

California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names

MINUTES

Wednesday, July 18, 2012
Department of Conservation
801 K Street, 12th Floor
Sacramento, California

1. Call to Order—9:35am

Attendance-- *Members:* Morrison; Wanish; Meyer; Veisze; Chambers
Advisors: Trumbly; Hawkins
Guest: John Fraser (for minutes)

2. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of January 18, 2012

Sylvia Bender's 1/18/2012 Minutes were noted for distinction.

The 1/18/12 Minutes were approved electronically and vocally.

Veisze explained delineation of the Committee's Regions, workload, expertise, and the relationship to the U.S. Board on Geographic Names (BGN) for the benefit of this author.

3. Announcements

Veisze announced GIS Day, a promotional and educational day of presentations on the use of GIS technology. Several California State agencies are expected to participate.

Veisze announced the upcoming ESRI User Conference, July 23 – 28.

Roster Updates—Meyer will forward hardcopy edits to James Spero, CACGN Webmaster, including a change in the Executive Secretary position at the California Native American Heritage Commission. The CACGN roster is posted at <http://cacgn.ca.gov>

Trumbly provided information on the history and origins of the Council of Geographic Names Authorities in the United States (COGNA) and discussed the purposes of the council's conference.

4. Consideration of Names Proposals on Pending Review Lists

Review List 387

Region V (Chambers)

Mount Minerva Hoyt

Chambers asked the committee about the approval authority process and Trumbly gave comments on how information is arrived at, how the BGN values the process associated with State names authorities. Trumbly and Veisze provided examples of naming types, cited policy guidelines, and discussed the implications of geographic naming and the motivating factors behind new naming proposals. Chambers mentioned the many issues associated with commemorative naming involving government employees, the validity of such practice, and the potential for biases.

Chambers re-directed to the Review List 387 and discussed the committee's past comments on why the name proposal (Mount Minerva Hoyt) had previously not been recommended for approval. The committee discussed several of the alternatives that were provided when the name proposal had been submitted earlier. Chambers provided background on Minerva Hoyt and summarized the proponent's case for the name proposal, which rested generally on Hoyt's committed activism and involvement with Joshua Tree National Park.

Trumbly discussed the importance of new information and how the committee was better equipped to reach a judgment on the name proposal at this time. Chambers submitted the CACGN Minutes from 1/26/2005. Veisze used web based mapping to locate the site in question as Chambers discussed the map associated with the 1/26/2005 CACGN Minutes. Chambers provided a letter demonstrating National Park Service (NPS) support for name proposal and mentioned the importance of the Wayside Exhibit and its association with the "Hoyt" peak. Chambers provided further documentation demonstrating community support, the geo-physical value of naming, and the "overriding need" to recommend the name proposal.

A widespread discussion ensued on the relevance of the National Park Service supporting letters. Trumbly suggested that the peak view-sheds from the Wayside Exhibit were very relevant to the naming consideration process and were yet unknown. General concurrence from the committee was reached on this matter, although Veisze urged the committee to confer great value on NPS supporting letters. Chamber recommended a vote on the recommendation of the name proposal; the recommendation was seconded by Meyer.

Trumbly discussed his concerns with the NPS supporting letters, and challenged its characterization of this committee's previous "oversight," in reference to the 2005 "no" recommendation. Trumbly questioned whether a new "overriding need" had truly been established. Chambers and Veisze both argued that new

“Need” had been established by the introduction of geo-physical values. Chambers, Veisze, and Trumbly discussed whether a deferment on decision could be made in light of the seconded recommendation to vote on the name proposal.

Hawkins discussed the NPS supporting letter and its characterization of this committee’s alleged “oversight,” and expressed not being troubled by the letter or its findings. Hawkins also joined Trumbly and Morrison in supporting the need for a better understanding of the view-shed elements associated with the Wayside Exhibit. The committee discussed the importance of demonstration of deliberation, and the BGN’s trust in this committee’s processes and understanding of the guidelines. Veisze steered group towards a motion. Trumbly questioned whether NPS had exhausted administrative naming options before settling on the peak in question, and reiterated concerns over demonstration of overriding need.

*Veisze stressed the importance of the NPS supporting letters and moved to vote on the proposal. The committee unanimously voted to **recommend approval** the name proposal. Yea: 5, No: 0*

Review List 407

Region III (Meyer)

Fossil Point

Meyer discussed the primary issues related to the name proposal, namely that the proponent sought to change an incorrect usage of a commonly used geographic name, Fossil Point, so that it reflected the historic application of the name. Fossil Point currently denotes a geographic place that is about one mile from another geographic place that historically was called Fossil Point. At some point in the latter half of the 20th century an error was made in the creation of a map, applying the name Fossil Point to the wrong geographic place. The error had been repeated on subsequent maps, and the erroneous application eventually entered local use.

Meyer discussed her consultation with the California Coastal Commission, California Public Utilities Commission, United States Coast Guard (who provided no opinion), local California Indian Tribes, and the San Luis Obispo County Supervisors. All of these entities, with the exception of the United States Coast Guard who did not respond with comment, provided neutral positions on the matter. Meyer distributed several historic maps to demonstrate the change in naming over time and the committee engaged in a speculative conversation about the nature of the error in naming and possible causes for the change. Meyer discussed the lack of response by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Trumbly discussed the precedence of correcting errors of this kind, noting that errors alone do not establish overriding need in all cases. Trumbly and Veisze agreed that continuity of naming usage over time was extremely important, even when the usage had been established by an initial error of application. Ensuing debate by the committee centered on the consequences of changing the name, in particular public safety ramifications caused by distinctions between common usage and official maps. Trumbly expanded on his concerns about the lack of definitive opinion, in particular the absence of a position on the proposal by NOAA.

*Veisze suggested deferral. Meyer **deferred** a vote on the name the name proposal until a response is provided by NOAA.*

Review List 408

Region IV (Veisze)
Clem Nelson Peak

Veisze provided background information on Clem Nelson, a former UCLA geology professor, who mapped a great deal of the area where the peak in question is located. Veisze reviewed a previous effort to change an existing geographic name from Squaw Peak to Clem Nelson Peak. This effort ended in withdrawal of the proposal when a counter-proposal was submitted by the Big Pine Band of Paiute Indians; the name Wünüpü Peak was subsequently approved by the BGN. The proponent of the original proposal re-submitted a different, unnamed feature for Clem Nelson Peak. Veisze discussed his consultation with the US Forest Service and local California Indian tribal authorities, who all supported the new name proposal. Using web based mapping, Veisze showed the feature location and imagery. Wanish questioned Veisze about the opinion of local historical societies, and Veisze prompted the committee to discuss certain philosophical questions related to commemoration naming practices.

*Veisze motioned to vote, Wanish seconded. The committee voted unanimously to **recommend approval** of the name proposal. Yea: 5, No: 0.*

Review List 409

Region II (Wanish)
Black Miner's Creek

Wanish discussed that Black Miner's Creek (proposed) had previously been proposed as Butterfly Creek and described the creek's complicated, historic name usage, which included the derogatory geographic name "Nigger Creek" and "Negro Creek." Wanish provided background information on the creek's location and discussed local confusion over identifying annotation on historic and contemporary maps.

Wanish's points prompted a discussion by the committee on the value and precedents associated with ethnicity geographic naming, and the many problems that have derived from such naming choices. Wanish highlighted a local historical association's support of the name proposal, noted the Nevada County Supervisors support of retaining common usage, and revealed the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) response of no opinion. Veisze and Trumbly commented on the necessity of naming stability and the lack of information available to make judgments about historic usage and the presence of mining.

*Wanish motioned to recommend disapproval of the name proposal. Veisze seconded the motion. The committee voted unanimously to **recommend disapproval** of the proposal. Yea: 5, No: 0.*

Review List 410

Region V (Chambers)

Jacumba Hot Springs

Chambers presented the name proposal, outlining the signature issue that of changing the existing name to that of a variant. Chambers presented information demonstrating that the local community supported efforts to rename the geographic place. Chambers presented information that the proponent was possibly motivated by commercial interests. Veisze recommended deferral based on an incomplete understanding of the issues driving the name proposal.

*Chambers **deferred** a vote on Jacumba Hot Springs (proposed).*

5. Current Items and Activities of Interest

CACGN recommendations and BGN decisions since January, 2012.

i. Review List 396

Region IV (Veisze) Roosevelt Point – CACGN recommended approval; BGN approved 2/9/12

ii. Review List 404

Region V (Chambers) Lucky Bastard Canyon – CACGN recommended disapproval; BGN disapproved 2/9/12

iii. Review List 405

Region III (Meyer) Ogilvie Island – CACGN recommended approval; BGN approved 3/8/12

iv. Review List 407

Region III (Meyer) Dufer Point – CACGN recommended disapproval; BGN approved 2/9/12

Region V (Chambers) San Gabriel Mountains – CACGN recommended disapproval; BGN disapproved 3/8/12

6. Time and Place of Next Meeting

January 16, 2013, 9:30 AM at the Department of Conservation, 801 K Street, 12th Floor, Sacramento, California

Meeting adjourned at 1:10 pm

CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

AGENDA

Wednesday, July 18, 2012
Department of Conservation
801 K Street, 12th Floor
Sacramento, California
9:30 A.M.

1. Call to Order

Attendance check

Members: Morrison; Wanish; Meyer; Veisze; Chambers;
Advisors: Steber; Hawkins; Wheaton; Ostergren;

2. Approval of minutes for January 18, 2012 meeting

3. Announcements

4. Roster Update

5. Consideration of Names proposals on Pending Review Lists

- a. Review List 387
 - i. Region V (Chambers) Mount Minerva Hoyt
(name revised per Action List 2012.06.14; as Review Listed)

- b. Review List 407
 - i. Region III (Meyer) Fossil Point

- c. Review List 408
 - i. Region IV (Veisze) Clem Nelson Peak

- d. Review List 409
 - i. Region II (Wanish) Black Miners Creek
(resubmitted after Butterfly Creek withdrawn; R.L. 407)

- e. Review List 410
 - i. Region V (Chambers) Jacumba Hot Springs

6. Current Items and Activities of Interest

- a. Discussion period, Joan Steber (deferred from January 2012)

- b. COGNA 2013 – Minneapolis, Minnesota

c. Mount Andrea Lawrence

d. CACGN recommendations and BGN decisions since January, 2012; Source: BGN Action List of 2012.06.14.

i. Review List 396

Region IV (Veisze) Roosevelt Point – CACGN recommended approval; BGN approved 2/9/12

ii. Review List 404

Region V (Chambers) Lucky Bastard Canyon – CACGN recommended disapproval; BGN disapproved 2/9/12

iii. Review List 405

Region III (Meyer) Ogilvie Island – CACGN recommended approval; BGN approved 3/8/12

iv. Review List 407

Region III (Meyer) Dufer Point – CACGN recommended disapproval; BGN approved 2/9/12

Region V (Chambers) San Gabriel Mountains – CACGN recommended disapproval; BGN disapproved 3/8/12

7. Time and place of next meeting