
Minutes

Washington State Committee on Geographic Names

December 11, 2023

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

EJ Juarez – Chair

Mary Schaff – WA State Library Representative

Dr. Allyson Brooks – Dept. of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

Mike Iyall – Tribal Representative

Dean Foster - Public Member

Dr. Grant Smith – Public Member

STAFF PRESENT

Caleb Maki

AUDIENCE PRESENT

Barbara Stark

Matthew O'Donnell

Tom Strong

Dee Camp

Marsha Aufenkamp

Cameron McCormick

Allyn Dukes

John Schneider

David Barta

Jennifer Runyon

Shelby Bourquein

**Washington State Committee on Geographic Names
December 11, 2023 - 10:00am – 12:00pm
Room 172 - Natural Resources Building
1111 Washington St. SE, Olympia, WA 98504
(360) 902-1000**

Agenda

CALL TO ORDER

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NAMES FOR INITIAL CONSIDERATION

Clark County

Prune Hill Creek – NEW NAME – APPROVED FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION

Lewis County

Lapome Creek – NEW NAME – DEFERRED

Skagit/Whatcom County

Elizabeth Creek – NEW NAME – APPROVED FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION

Snohomish County

Mary Pamela Falls – NEW NAME – APPROVED FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION

Stevens County

Wild Plum Creek – NEW NAME – APPROVED FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION

Jefferson, Kitsap, and Mason Counties

Salish Fjord – NAME CHANGE - DENIED

ADJOURNMENT

1 **CALL TO ORDER**

2 The Chair of the EJ Juarez called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and gave an overview of the
3 Committee’s purpose and meeting agenda. EJ Juarez then called for attendance from the
4 Committee members.

5

6 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

7 Chair EJ Juarez called for a motion to approve the minutes from the last Committee meeting.

8

9 MOITION: Mike Iyall moved to approve the minutes.

10

11 SECOND: Dean Foster seconded the motion.

12

13 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously.

14

15 **PUBLIC COMMENT FOR PRUNE HILL CREEK**

16 None

17

18 **PRUNE HILL CREEK INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)**

19 After staff gave an overview of the proposal, Mary Schaff said that she recalled that there were
20 other features in the area with the name “Prune”. Staff listed the other three features containing
21 the name “Prune” in Washington, one being Prune Hill where the creek originates. Dean Foster
22 said that he did have concerns about having other features with the name “Prune”, but he sees that
23 the local community supports the proposal, and he does not see a commercial interest. Dean Foster
24 said that he would be inclined to support this proposal.

25

26 Mike Iyall asked if there was any evidence that this was a fish bearing stream, because if it was,
27 having a name would help biologists in their efforts. Staff said that they would clarify this before
28 the next Committee meeting.

29

30 Dr. Allyson Brooks said that according to the proposal, the feature flows year-round and can be
31 seen from nearby hiking trails. Mary Schaff said that the feature empties into the Columbia River,
32 so it should be fish bearing, and said she would advance this proposal for Final Consideration.

33

34 MOTION: Mary Schaff motioned to approve the name Prune Hill Creek.

35

36 SECOND: Mike Iyall seconded the motion.

37

38 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously to approve that name Prune Hill Creek for Final
39 Consideration.

40

41 **PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ELIZABETH CREEK**

42 None

43

44 **ELIZABETH CREEK INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)**

45 Staff gave an overview of the proposal and informed the Committee that this proposal had been
46 brought to the Committee in the past, but the five-year commemorative naming rule had not been

1 met. Staff said now that the person being commemorated has been deceased for five or more years,
2 the proponent would like the Committee to hear the proposal.

3

4 Mike Iyall said that he supports this proposal, in part because the pioneer newspaper people gave
5 us a lot of history. Mike Iyall said that he hopes some of Elizabeth's articles are archived
6 somewhere.

7

8 Dean Foster asked if the proponent had brought this before the Committee, or if this was something
9 the Committee automatically does for names denied in the past for not meeting the commemorative
10 naming rule.

11

12 Mary Schaff asked if the person being commemorated had any connection to the feature. Dr.
13 Allyson Brooks said that according to the materials submitted, Elizabeth had done a lot of walking
14 and had an emotional attachment to the area. Dr. Grant Smith said that the materials say that
15 Elizabeth led a group of hikers to the creek at one time and had a physical association with the
16 creek, which Dr. Grant Smith said was important to him.

17

18 Dr. Allyson Brooks said that it looks like there is support for this proposal from the local
19 community, and she supports moving it forward.

20

21 MOTION: Dr. Allyson Brooks motioned to approve the name Elizabeth Creek.

22

23 SECOND: Dr. Grant Smith seconded the motion.

24

25 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously to approve that name Elizabeth Creek for Final
26 Consideration.

27

28 **PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MARY PAMELA FALLS**

29 None

30

31 **MARY PAMELA FALLS INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)**

32 After staff gave an overview of the proposal, Dean Foster said that he noticed the feature is on
33 DNR land and if the Committee could name the feature. Staff said that the Committee has named
34 features in the past on DNR land, and if the proposal is approved today for Final Consideration,
35 staff will contact the landowner.

36

37 Dr. Allyson Brooks asked if this is the proposal that claimed to have discovered the waterfall, as
38 that set her back a bit.

39

40 Mike Iyall said that the Committee could move this name forward and see if there is anything
41 received during the comment period. Mike Iyall said that it is hard to imagine that there are any
42 geographic features in Washington that have never been seen by people. Mike Iyall said that the
43 feature may have been not worthy of naming, but it was unlikely that it had never been seen before.

44

45 Dean Foster said that agrees with Mike Iyall moving this proposal forward but is very curious to
46 see what DNR has to say about naming the feature. Dr. Allyson Brooks said that she will be

1 curious to see what the Tribes have to say. Dr. Allyson Brooks said that she hears alarm bells go
2 off whenever someone claims to have discovered a geographic feature, and Tribal consultation for
3 this proposal is going to be critical.

4
5 Dr. Grant Smith said that the word discovery can be interpreted several ways, this might have been
6 a discovery for Mary Pamela. Dr. Grant Smith said that he is not too hung up on the word
7 discovery but will be curious to see what comments the Committee receives and if there is any
8 local support.

9
10 Dr. Allyson Brooks said to Dr. Grant Smith that while she appreciated what he said, this is and
11 administrative record and the Committee should get it right. Dr. Allyson Brooks suggested that
12 the Committee asks the proponent what was meant by the word “discovery”, and make sure that
13 the Committee is extra careful during Tribal consultation.

14
15 Mike Iyall said that if the person being commemorated has not been deceased five years, it could
16 be moot. Mike Iyall said he agreed with Dr. Allyson Brooks and the Committee should move this
17 proposal forward.

18
19 Mary Schaff asked that because this feature is located on DNR land, would it be possible to get
20 community support. Dr. Grant Smith said that will be part of the discovery process, and the
21 Committee should move this proposal forward. Dr. Grant Smith said that the Committee will
22 surely get some interest if the proposal is moved forward, and it seems to be a reasonable proposal.
23 Dr. Grant Smith said that he thinks all the Committee members have reservations with this
24 proposal, and he feels that same but would like to move the proposal forward.

25
26 MOTION: Dr. Allyson Brooks motioned to move Mary Pamela Falls forward but on the condition
27 that the Committee takes extra measures on Tribal consultation and contacting the landowner.

28
29 SECOND: Dr. Grant Smith seconded the motion.

30
31 ACTION: The motion was approved to approve that name Mary Pamela Falls for Final
32 Consideration, with Chair EJ Juarez and Dean Foster voting in opposition.

33
34 During discussion of the motion, Mike Iyall said that Committee must answer their own concerns.
35 Mike Iyall said the Committee can move this proposal forward, but careful consultation must be
36 done.

37
38 **PUBLIC COMMENT FOR LAPOME CREEK**
39 None

40
41 **LAPOME CREEK INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)**
42 Staff gave an overview of the proposal and said that the US Board on
43 Geographic Names had asked the proponent a series of questions but had not received a response.
44 Mike Iyall said that he spoke with the Cowlitz Cultural Resources Office earlier in the day, and
45 informed the Committee that the Cowlitz Cultural Resources Office has had a change in leadership
46 and does not have anyone to comment on this proposal at this point. Mike Iyall said that the

1 Chinook Jargon is not a Native Tribes language, Tribal languages did not include European words.
2 Mike Iyall said that the Chinook Jargon is composed of European words and thinks until
3 consultation is done with the Cowlitz Tribe, the Committee should take no action.

4
5 Dr. Grant Smith said he supports Mike Iyall's comment, but at the same time the historical
6 perspective regarding the apple tree clones along the creek makes it descriptive and in context of
7 the Jargon language. Dr. Grant Smith said that the Jargon language would be associated with the
8 historical development of the area. Dr. Grant Smith said that he is in between on this proposal,
9 and he thinks the Committee needs more discovery on the proposal. Dr. Grant Smith said that if
10 the Committee allows the proposal to go forward that would elicit Tribal input, and it seems to
11 him that is exactly what the Committee wants. Dr. Grant Smith said he shares Mike Iyall's
12 concerns and thinks it would be useful to move this proposal forward to elicit that kind of feedback
13 and the Committee could receive another proposal for the feature. Dr. Grant Smith said that is his
14 thought right now, and he is leaning towards moving this proposal forward for Final Consideration.

15
16 Mike Iyall said that there is a new Director for the Cowlitz Cultural Resources Office, and he will
17 get an electronic introduction with the new Director and Committee staff. Mike Iyall said that the
18 word "Lapome" is probably a French word for apple, and until the Cowlitz Tribe has giving
19 comment the Committee should take no action.

20
21 Dr. Allyson Brooks said that she would make a motion to table this proposal until the Committee
22 finds out more information from the Cowlitz Tribe. Dr. Grant Smith said he would second that
23 motion because it keeps the question alive as opposed to simply rejecting this proposal.

24
25 Mike Iyall said that in that part of the world the people would be Sahaptin speakers, as Chinook
26 Jargon was introduced post contact. Mike Iyall said that his people were poly-lingual, and the
27 marriage traditions required that they marry not closer than a cousin of the 5th to 7th degree which
28 means and individual married a long way out so most people had more than one language. Mike
29 Iyall said that the people did not need Jargon until after contact.

30
31 Mary Schaff said that reading in the materials there appears to be disagreement between Chinook
32 Jargon dictionaries. Mary Schaff said that in the packet only one of the dictionaries use this word
33 and she feels that even the basis for this proposal using Chinook Jargon is shaky. Mary Schaff
34 said that Mike Iyall's comments on the language are valid, and she will support tabling this
35 proposal.

36
37 MOTION: Dr. Allyson Brooks motioned to defer the name Lapome Creek until consultation with
38 the Cowlitz Tribe.

39
40 SECOND: Mike Iyall seconded the motion.

41
42 ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously to defer that name Lapome Creek for Final
43 Consideration until consulting the Cowlitz Tribe.

44
45 **PUBLIC COMMENT FOR WILD PLUM CREEK**
46 None

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

WILD PLUM CREEK INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)

Staff gave an overview of the proposal and showed some pictures to the Committee submitted by the proponent. Mary Schaff said she is a sucker for pictures, especially if they show how the land is being used. Mary Schaff said in the past the Committee has approved names based on use of the feature, citing Passage Through.

MOTION: Mary Schaff motioned to approve the name Wild Plum Creek.

SECOND: Dr. Grant Smith seconded the motion.

ACTION: The motion was approved unanimously to approve that name Wild Plum Creek for Final Consideration.

SALISH FJORD INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)

During the proposal overview from staff, Mike Iyall said his concerns is that this proposal will cover numerous Tribes and asked if there had been any Tribal comments on this feature and what was the outcome of the consultation. Staff said that this proposal is up for Initial Consideration and has not been approved for Final Consideration by the Committee which is when Tribal Consultation and comment solicitation will take place.

Mary Schaff said that she first saw this proposal a newspaper article was published with comments by a Tribal member, but she did not recall which Tribe the person was with. Mary Schaff said the Tribal member said that the Tribe had their own name for the feature. Mary Schaff said that this was a quote in a newspaper article and did not officially represent Tribal comment, but as far as she could read the Tribe already had a name for this feature and it was not Salish Fjord. Mary Schaff said this proposal covers so many people such as Tribal people, non-Tribal people, and businesses. Mary Schaff said that this proposal is an enormous undertaking, and the Committee must make sure to do due diligence with this proposal.

Staff said that they did receive an email from Tom Strong who is with the Skokomish Tribe saying that he would be attending the meeting today. Tom Strong instead attended virtually and asked to address the committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR SALISH FJORD

Tom Strong, Vice-Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Skokomish Indian Tribe, addressed the Committee. Tom Strong said that the comment from the newspaper article Mary Shaff mentioned earlier might have been his. Tom Strong said that the Skokomish Indian Tribe is located in Mason County on the southern end of Hood Canal, and he was not appearing before the Committee today as a member of the public but as a representative of the sovereign self-determining nation of the Skokomish. Tom Strong asked that this proposal be rejected based upon a number of factors. Tom Strong said that the Skokomish are member of the Twana group, and while loosely affiliated with the Salish group, the Twana people are distinct and have their own language and culture. Tom Strong said that the Skokomish have what is known as Primary Right, which means the Skokomish exercise their treaty rights within the Hood Canal drainage to the exclusion of other Tribes. Tom Strong said that being in Hood Canal did not mean that you could

1 just be a member affiliated with a Salish Tribe or the region, you had to be either married to a
2 member of the Skokomish Tribe or there on invitation to be in the Skokomish territory. Tom
3 Strong said that is somewhat a misnomer to provide not just that the proposed name is Salish in
4 nature, but that the area was not exclusively in use and enjoyment by the Twana people.

5
6 Tom Strong said that by looking at other geographic names in the area you will see that they are
7 Twana in origin and include names like Quilcene, Duckabush, Dosewallips, Tahuya, Hamma
8 Hamma, and Skokomish. Tom Strong said that this proposed name would be outside of the naming
9 conventions used in the past for this area. Tom Strong said that he is here today to humbly request
10 that the Committee deny this proposal and suggested that the Committee look at their process as
11 this moves forward. Tom Strong said that as a board or commission, the Committee's efforts fall
12 outside of the regular order of business that the Tribes interact with the State on that do require an
13 agency interaction and a government-to-government type of interaction. Tom Strong suggested
14 soliciting Tribal input versus eliciting Tribal input as this moves forward. Tom Strong said this
15 was a humble request to think about the impact, because the Tribe's response is different when
16 they find out about something versus the issue being brought to their attention.

17
18 Tom Strong said that he has heard from a lot of folks at home that have heard about this effort, and
19 they want to see the Tribe engaged and challenging this name as it moves forward. Tom Strong
20 said that many of the folks pushing this name change do not come from the Hood Canal region,
21 and he requests that the Committee reject this proposal and engage with the Tribe if there is going
22 to be an effort to rename this feature. Tom Strong said that to be honest, the name Hood Canal
23 has not always sat well with his Tribe but it's something that they understand that is just the way
24 things are. Tom Strong said that he is asking for the request to be rejected, and for the Committee
25 to include the Tribe with the only exclusive rights in the Hood Canal in possible efforts to rename
26 Hood Canal.

27 28 **SALISH FJORD INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)**

29 Mike Iyall said that he will respect the Skokomish request to oppose this name change. Mike Iyall
30 said that if you listen to what Tom Strong told the Committee, you are trying to replace one
31 outsider's term with another. Mike Iyall said that this is a case where there is no reason to change
32 the name and replace one outsider's term with another.

33 34 **PUBLIC COMMENT FOR SALISH FJORD**

35 Barbara Stark, the proponent, addressed the Committee. Barbara Stark said she appreciates the
36 Committee taking their time and understands the previous comments. Barbara Stark said that she
37 is looking more towards getting the recognition of the fact that Washington has a fjord. Barbara
38 Stark said that she does not have an attachment to "Hood" and selected "Salish" because the coastal
39 Tribes and the Salish Sea. Barbara Stark said she certainly understands that there are many Tribes
40 who have lived alongside this beautiful water for many hundreds and hundreds of years.

41
42 Barbara Stark said that if someone wants to come up with a name other than "Salish", she would
43 certainly be willing to support that effort. Barbara Stark said this is about getting rid of the term
44 "canal" which is the wrong term as this feature was created by glacial movement and is the only
45 fjord on the entire contiguous west coast of the United States, Alaska having several. Barbara
46 Stark said that she feels very strongly that this recognition must be made that this feature is a fjord.

1
2 Barbara Stark said that she did not get responses from the Tribes when she attempted to contact
3 them but understood their lack of response as she would just be another person to them. Barbara
4 Stark said she did not get any suggestions from the Tribes for a name for this feature, and she
5 would certainly welcome suggestions if the term “fjord” is recognized.
6

7 **SALISH FJORD INITIAL CONSIDERATION (Action Item)**

8 Dr. Grant Smith said that when the Committee adopted the name Salish Sea it was for all the waters
9 up into Canada and down into Washington and was an international agreement. Dr. Grant Smith
10 said the decision was based upon the usefulness of the name for scientific research, looking at the
11 ecology of all the waters that are connected. Dr. Grant Smith said that the name “Salish” was one
12 name that competed with other names to describe the general body of water and had many
13 references and appeared in scientific journals. Dr. Grant Smith said the name “Salish” has broad
14 international usefulness, and the name Salish Fjord is accurately descriptive in geological terms
15 and connects the water with the rest of the bodies of water that are constantly studied by scientists.
16 Dr. Grant Smith said that the association with the Salish Sea is important.
17

18 Dr. Grant Smith said that maybe the Tribes in the area can make plausible assertions that a more
19 specific designator is useful. Dr. Grant Smith said that what he is arguing is that the choice
20 between a more specific designator and a more general designator, like “Salish”, is useful for
21 international agreements that were forged with great intellectual struggle and bureaucratic red tape
22 when the name Salish Sea was selected. Dr. Grant Smith said that the Committee should not
23 dismiss this proposal, but he thinks the Committee needs to explore the name further and use it as
24 a mechanism for discovery, bearing in mind the Committee’s previous precedents with cooperating
25 within the general region and the usefulness of the word “Salish”. Dr. Grant Smith said that the
26 name “Salish” is a general term, and there are features named that are associated with more general
27 terms, and when he saw the proposed name of Salish Fjord, he thought it sounded reasonable to
28 him.
29

30 Dr. Grant Smith said the more specificity can be argued, and the Committee should give the Tribes
31 the opportunity. Dr. Grant Smith said that he really appreciates the arguments that Tom Strong
32 had proposed, basically moving towards greater specificity. Dr. Grant Smith said he does not want
33 to vote against the proposal, but to keep it as a proposal to compete with other possible proposals
34 that will come down the line. Dr. Grant Smith said the Committee should take the middle position
35 and table the proposal, and he will oppose denying the proposal.
36

37 Mike Iyall said in his time on the Committee, he has never wanted Olympia to over-rule the
38 thoughts and wishes of locals, and the Committee had just heard from the Skokomish Tribe who
39 are the locals and have the longest naming rights for the area. Mike Iyall said that the Committee
40 should not impose the Committee’s will on the people and made a motion to reject the proposal.
41

42 MOTION: Mike Iyall made a motion to reject the name Salish Fjord.
43

44 SECOND: Dr. Allyson Brooks seconded the motion.
45

46 Mary Schaff asked for more discussion of the motion before a vote was called. Mary Schaff said

1 there was someone in attendance who had their hand raised, and Chair EJ Juarez agreed. Dr.
2 Allyson Brooks asked Chair EJ Juarez if he was taking public comment, or if this was a discussion
3 of the motion and the Committee was getting things turned around. Chair EJ Juarez apologized as
4 he was attending virtually and cannot see who is in the room. Staff said that the two people who
5 had given comments have their hands raised in the online chat.
6

7 Dean Foster said that to him there appears to be three things at play, the word “Salish”, the word
8 “fjord”, and a drastic change to a major body of water. Dean Foster said that the proponent stated
9 she was open to coming up with another name and he was supporting the motion to deny this
10 proposal but thinks it’s wonderful if folks want to come together to propose another name, but this
11 isn’t it. Dean Foster said that he does not think that if the Committee moves this proposal forward,
12 a compromise will come out of what has been presented. Dean Foster said that the Committee has
13 heard Tribal issues and referenced a letter in the packet said that when the feature was named
14 the word “fjord” was an appropriate use of the word. Dean Foster said that the Committee could
15 debate that all day, but he did not think the Committee is prepared to make such a major change.
16 Dean Foster said that he would vote to deny this proposal and if someone comes up with something
17 down the road the Committee will deal with it.
18

19 Dr. Allyson Brooks said that this is a major change, the Committee is not just naming a creek. Dr.
20 Allyson Brooks said a lot more work needs to go into that than just approving and treating this as
21 a small proposal and agreeing to talk about it later. Dr. Allyson Brooks said this is not the kind of
22 thing you talk about later; this is the kind of proposal you should be having public hearings for all
23 the way up and through Hood Canal. Dr. Allyson Brooks said that this is not a small creek
24 proposal, and the Committee cannot treat the idea or concept of changing the name of Hood Canal
25 like the Committee would deal with small creeks. Dr. Allyson Brooks said that it is not fair to the
26 proponent to table this proposal when the Committee has no interest from what she has seen, and
27 said the Committee should be fair all around.
28

29 Mary Schaff said that she wanted to go back to what Mike Iyall and Tom Strong stated about
30 outsider terms because that really clicked with her. Mary Schaff said that because Dean Foster
31 mentioned three different aspects, that the Committee should look at fjord as an outsider term.
32 Mary Schaff said that the term fjord may be a geological term, but that does not mean that the
33 feature has to be named that. Mary Schaff said that British Columbia has many of these features
34 and they are named inlets or channels, and do not have to be named fjords. Mary Schaff said that
35 there are other fjords, and mentioned two articles called “Fjords in Canada” and “Fjords in United
36 States” and said cannot speak to the fact that this is the only fjord. Mary Schaff said that this might
37 be the only one, but the geological process is worked out over large scales over and over again and
38 feels that fjords as a geological process is a much wider issue. Mary Schaff asked if the term fjord
39 was really the term needed to describe this feature using a Scandinavian term. Mary Schaff said
40 that we can acknowledge that the feature was a fjord created by geological processes without
41 having to have that reflected in the name and she will also be voting no on this proposal.
42

43 Chair EJ Juarez said he wanted to thank both Tom Strong and Barbara Stark for their efforts to
44 make the meeting today and thinking through what this change could mean to their communities
45 and Washington State. Chair EJ Juarez said that he does see their hands raised in the online chat
46 but that he will not be accepting further public comment at this time. Chair EJ Juarez said that he

1 agrees with Barbara Stark that focusing on the descriptive nature of a change is valid and worthy.
2 Chair EJ Juarez said that he personally agrees with Tom Strong that there are deep inequity
3 considerations and public input that needs to be given on this issue, especially with Tribes, and
4 because of these reasons he is not supportive of moving this proposal forward.

5
6 Chair EJ Juarez said that he will be voting no, but with the hope that if this is something that there
7 is community and Tribal interest in addressing, that there would be a robust process that was
8 months and months long but did not think that would happen or be the responsibility of this
9 committee if this proposal moves forward.

10
11 ACTION: The motion was approved to deny the name Salish Fjord, with Dr. Grant Smith voting
12 in opposition.

13
14 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

15 Mary Schaff gave the Committee an update on the Council of Geographic Names Authorities
16 (COGNA) that was held in Portland, Oregon in September. Mary Schaff said it was a great
17 conference and focused on indigenous placenames and the processes to incorporate those in our
18 landscape. Mary Schaff encouraged other members to attend future conferences, as the next
19 COGNA will be in Missouri but will also be held online.

20
21 Mike Iyall said he wanted to thank the Committee and he has always felt welcome and is glad to
22 be part of this group. Mike Iyall said that even though the members may not always agree with
23 comments made, they listen, and it is important that the local voice be heard the loudest and the
24 Native voice would have had naming rights the longest. Mike Iyall said newcomers selected and
25 replaced names. Mike Iyall asked how many people would be impacted by changing the name of
26 Hood Canal, saying that is not as big a name change as Mt. Rainier, but it is a big change that must
27 be taken with due care and diligence.

28
29 EJ Juarez thanked the Committee and said he has heard exciting things coming up for the
30 Committee and has heard good things about the Committee while interacting with the public.

31
32 **ADJOURNMENT**

33 The meeting was adjourned at 10:56 am.