 1972.”

The proponent serves as the project lead for the Tidal Marsh Ecotone Restoration Research project, and reports “the island has emerged naturally over the past decade due to sedimentation, and now contains low marsh vegetation. Much of the island sits above mean low tide, so it is likely to continue to collect sediments and should reach equilibrium elevations around mean high high water (MHHW).”

A decision on this proposal was deferred by the DNC at its February 2012 meeting, citing a need for further research on the physical characteristics of the feature. The proponent was asked to address the issue and responded that the feature is a tidal island and that its vegetative cover is sufficiently permanent to be exposed at high tide. He reports that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and a USGS sedimentologist have confirmed this is the case. Finally, he notes that Station Island, located just to the east of the island in question, has similar tidal marsh characteristics.

The Santa Clara County Commissioners support the proposal. The Alameda County Commissioners did not respond to a request for opinion, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion. The Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge expressed support for the proposal, while the California State Lands Commission has no objection. The California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service both recommend approval of the proposal.

A copy of the proposal was forwarded to five Federally recognized Tribes with an interest in Alameda County or Santa Clara County. The Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians responded that they have no objection. The Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians, the Santa Rosa Indian Community of the Santa Rosa Rancheria, the Table Mountain Rancheria, and Tule River Indian Tribe did not respond to a request for opinion, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion.

IV. Revised Decisions

Change application of San Gabriel Mountains (FID 254210) (BGN 1927), California
(Angeles National Forest)
(Review List 407)

http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglemap?p_lat=34.2888927&p_longi=-117.6467218&fid=254210

This proposal is to amend the application of the name San Gabriel Mountains. In 1927, the BGN approved the name and defined the feature as “[M]ountains, California, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, between Los Angeles plains and Mohave Desert, and extending from Cajon Pass westward to San Fernando Pass.” The decision was rendered as the result of an inquiry regarding the official name of the range; several sources dating back to the 1860s had variously referred to it as San Bernardino Mountains, San Gabriel Range, Sierra San Gabriel, and Sierra Madre. A professor of geology at Pomona College asked the BGN to make official the name San Gabriel Mountains. In acknowledging the proposal, the BGN cited a draft manuscript published in 1914 by Henry Gannett that listed all the mountains of the United States; one of the entries was for San Gabriel Mountains, “defined as limited north and south by Mohave Desert and Los Angeles Valley; and east and west by Cajon Pass and Southern Pacific Railroad.” The proponent in 1927 noted that the name San Gabriel Mountains had first been published by Josiah Whitney of the Geological Survey of California in 1865, although the name Sierra Madre was also widely used. Whitney suggested the name San Gabriel Mountains was given “because they contained so many creeks and streams that were tributary to the San Gabriel River” (Hanna, 1951). Erwin Gudde, in his 1998 volume *California Place Names*, states, “The mountain range was vaguely called the Sierra Madre by the missionaries, but a Cierra (Sierra) de San Gabriel is mentioned in Aug. 1806.”

The 1927 decision defined the feature as “Mountains, Cal., Los Angeles & San Bernardino Cos., between Los Angeles plains and Mohave Desert, and extending from Cajon Pass westward to San Fernando Pass.”

The name San Gabriel Mountains began to appear on U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps around 1934. It was also listed in the *Gazetteer of the Mountains of the State of California*, published in 1929 by the Federal Board of Surveys and Maps.

In 1937, the USGS suggested that the 1927 definition was somewhat vague, and although it did not wish for the BGN to revisit the case, asked that the definition be further amended to read, “Between Los Angeles plains on the south, San Fernando Pass on the west, Soledad Canyon and Antelope Valley on the north, and Cajon Pass on the east, excepting the Verdugo Mountains.” Although the BGN did not officially revisit the matter, a memorandum written in 1938 by the Executive Secretary to the USGS stated, “This name... may be used without a new decision under Rule B-13 of the ‘Statement for Guidance.’ It would doubtless be better if the existing decision were worded more definitely concerning the boundary of the mountains on the north, but I do not see that a restatement of the decision is essential for present needs, or that any uncertainty or confusion is likely to arise.”

The approved name was also published in the 1946 volume *Dictionary of California Land Names* (Hanna) and in subsequent editions of Erwin G. Gudde’s *California Place Names*. The American Guide Series volume *Los Angeles: A Guide to the City and its Environs* (Second Edition, 1951) described the feature as “extending the 75 miles between Newhall Pass and Cajon Pass.” During the 1950s and 1960s, the BGN responded to several inquiries regarding the 1927 decision, each time reaffirming the official name and definition. The Peakbagger.com listing for [San Gabriel Mountains](#) includes a map that shows the extent as defined by the BGN.

Despite eighty-plus years of usage as defined by the BGN, the Director of the Antelope Valley Conservancy, who submitted the current proposal, believes the application should be extended to the northwest to also encompass a group of mountains and ridges that includes Liebre Mountain, Sierra Pelona, and Sawmill Mountain, among others, extending nearly as far west as the Topatopa Mountains in Ventura County. The proposed definition would read, “Extends from Cajon Pass on the southeast, along the south-southwest edge of the Mojave Desert and Antelope Valley, then northwest to include Liebre Mountain, Sierra Pelona, and Sawmill Mountain, southwest of Pine Canyon Road and northeast of Interstate 5.” The proponent also believes the larger feature is more appropriate geologically; one definition states, “The [San Gabriel Mountains](#) (SGM) are part of the ‘transverse ranges’, an east-west trending belt of mountains that have been thrust up by compression of the crust at a ‘restraining’ bend in the San Andreas fault.” She cites a USGS map of Southern California Earthquakes which “shows the subject mountains and the San Andreas Fault and San Gabriel Fault from which they form. These massive mountainous elevations along the Rift Zone comprise the southern boundary of the triangular shaped USGS Antelope-Fremonts Valley Watershed 18090206. The Watershed does not feed or connect to the Santa Clara River Watershed, due to the continuous and unbroken elevation of the range. The saddle at the 14 Freeway, as evidenced by its elevations, is a high mountain pass not a valley. It offers no drainage to the watershed to the south.”

She further states, “Lastly, geographic name decisions may take into account real-world scientific and commonplace usage, common usage by citizens and government agencies of the region. Such decisions may also take into account homogenous biotic communities, geology, communities of interest, and governance, all of which are pertinent to this inquiry. In the region, even the smallest mountainous features are designated as Ranges. It seems inconsistent for such a major feature as the subject mountain chain, which covers perhaps 500 square miles, to neither be designated as a range, or to be incorporated within the SGM. Research does illuminate a variety of federal, state and local government entities, press uses,

and public references that include the subject mountain chain as a portion of the SGM. Many of us in the region and up to our state capitol were surprised to learn that USGS does not include it in the SGM. The widespread belief is that it [is] the western portion of the SGM, particularly as the entire mountain range is consolidated as the Angeles National Forest under stewardship by the US Forest Service/National Park Service [sic].”

Numerous conservation groups are named for the San Gabriel Mountains, but none of their websites provide a definition of what they consider to be the extent of the range. (Three wilderness areas fall within the current limits of the San Gabriel Mountains, but they are outside the area impacted by this proposal.)

The 1963 volume *A Guidebook to the San Gabriel Mountains of California* (Leadabrand) describes the feature as “part of the great high barrier that separates the Mojave Desert from the fair sea-bounded coastlands. Roughly east and west the range runs, with pronounced terminations at the east with Cajon Pass and 100 miles to the west at the natural trough followed by U.S. Highway 99 [present-day I-5].” Some of the features mentioned in the book include Sierra Pelona Ridge, Liebre Mountain, San Francisquito Canyon, and Elizabeth Lake, which suggests the author defines the extent of the range as proposed.

The Wikipedia entry for San Gabriel Mountains would appear to support the proposal, stating, “The mountain range lies between the Los Angeles Basin and the Mojave Desert, with Interstate 5 to the west and Interstate 15 to the east,” and continuing, “In the western portion of the San Gabriel Mountain Range, the Sierra Pelona Ridge stretches from approximately Soledad Canyon (14 Freeway and railroad right-of-way), formed by the Santa Clara River. The Sierra Pelona Ridge includes Liebre Mountain, Sawmill Mountain, Grass Mountain, Redrock Peak, Burnt Peak...” Yet another Wikipedia entry, for Sierra Pelona Mountains [sic], states, “The Sierra Pelona Mountains lie northwest of the San Gabriel Mountains.”

John Robinson’s volume *The San Gabriels - The Mountain Country from Soledad Canyon to Lytle Creek* (1991) suggests the name applies just to the area as currently defined by the BGN.

The Los Angeles County Supervisors and San Bernardino County Supervisors were contacted for their opinions on the proposal. The Los Angeles County Supervisors responded that “since the County does not use the ‘San Gabriel Mountains’ for administrative or mapping purposes (we use the Angeles National Forest), we won’t have a recommendation for or against.” The San Bernardino County Supervisors did not respond, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion (the affected area is outside San Bernardino County).

Responses from the various local, State, and Federal organizations and agencies that were contacted were mixed. The Associate Chair of Geosciences and Environment at California State University, Los Angeles stated that he is “fine” with the proposed extension. Three members of the San Gabriel Mountains Trailbuilders responded in support of the proposal, with one stating, “Presumably, there is geological continuity in this proposed extension of the range’s applicability,” and another, “This could give it further protection from encroaching suburbs like Santa Clarita and Valencia.”

The San Gabriel Mountains Regional Conservancy does not support the change, stating, “Better choice NOT to make the proposed change/addition; to add a new, northwest addition does not appear to be an extension of the east/west pattern[s] [of] geomorphology, botany, entomology, and ornithology.” One USGS geologist commented, “[T]he description you provide for current usage largely is the way all the geologists I know use the name.”

A professor of geology at Iowa State University commented, “I can see merits to both sides of the argument based on the geology and geography... Including the current San Gabriel Mountains, the Sierra Pelona, Liebre Mountain, and Sawmill Mountain in a single range (an expanded San Gabriel Mountains) is reasonable, but no better than the current nomenclature involving multiple names. Given that, I see no reason to reverse a convention of 80+ years. The current usage is well entrenched in the geologic literature. I have never found the current terminology to be confusing or inappropriate, and I cannot recall hearing any other geologist express concern with the current nomenclature.”

Other organizations and offices that were contacted for an opinion but which did not respond include the USGS California Water Science Center; the San Gabriel & Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy; the Pasadena Audubon Society; California Polytechnic University-Pomona; the California Native Plant Society; the Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter; and San Gabriel Mountains Forever (“a diverse partnership working to preserve Southern California's most scenic and valuable natural resource”).

The California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names recommends disapproval of the application change, citing the 1927 BGN decision, longstanding published usage, and opposition from geologists. The CACGN minutes read, “Opinions from geologists of varying backgrounds, including scholars, and our own California State Geologist believe the extents should remain unchanged. In addition most historians contend that extents now in place on the GNIS report are the historical extents, and should not be changed. References to existing websites showing expanded extents of the San Gabriel Mountains were viewed, and found to be erroneous. Established Usage is evident. “

The U.S. Forest Service also recommends disapproval, citing in part the recommendation of its regional geologist who believes Soledad Canyon constitutes a clear geologic separation between the two areas. The National Park Service, which is involved in various research efforts in and around the area, also does not support the proposal, citing longstanding usage of the existing name and extent, and “no persuasive reason for the change.”

According to the NAGPRA Native American Consultation Database, there are no Federally recognized Tribes with an interest in Los Angeles County or San Bernardino County.

V. New Names agreed to by all interested parties

Raccoon Hollow Branch, Florida

(Review List 407)

Mouth: http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=30.772778&p_longi=-86.197222

Source: http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=30.765531&p_longi=-86.201247

This proposal is to apply the new name Raccoon Hollow Branch to a 0.5-mile-long unnamed tributary of Narrows Creek in north-central Walton County. According to the proponent, a pastor and radio station news director, the “small spring fed creek” heads on his family’s homestead in an area known as Raccoon Hollow Farm. He adds, “The wetland area is to be preserved and is bio-diverse.” The stream is unnamed in the Walton County GIS files. An online search for Raccoon Hollow Farm shows that it was established in 1999 and that it is not a commercial operation. The proponent also did not indicate that the valley through which the stream flows is known as Raccoon Hollow.

The Walton County Commissioners were asked for an opinion on the proposal for Raccoon Hollow Branch, and responded that they had no opinion. A copy of the proposal was forwarded to the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, the Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, and the Seminole Tribe of Florida (Dania, Big Cypress, Brighton, Hollywood & Tampa Reservations), all of which are Federally recognized. The Muscogee (Creek) Nation supports the proposal, while the other two tribes did not respond, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion. The Florida State Names Authority recommends approval of the new name.

Candle Creek, Pennsylvania

(Review List 407)

Mouth: http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=41.00944444444444&p_longi=-75.13277777777778

Source: http://geonames.usgs.gov/pls/gazpublic/getgooglecoor?p_lat=41.01472222222222&p_longi=-75.145

This proposal is to apply the new name Candle Creek to a 0.9-mile-long stream located in Smithfield Township in Monroe County. The stream flows southeast then east to enter Marshalls Creek. According to the proponent, the proposed name refers to the shape of the stream as it runs through her property, “like a tapered candle.” She reports that she has not been able to find a name for the stream after talking with the township government, with local residents, or with previous land owners who lived in the area for 60 years.

The Smithfield Township Chairman has no objection to the proposal, and the Monroe County Commissioners support it. A copy of the proposal was forwarded to the Seneca Nation of New York and the Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians of New York, both of which are Federally recognized. Neither tribe responded, which is presumed to indicate a lack of an opinion. The Pennsylvania State Names Authority has no objection to the name.