

# California Advisory Committee on Geographic Names (CACGN)

## Minutes

March 25, 2022

Virtual Webinar

Sacramento, California

10:00 A.M. – 3:10 P.M.

### 1. Call to Order - Chair Tiffany Meyer, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

Roll was called

Committee Members: 6 of 8 voting members were present

#### *Present*

- ✓ Department of Water Resources (**Mary Simmerer**)
- ✓ Department of Parks and Recreation (**Daniel Walsh**)
- ✓ Department of Fish and Wildlife (**Richard Lis**)
- ✓ Department of Conservation (**Amy Loseth**)
- ✓ Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (**Tiffany Meyer**)
- ✓ California State Library (**Rebecca Wendt** for Greg Lucas)

#### *Absent*

- ✗ Native American Heritage Commission (Debbie Treadway)
- ✗ California African American Museum (Susan Anderson)

Ex-Officio Members:

#### *Present*

- ✓ Department of Transportation (**Amar Azucena Cid**)
- ✓ Legislative LGBTQ Caucus (**Jacob Fraker** for Sen. Susan Eggman)
- ✓ Tribal Advisor to the Office of the Governor (**Christina Snider**)
- ✓ California Natural Resources Agency (**Geneva E. B. Thompson**, Assistant Secretary for Tribal Affairs)

#### *Absent*

- ✗ Select Committee on Native American Affairs (Asm. James C. Ramos); Legislative Black Caucus (Asm. Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr.); Latino Legislative Caucus (Asm. Luz Rivas); Asian Pacific Islander Legislative Caucus (Asm. Ash Kalra); Legislative Women's Caucus (*TBD*)

Federal Advisors:

#### *Present*

- ✓ United States Geological Survey (**Carol Ostergren**)
- ✓ United States Forest Service (**Rich Spradling**)

#### *Absent*

- ✗ United States Bureau of Land Management (James Barnes); National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (Jeffrey Ferguson); National Park Service (Amanda B. Kaplan)

Emeritus Advisors:

Present

- ✓ **Jim Trumbly**, former Chair, retired State Parks
- ✓ **Will Patterson**, past member, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Absent

- ✗ Clayton Guiraud, past member, Department of Water Resources

Non-committee guests: Jenny Runyon; Matt O'Donnell; Heather Witzens (recording minutes)

## 2. Approve Minutes for December 8th, 2021 meeting

- Minutes were distributed and approved electronically following the previous meeting.

## 3. Introductions / Announcements / Business

- Roster was circulated electronically with agenda. Members were asked to confirm their information is correct.
- Chair provided a summary of charter updates which were determined on Feb. 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022:
  - Committee, Ex-officio and advisory members may designate an alternate to sit in on meetings. The alternate must be from the same agency, alternate must be briefed on committee responsibilities and will have the same responsibilities as the primary member, and Chair/Vice Chair must be notified 14 days in advance of meeting that the primary member will not be present and will be designating an alternate. The intent is that the primary member sends someone in their place that is prepared to fill the primary member's responsibilities in their absence.
  - Vice Chair position has been added, and will be nominated and voted in by committee members. Vice Chair is a one-year position, before they succeed the Chairperson.
- DOI Secretarial Order 3404
  - The Chair provided background and an update on timing of S.O. 3404.
    - Order from Deb Haaland, Secretary of U.S. Dept. of Interior, to remove Sq\_\_\_ geographic names from federal maps due to the derogatory nature of the name.
    - Federal Register Notice was published on February 24th and candidate names were released. The federal task force for this initiative suggested five candidate names for each Sq\_\_ name; these were derived from names of other features in close proximity to the Sq\_\_ feature. If an Sq\_\_ name was already on a Review List prior to S.O. 3404, the suggested names from the Review petition are also included for consideration. California has 85 Sq\_\_ names. [Excel list of Candidates](#)
    - Public and Tribal comments period closes on April 24th. The CACGN can also comment during this period.

- Task force will provide recommendations to federal BGN (Board of Geographic Names) on July 24<sup>th</sup>.
  - BGN renders decision on September 24<sup>th</sup>.
  - It is still undecided whether the task force will address Sq\_\_ names in unincorporated places.
- CNRA Assistant Secretary for Tribal Affairs provided an update on CNRA's California Native American Tribal outreach effort to generate Tribal input on candidate names for S.O. 3404.
  - They are starting to receive feedback and naming recommendations from Tribes regarding the Sq\_\_ names.
  - The state prioritizes early, often and meaningful engagement with Native Tribes, so Tribal outreach is encouraged for all future naming/renaming cases. CACGN can contact CNRA Assistant Secretary for Tribal Affairs for outreach support with future cases.
- U.S. Forest Service advisor provided comments on USFS efforts regarding S.O. 3404.
  - The USFS finds many candidate names generated by the task force less than desirable.
  - USFS is also engaging with Tribal partners and suggested that USFS and CNRA coordinate their Tribal outreach to avoid duplication of efforts.
- Updated on proposed AB2022 State Legislation was provided by Chair.
  - If passed, would require the removal of Sq\_\_ from all geographic features and place names in the state of California.
    - "Geographic feature" is defined as any location or publicly owned structure in this state, including, but not limited to, navigable waters of the state, geographic features, parks, state or local roads, bridges, and publicly owned buildings.
    - "Place" means any natural geographic feature or street, alley, or other road within the jurisdiction of the state or political subdivision of the state.
  - If passed, the CACGN Charter would be amended again to give us the power and responsibilities to make these changes. CACGN would be required to:
    - Establish a procedure to receive reports of geographic features with the name, verify those reports, solicit proposals for replacement name, vote on a new name and report the alternative name.
    - Notify departments that compile the information to ensure the information is changed on maps and documents.
    - Report progress to the Governor and Legislature.
- CACGN Vice Chair
  - Richard Lis was nominated as Vice Chair
  - 6 voted in favor, 2 absent
  - Final vote will be taken to CNRA Secretary Crowfoot for approval

**4. Actions made by U.S. BGN since December 8, 2021**

Chair announced the decisions made by the US BGN based on the recommendations of the CACGN.

Source: [geonames.usgs.gov](https://geonames.usgs.gov) > Domestic Names > Action List; 2022.02.10; Accessed 2022.03.04)

Proposed Name	Feature Type	County	Review List	BGN Decision Date	Case Status
<i>Sawyer Falls</i>	<i>fall</i>	<i>El Dorado</i>	440		<i>Pending</i>
The Duke	summit	Tuolumne	443	2/10/2022	Disapproved
Oak Springs	ppl	San Bernardino	436	2/10/2022	Approved
<i>Paac Kūvūhū’k</i>	<i>reservoir</i>	<i>Riverside</i>	437		<i>Pending</i>
Howe Arch	arch	Los Angeles	439	2/10/2022	Disapproved
<i>Chesed Hills</i>	<i>ridge</i>	<i>Imperial</i>	443		<i>Pending</i>
Gasparini Creek	Creek	El Dorado	441	2/10/2022	Approved

**5. Names proposals on Pending Review Lists for Consideration**

*\*Following committee discussion of each proposed name, public comments will be accepted for up to three minutes.*

County	Proposed name	Current name	BGN list #	Assigned member
Nevada Co.	Johnson Canyon	Negro Canyon	434	Susan Anderson
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Needs further research.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Assigned member absent; Chair stated no new information is available at this time.</p>				
Alpine Co.	Da-ek Dow Go-et Wa Tah	Jeff Davis Creek	440	Amy Loseth
<p><b>Voted (for <u>6</u> /against <u>0</u> /abstain <u>0</u> ) Recommendation: <u>APPROVE</u></b></p> <p><b>Recommendation basis:</b> Alpine County Board of Supervisors, Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. BGN, CACGN all support the full proposed name; Governor Newsom also supports changing the existing name.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> The existing name is commemorative and refers to Jefferson Davis, president for the Confederacy during the Civil War. Davis supported slavery and had no ties or connection to the state</p>				

of California; the current name may have been given to the feature by confederate sympathizers who moved to the area after the Civil War. The current name first appeared on a USGS map in 1958.

Proposed Washoe name means “saddle between two points” (proponent’s translation is “saddle going over”); Wa Tah means “water/stream/river”). Feature is a 2.8-mile-long tributary of the Pleasant Valley Creek in the Mokelumne Wilderness Area in the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest. The mouth of the creek is on the Markleeville quad and the remainder of the creek is on the Carson Pass Quad. This proposal is associated with a 2018 proposal to rename Jeff Davis Mountain to Da-ek Dow Go-et Mountain, which the BGN approved in 2020.

The Forest Service previously expressed concern about using the Native generic “Wa Tah” instead of the English generic “Creek”; they felt English generics are helpful for map users. When the assigned member approached the proponent about this issue, the proponent stated either term is acceptable. The USFS advisor stated that as a result of S.O. 3404, USFS is now rethinking their initial stance and are more open to “Wa Tah” – similarity to English “Water” was pointed out. USFS advisor also got feedback from Washington that they are open to “Wa Tah,” as is Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest. USFS advisor says this decision could set precedence regarding Native vs. English generics.

BGN advisor states that if CACGN wants to change “Wa Tah” to “Creek,” the proponent would need to submit an amendment to BGN, who would essentially treat it as a new proposal resulting in further delay of up to six months. The Washoe Tribe also expressed to the advisor their preference for “Wa Tah” over “Creek,” and that the previous addition of the English generic “Mountain” to the nearby feature was a concession on the Tribe’s part.

Chair pointed out that due to S.O. 3404, CACGN is likely to receive many more naming proposals in the near future, and the process should not be held up by deliberation over Native vs. English generics; USFS advisor concurred. Additionally, BGN no longer strongly supports English generics and are open to Native generic terms.

The assigned member suggested that CACGN should also consider the added administrative burden that is placed on the proponents when amendments are requested; BGN advisor concurred. BGN also confirmed that adding the English generic “Mountain” to the recently-approved nearby feature required the proponent to submit an amendment, which then went back to CACGN for approval before final approval by BGN.

**Summary of Forest Service and BGN opinions regarding English vs. Native generics:** Advisors for U.S. Forest service and U.S. Bureau of Geographic Names both expressed their agencies’ acceptance of Native generics; the agencies are no longer committed to enforcement of English generics.

Tuolumne Co.	James Wong Howe Creek	Chinaman Creek*	440	Tiffany Meyer
<p><b>*This is the first of two proposals for the same feature; the second proposal is listed under 443, below.</b></p> <p><b>Deferred</b> – Pending research and discussion regarding the other proposed name (China Creek, list 443, covered below) for the same feature.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Small, remotely located creek with a name that is considered offensive. Committee feels the person referenced in the proposed name, while deserving of commemoration, is geographically and historically irrelevant to this specific creek and the Tuolumne County area. BGN is waiting on response from proponent regarding potential withdrawal of proposal.</p>				
Marin Co.	Elk Creek	n/a	440	Richard Lis
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Needs Tribal and county input.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Currently unnamed creek is in Tennessee Valley near very popular trail. Creek has been referred to by various names, including Elk Creek, Tennessee Valley Creek, Elk Valley Creek, primarily by the Dept. of Fish and Wildlife. The proponent, Golden Gate Recreation Area, supports the Elk Creek name due to area’s historic Tule Elk populations. Assigned member has worked with Native Tribes in other areas but is unfamiliar with the Tribes in the Marin area. The local Tribes appear to be primarily Miwok (Granton Rancheria/Federated Coast Miwok and Coast Miwok of Marin); assigned member wishes to contact these tribes (and any other local Tribes) and will reach out to CNRA Assistant Secretary for Tribal Affairs for assistance. Assigned member also emailed Tribal Advisor to the Office of the Governor for advice on how best to communicate with local Tribes but has not heard back yet.</p> <p>Assigned member described a current controversy that has parallels to this case. The Coast Miwok of Marin are unhappy with Point Reyes National Recreation Area’s prioritizing cattle ranching and dairying over reestablishment of Tule Elk populations; Point Reyes NRA wanted to cull Tule Elk populations to lessen competition with the cattle. The Coast Miwok of Marin have sent a letter to Secretary Haaland regarding this issue.</p> <p>There is no comment from the county as yet. BGN reached out to the county two years ago (July 2020) but received no response. Assigned member would like to contact the County Supervisor, but the BGN advisor suggested getting Tribal input before reaching out to the county. The BGN also says the proponent may withdraw their suggested name if Tribal names surface and that the proponent is currently working with Tribal contacts; local Tribal groups have expressed interest in this case. BGN will contact assigned member to update him on the case progress on their end.</p> <p>Chair feels that due to popularity of nearby trail, it is likely the county will want to provide input. BGN advisor says county, local historian, or GIS personnel can possibly provide some additional information such as whether there is an existing name for the feature mentioned in any county literature, so it may be a good idea to initiate conversation with the county now and let them know how the case is progressing.</p>				

Riverside Co.	Menifee Hills	n/a	440	Amy Loeth
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Additional outreach and research needed.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Feature is a currently unnamed ridge in city of Menifee, Riverside County, between Menifee Valley and Paris Valley. Ridge is approximately two miles long and 1.5 miles wide. Ridge is a popular hiking area with several trails. Proponent claims feature is known locally as Menifee Cross Hill (large cross on trail); online trail maps corroborate a similar name. Other regional geographic and community features (libraries, school districts, road, golf course, etc.) use Menifee name. City of Menifee supports; no response from Riverside County.</p> <p>The Menifee name originally commemorated Luther Menifee Wilson, who worked for the railroad and may have been a Civil War veteran. He also worked as a miner in Kern County and discovered gold in Menifee, which may have brought attention to the area, although the region’s overall mining history is unnotable. Miners in that era did not typically contribute to their communities; the Menifee Historical Society states farmers and businessmen were more responsible for the settlement of the Menifee area than miners were. Menifee was known as a black sheep fond of drink and young women, and he died destitute in 1899 near Winchester, CA after a three-month drinking spree.</p> <p>Several committee members support the name due to its associative and local use, since so many other geographic and community features already use the Menifee name, and the feature is apparently commonly referred to as Menifee Cross Hill by the local community. Additional clarification of the nature and extent of the local usage would be helpful. The Chair pointed out that the omission of “Cross” from the proposed name disassociates it from local usage. The BGN advisor suggested that the area called Menifee Cross Hill may be a subfeature of the larger hills; Menifee Cross Hill could also be listed as a variant name. Another member pointed out that a subdivision named Menifee Hills was also recently constructed in the area.</p> <p>The committee questioned whether it was appropriate to name yet another feature after Menifee the person, considering his history. BGN advisor pointed out that the proposed name was submitted as an associative name and should not be considered commemorative of Menifee the person; the BGN supports the proposed name due to its associative aspect and because no other names have been proposed – no comments by federally recognized Tribes were received, and the Tribal comment period has now passed. The proponent also listed a point of contact as the Chair of Parks, Recreation and Trails Commission for the city of Menifee, who has also not responded. CNRA Assistant Secretary for Tribal Affairs emphasized that lack of response should not imply consent. Assigned member stated desire to conduct further research and outreach.</p>				

**BGN advisor comment regarding coordination of efforts between BGN and CACGN:** Advisor suggested CACGN members and BGN staff touch base in between scheduled meetings regarding their cases to make sure everyone is up to date and has coordinated efforts prior to the scheduled CACGN meetings.

<b>San Bernardino Co.</b>	<b>Risler Buttes*</b>	<b>Pickaninny Buttes</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>Mary Simmerer</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	------------	----------------------

**\*Relisted from 437.**

**Deferred** – Additional research desired regarding African American presence in Lucerne Valley.

**Notes:** The first proposed name (Alfalfa Buttes from list 437) was withdrawn; current proposal is submitted by the Lucerne Valley Economic Development Association. Feature is a standalone high point on a parcel historically and currently owned by the Risler family; homestead patent for land containing the feature was granted to honoree in 1928. There has been African American presence in the valley, but not to the specific parcel that contains the feature. Assigned member attempted to contact absent member Susan Anderson of the California African American Museum regarding African American history of area, but has not yet received a response, so suggests deferment. Chair reiterated that current name is derogatory and assigned member agreed, stating the property owners should not be associated with a derogatory name.

<b>Tuolumne Co.</b>	<b>China Creek</b>	<b>Chinaman Creek*</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>Tiffany Meyer</b>
---------------------	--------------------	------------------------	------------	----------------------

**\*This is the second proposal for the same feature; the first proposal is listed under 440, above.**

**Deferred** – Additional input pending from Asian American community regarding this feature; both currently proposed names (China Creek and James Wong Howe, noted above) will likely be pulled in favor of a name suggested by the Asian American community.

**Notes:** Small, remotely located creek with a name that is considered offensive. Assigned member has been communicating with the Tuolumne County Historical Society, a Stanford historian specializing in Asian history, and the County of Tuolumne Archives. Feature is on Forest Service land; Forest Service has been in contact with Chinese Historical Society of America. The first proposal for the same feature proposes the name James Wong Howe (detailed above). The experts in Asian American history agree that the James Wong Howe name is inappropriate for this specific feature.

BGN advisor states that current proposal(s) could not be amended; proponent would need to submit a new proposal so that the new name would be included on the review list, which would allow Native Tribes to provide input. Simply amending the current proposal(s) would not trigger the Tribal review process. This will push approval of any future proposed names to the Fall.

----- *Lunch Break was taken 11:53-12:55* -----



Nevada Co.	Granite Face Lake	n/a	443	Richard Lis
<p>Voted (for <u>6</u> /against <u>0</u> /abstain <u>0</u> ) Recommendation: <u>APPROVE</u></p> <p><b>Recommendation basis:</b> County supports; no opposition; proposed name is a non-commemorative name for a man-made feature, is not likely to be found derogatory, and is proposed by the landowner.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Feature is five-acre man-made reservoir, approximately 1.5 miles east of Fordyce Lake, on a private inholding. Property owner, who lives in Reno, also owns adjacent parcels; parcel containing feature is 240 acres. The Bear-Yuba Land Trust has a conservation easement on Fordyce Lake, but have not responded to assigned member’s request for input or knowledge of any previous name(s). Local Tribe appears to be a Maidu Tribe based out of Oroville. Chair states that federally recognized Tribes would have seen the US BGN notification of proposal, but if the Oroville Maidu are not a federally recognized Tribe, they would not have been notified of the case; it is up to CACGN whether they want to contact non-federally recognized Tribes. BGN advisor confirmed that county supports the proposed name. Several committee members agree proposed name is innocuous and non-commemorative. Assigned member also points out that the proposed name seems to be describing the feature itself since a face can apparently be seen in the granite surrounding the lake. Additionally, the fact that it is a man-made reservoir means Native Tribes would not have a historical connection to it. Feature is also on private land without public access. Assigned member states that he originally wanted to conduct more research, but upon learning that the proponent is the landowner, he feels comfortable to proceed with approval.</p>				
Sierra Co.	Damalung Lake	Squaw Lake	416	Debbie Treadway
	Harmony Lake		446	
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Forest Service Tribal Manager is currently seeking additional input from Tribes; the deadline for S.O. 3404 is approaching and that task force will need to make the final determination.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Assigned committee member absent; case background provided by Chair and USFS advisor. Original proposal from Washoe proponent (BGN list 416) has been pending since 2014. Committee found features to be within historic Mountain Maidu core territory. The Mountain Maidu Summit Consortium recently submitted new proposals (BGN list 446) for the same features. Washoe proponent expressed willingness to remove the 416 proposals except Seshme Creek. Chair shared maps of Washoe territory (core and secondary) with proposed names plotted; features fall within secondary or ancestral Washoe areas. Forest Service Tribal Relations Manager just got response from Washoe proponent and Mountain Maidu Summit Consortium that they are willing to discuss the issue further. Additional names have been informally suggested by Greenville Rancheria. <i>See additional note under Sq__ Valley Peak entry below.</i></p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same two proponents for same region and considered together.</b></p>				

Plumas Co.	Delmooh Valley	Squaw Valley	416	Debbie Treadway
	Beyem Seyo		446	
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Forest Service Tribal Manager is currently seeking additional input from Tribes; the deadline for S.O. 3404 is approaching and that task force will need to make the final determination.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Proposer of name listed under 416 (Washoe) expressed willingness to retract proposal.</p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same two proponents for same region and considered together.</b></p>				
Plumas Co.	Delunga Peak	Squaw Valley Peak	416	Debbie Treadway
	Mudoim		446	
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Forest Service Tribal Manager is currently seeking additional input from Tribes; the deadline for S.O. 3404 is approaching and that task force will need to make the final determination.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Greenville Rancheria indicated they agree with “Delunga” as originally proposed by the Washoe proponent under BGN list 416; “Mudoim” name proposed under 446 was very likely an error on the part of the CACGN committee. The Mountain Maidu Summit Consortium expressed no preference or offered an alternative name.</p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same two proponents for same region and considered together.</b></p>				
Plumas Co.	Seshme Creek	Squaw Queen Creek	416	Debbie Treadway
	Mo Bisipi		446	
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Forest Service Tribal Manager is currently seeking additional input from Tribes; the deadline for S.O. 3404 is approaching and that task force will need to make the final determination.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Proposer of name listed under 416 (Washoe) did not wish to retract proposal.</p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same two proponents for same region and considered together.</b></p>				
Placer Co.	Lake Marie	Part of Loch Leven Lakes complex	445	Mary Simmerer
<p><b>Deferred</b> – Additional input needed from local Tribes and Forest Service.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Feature is a currently unnamed lake within the Loch Leven Lakes complex; complex was formally named in 1962, taking its name from Loch Leven in Scotland. Travel blogs refer to the feature as Middle Lake.</p>				

Proponent is Washoe; proposed name commemorates Marie Barry, who died in 2016 and had local connections to the region, having grown up at the big bend on the Yuba River. Barry did some work for the Hoopa Tribe in Northern California, but primarily did work for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. She had many environmental and community health achievements, including establishment of a clean drinking water program for the Washoe tribe. Barry also built up a staff of 30 people, created a recycling yard, led flood mitigation and restoration work, implemented a yearly Earth Day event, and helped reintroduce trout to Lake Tahoe.

Initial research indicates the Northern Maidu, Washoe, and Nisenan Tribes historically resided in the general area. Assigned member notes that some consider Maidu to be a language rather than a Tribe, and also that the Northern Maidu and Nisenan Tribes are often considered to be part of the same Nation (for example, the Nevada County website only identifies historic Nisenan territory and does not mention the Northern or Southern Maidu). General consensus is typically that the Washoe are a separate Nation. It is currently unclear whether Washoe territory extends to this lake; Nisenan territory appears more appropriate based on initial research. Assigned member has not yet received input from the Northern Maidu or Nisenan Tribes, and the Forest Service has not conducted any inquiries of yet. USFS advisor mentioned that proponent is the widower of the proposed honoree and is also the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Washoe Tribe.

Placer Co.	Washeshu Peak	Squaw Peak	445	Susan Anderson
------------	---------------	------------	-----	----------------

Voted (for 6 /against 0 /abstain 0 ) Recommendation: APPROVE

**Recommendation basis:** Proposed Washoe name is preferred over both the existing name and the associative names (names taken from nearby features) generated by the 3404 task force.

**Notes:** Assigned member absent; chair suggested deferral based on pending 3404 actions and lack of CACGN research. A committee member asked if there was any known reason not to vote on the proposed name. Chair is not aware of any opposition, but reiterated that CACGN has not conducted their own research or solicited feedback from other parties.

Chair referred to proposal to summarize the case background. Proposed name means “Many Washoe.” Feature is in ancestral territory of Washoe Tribe, in Tahoe National Forest; proponent states Docket-288 of the Indian Claims Commission supports Washoe affiliation to the place. Placer County currently has no place name that commemorates the Washoe as the region’s original people. No previous BGN actions exist. Existing name is considered derogatory to Native American women and the Forest Service has declared offensive names to be removed.

Chair agreed that a vote could convey to the task force that CACGN supports the removal of the offensive name in favor of the proposed Native name. CNRA Assistant Secretary for Tribal Affairs concurred that a vote of approval would be consistent with Tribal outreach initiatives and S.O. 3404. USFS advisor stated USFS has not conducted its own research; while advisor is not against the committee proceeding with a vote, no USFS opinion would be provided for this case.

Alameda Co.	Oakland Hills*	n/a (Berkeley Hills area)	445	Tiffany Meyer
<p><b>* Relisted from 428</b></p> <p><b>Deferred</b> – Geographic boundaries of feature are still unclear. Feedback still needed from local governments.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Originally submitted several years ago. BGN process notified federally recognized Tribes, local governments and Association of Bay Area Governments; no responses received as yet.</p> <p>A member who grew up in the area (and still visits frequently) offered to help assigned member with research/provide background information, and concurred that the boundaries of the proposed feature are unclear; member stated Berkeley Hills are in back of Berkeley and proposed feature is in back of Oakland, but the boundary between these two features is what is unclear, so the proponent will need to provide detailed maps that identify the boundaries. Member noted that the original proposal appeared to use road as dividing line; member believes a watershed ridge would be more logical division.</p> <p>Chair will contact Association of Bay Area Governments if no other input is received; chair notes that the BGN letters sent out for the original proposal requested that the local governments have a collaborative discussion regarding the case. If chair gets opportunity to attend that meeting, chair will invite the member familiar with the original case and the area.</p>				

**6. Names proposals on Pending Review Lists to be introduced**

*\*\*Case assignments are subject to change following committee meeting discussion*

County	Proposed name	Current name	Proposal release date	BGN list #	Assigned member
Imperial Co.	Avi Kwalal*	Pilot Knob	1/24/2022	446	Greg Lucas
<p><b>*Relisted from 443</b></p> <p><b>Deferred</b> – Needs input from Bureau of Land Management and county, and potentially additional research.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Representative for assigned member notes that the currently proposed name was mentioned in the original proposal as meaning “place of pilgrimage” and had been used in the past.</p>					

San Diego Co.	Cush-Pie	Stonewall Peak	1/24/2022	446	Daniel Walsh
<p><b>Deferred</b> - No research or information yet.  <b>Notes:</b> Features are on State Park land.</p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same proponent for same region and will be considered together</b></p>					
San Diego Co.	Cush-Pii Creek	Stonewall Creek	1/24/2022	446	Daniel Walsh
<p><b>Deferred</b> - No research or information yet.</p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same proponent for same region and will be considered together</b></p>					
San Diego Co.	Ipuk Spiruk	Little Stonewall Peak	1/24/2022	446	Daniel Walsh
<p><b>Deferred</b> - No research or information yet.</p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same proponent for same region and will be considered together</b></p>					
San Diego Co.	Ipuk Spiruk Creek	Little Stonewall Creek	1/24/2022	446	Daniel Walsh
<p><b>Deferred</b> - No research or information yet.</p> <p><b>** 4 cases submitted by same proponent for same region and will be considered together</b></p>					
Fresno Co.	(Nuum Valley) / Yokuts Valley	Squaw Valley	1/24/2022	446	Greg Lucas
<p><b>Voted (for <u>  6  </u>/against <u>  0  </u>/abstain <u>  0  </u>) Recommendation: <u>  APPROVE Yokuts Valley  </u></b></p> <p><b>Recommendation basis:</b> Based on request of proponent, who offered public comment stating his desire to change the proposed name to Yokuts Valley based on input from other local Tribes. The BGN and task force are also aware of this request.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Feature is in an unincorporated, yet populated, place, and although existing name is of the derogatory nature covered under S.O. 3404, the 3404 task force is currently unsure whether they will handle populated places.</p> <p>Representative for assigned member stated staff has conducted initial research; haven't been able to find Nuum as a word within the Mono Tribal language. Still conducting research to confirm that Yokuts means "all people" (not just Tribal people). Yokuts territory historically extends through most of the San Joaquin Valley and encompassed hundreds of tribes; one of these tribes, the historically settled in the area containing the feature. Research team concluded that Yokuts Valley is a historically accurate name to replace the offensive name.</p>					

Chair proposed deferment due to task force uncertainty; if the case comes back to CACGN it could be a controversial deliberation because the County Board of Supervisors don't want to change existing name; they feel the existing name has historical value.

**Public Comment:** Three minutes allowed.

- Roman Rain Tree, Chair of Rename Sq\_\_ Valley Fresno County, current proponent – Mr. Rain Tree states that after conducting additional outreach to other Tribes and Tribal elders, proponent has contacted the task force to request retraction of the listed proposed name, Nuum Valley, in favor of Yokuts Valley. The region is considered to be primarily Foothill Yokuts territory, and all of the Tribes Indigenous to the area are non-federally recognized; Mr. Rain Tree is related to one of these non-federally recognized Tribes. Mr. Rain Tree concurred that there has been a lot of pushback from county officials.

Discussion followed about the best way for CACGN to proceed in light of this new information. Chair suggested CACGN or CNRA Tribal Outreach could submit Yokuts Valley to the task force as part of the open public and Tribal input process; chair is concerned task force may default to favoring the currently listed name (Nuum Valley) if they do not receive feedback in support of Yokuts Valley. Another member concurs that it would be beneficial to share Mr. Rain Tree's comments with the task force. Chair states that since Nuum Valley is the name on the Review List, she doesn't believe CACGN can vote directly on the Yokuts Valley name, so suggests that voting to disapprove Nuum Valley could be an allowable action on the part of CACGN. The other member reiterates suggestion to pass along Mr. Rain Tree's comments to the task force with the statement that CACGN supports the desired change to the listed name; this would in effect put a "red flag" on the Nuum Valley name. Another member suggests submitting a letter as part of the comment period. Chair states disapproval of Nuum Valley makes sense because in order for Mr. Rain Tree to retract the currently listed name, he will have to submit a new proposal, which would nullify the original proposal.

**Public Reply** – Mr. Rain Tree replied that he had been in touch with BGN advisor in January asking if a new proposal would need to be submitted, or if an amendment to the current proposal would be sufficient; BGN advisor stated he could simply submit a written request for amendment. Mr. Rain Tree stated that if he had been told a new petition was needed, his organization would have proceeded with that immediately. He stated that the BGN advisor also informed him that due to the impending 3404 deadline, he would need to communicate directly with the task force moving forward. He expressed confusion about why CACGN would vote to disapprove a proposal that had a pending amendment on it.

**CACGN Reply** – Chair replied that CACGN vote would only be a recommendation and would not actually remove the proposal. Additionally, in regards to another case discussed earlier in the meeting, chair mentioned that BGN advisor said the proposal in the other case could not be amended and a new proposal would need to be submitted; chair asked for clarification from BGN advisor regarding their policy on amendments.

**BGN Reply** – BGN advisor explained that these seemingly conflicting instructions are due to the timing/deadlines of the various cases. At the time of BGN's

communication with Mr. Rain Tree, the Nuum Valley application was still being handled by BGN, but as of July 24 BGN's role ceased and the case was moved to the task force. At the time of BGN's correspondence with Mr. Rain Tree, BGN was not aware that the task force might potentially give the case back to BGN due to the feature being in an unincorporated, populated place. BGN advisor noted that any name on the candidate list submitted to the BGN, along with any comments submitted to the task force, will be taken into consideration; the task force member currently assigned to this case is also aware of Mr. Rain Tree's request. If the proposal does in fact come back to BGN, BGN will work with Mr. Rain Tree's organization to either amend the current proposal or submit a new proposal, whichever is appropriate. Advisor acknowledged that the current situation is confusing and frustrating, but is confident that Mr. Rain Tree's concerns are being taken into account.

**CACGN Reply** – Chair explained that a CACGN vote to disapprove Nuum Valley would be conducted more for optics to communicate to the task force that Nuum Valley is not the appropriate name; it would in effect be a way for CACGN to communicate support of the Yokuts Valley name. CACGN would include Mr. Rain Tree's preference for the new name as reasoning for disapproval of the listed name. Chair also explained that since task force is new, CACGN is unfamiliar with their exact rules and methods of operation, but concurred that task force is aware of Mr. Rain Tree's preference.

One member asked whether there is a local Post Office that uses the current derogatory name. The representative for another member confirmed that there is. BGN advisor asked for confirmation from Mr. Rain Tree.

**Public Reply** – Mr. Rain Tree confirmed that there is a local Post Office that uses the current derogatory name and shared that residents are embarrassed to use that name as a return address. Mr. Rain Tree also posed a question to BGN advisor: If CACGN disapproves Nuum Valley and the case later returns to BGN, would he need to submit a new petition, or could BGN consider an amendment to his original petition?

**BGN Reply** – BGN advisor replied that BGN would consider his amended proposal; Mr. Rain Tree has essentially withdrawn Nuum Valley for consideration, and BGN (or the task force) would not approve a withdrawn name. BGN advisor feels that it is not necessary for CACGN to disapprove Nuum Valley and suggests that CACGN convey support for Yokuts Valley instead.

Chair proposed approval of Yokuts Valley in place of Nuum Valley, based on proponent's wishes.

**Public Comment:** Three minutes allowed.

- Tedde Simon, Indigenous Justice Advocate at ACLU of Northern California – ACLU has been working with Mr. Rain Tree's coalition to change the offensive name. Commenter expressed

appreciation for the committee's current dialogue and their commitment to this issue. Asked if committee has any additional information on whether the task force may or may not address populated places, and if there is a way for civic groups to advocate with the task force for them to do so. Commenter also noted that it isn't necessarily the entire Fresno County Board of Supervisors that is against the name change; all county opposition is coming from a single supervisor who has been very vocal with his opposition. There is a change.org petition with over 35,000 signatures in support of the name change, a large group of local residents who support the change, and additional allies throughout the county and state also support the change. Commentator voiced concern about the current limbo of the case between the task force and the BGN and reiterated appreciation for CACGN's diligence toward the case to ensure that it doesn't get drawn out for a decade, during which time county residents would continue to drive by signage with the name that epitomizes the racism and violence against Indigenous women.

**CACGN Reply** – Chair replied that the committee is unsure which way the task force will go, but the impression is that the task force really prefers not to consider populated places; task force is currently petitioning for permission to exclude populated places from their list.

**BGN Reply** – BGN advisor encouraged anyone with an opinion about who should handle populated places (task force or BGN) to submit that to the email address listed in the Federal Register notice for public comment. Advisor reiterated that both organizations will take public comments into consideration. Advisor is aware that it is one county supervisor in opposition and that BGN has not received any formal opinion from the County Board of Supervisors. If the case does come back to BGN, they will send a formal request to the Board of Supervisors for their recommendation. Advisor expressed assurance that the case will not languish for 10 years and is being taken seriously by the Federal Government. Advisor anticipates that the committee will have more complete information about who will handle populated places by the next CACGN meeting.

**CACGN Reply** – Chair mentioned that what may be causing alarm is the mention earlier in the meeting of the Plumas/Sierra cases that have been languishing for 10 years. Chair emphasized that the reason for this has been lack of engagement, and if this case goes back to BGN it will be resolved more promptly due to active engagement from the community, which is exactly what the committees need to help them make timely decisions.

One member added that although the feature is in an unincorporated area, it does get a lot of public visibility due to being along the main route to Kings Canyon National Park's General Grant Grove area.

Chair agreed that is an important point and underscores the fact that the existing derogatory name is being widely seen by the larger public.



Placer Co.	Olympic Valley	Squaw Valley	1/24/2022	446	Amy Loseth
Voted (for <u>  6  </u> /against <u>  0  </u> /abstain <u>  0  </u> ) Recommendation: <u>  APPROVE  </u>					
<p><b>Recommendation basis:</b> Name proposed by the Washoe Tribe’s Tribal Historic Preservation Officer refers to the 1960 Winter Olympics that were held in the region, and is preferred over the more generic associative names (names taken from nearby features) generated by the 3404 task force; proposed name is also used by the local Post Office and community.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> CACGN has not had time to conduct thorough research.</p>					
Placer Co.	Washesu Creek	Squaw Creek	1/24/2022	446	n/a
Voted (for <u>  6  </u> /against <u>  0  </u> /abstain <u>  0  </u> ) Recommendation: <u>  APPROVE* (see notes)  </u>					
<p><b>Recommendation basis:</b> Proposed Washoe name is preferred over the more generic associative names (names taken from nearby features) generated by the 3404 task force.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Proposed name means “Many Washoe.” Feature is in ancestral territory of Washoe Tribe, in Tahoe National Forest. CACGN has not conducted any research or solicited feedback from other parties.</p> <p><i>*Feature crosses Sq__ Valley (proposed name Olympic Valley) and ends well north of Sq__ Peak (proposed name Washeshu Peak – see Section 5, above). There is an apparent (unnamed) tributary of Sq__ Creek that travels more directly to Sq__ /Washesu Peak, which would be the more logical feature to receive the Washeshu Creek name. The Committee feels that Olympic Creek may be the most appropriate name to replace the Sq__ Creek name, with Washeshu Creek applied to the southern tributary that travels in the direction of Sq__ /Washesu Peak. However, barring that possibility, the committee is supportive of the proposed name as it was submitted.</i></p>					

**7. Time and place of next meeting:** July 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2022 @ 10:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.

Proposed Fall meeting date: November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2022 @ 10:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.

