

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

1

CITIZENS COINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PUBLIC MEETING

Tuesday, April 8, 2014

2:00 p.m.

United States Mint

8th Floor Boardroom

801 9th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20220

Reported by: Natalia Thomas

Capital Reporting Company

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

2

A T T E N D A N C E

Board Members:

Gary Marks, Chairman
Michael Bugeja
Robert Hoge
Erik Jansen
Michael Moran
Michael Olson
Donald Scarinci
Jeanne Stevens-Sollman
Thomas Uram
Heidi Wastweet

Mint Staff:

Michael White, Public Affairs
Greg Weinman, Senior Counsel
April Stafford, Stakeholder Relations Manager
Don Everhart

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

3

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. STAFFORD: Check in?

MR. WHITE: Yeah, I just wanted to get a roll of the press on the line, if we can. I think I heard Paul Gilkes.

MR. GILKES: Here.

MS. BRADLEY: Debbie Bradley.

MR. WHITE: Okay.

MR. UNSER: Mike Unser.

MR. BUGEJA: Michael Bugeja.

MR. PETERS: Les Peters.

MR. WHITE: Okay, so it's Debbie, Paul, Mike and Les?

MR. HOGE: Robert Hoge. I think we're doing a roll call of the press phone.

MR. GOLINO: Louis Golino.

MR. WHITE: Okay, thank you. All right, I'm done.

MR. MARKS: I count five, is that what you have?

MR. WHITE: Yeah.

MR. JANSEN: Gary, are we doing a transcript

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

4

of today's call?

MS. STAFFORD: We are.

MR. JANSEN: Good. Thank you.

MS. STAFFORD: Greg, do you happen to have the list of CCAC members with you?

MR. WEINMAN: Yes.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. So Gary, Greg has a list of the CCAC members, would you like him to go down it so you can know who's here?

MR. MARKS: Yeah, let's still roll call. I suspect there's eight of us, but let's go ahead and do it.

Actually, should I maybe convene the meeting first?

MR. WEINMAN: Um hmm.

MR. MARKS: I'll go ahead and do that.

MR. WEINMAN: Fine.

MR. MARKS: So, I'm calling this Tuesday, April 8th, 2014 meeting of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee to order. First thing we'll do is call the roll.

MR. WEINMAN: Would you like me to do it?

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

5

Okay. Robert Hoge?

MR. HOGE: Here.

MR. WEINMAN: Heidi Wastweet. Heidi, are you on the phone? Apparently not.

Michael Ross? Apparently not.

Michael Bugeja.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can hardly hear you.

MR. BUDEJA: Here.

MR. WEINMAN: Michael Bugeja.

MR. BUDEJA: Here.

MR. WEINMAN: Sorry. Let me move the speaker closer to me. Jeanne Stevens-Sollmon?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Here.

MR. WEINMAN: Gary Mark?

MR. MARKS: Here.

MR. WEINMAN: Erik Jansen?

MR. JANSEN: Here.

MR. WEINMAN: Tom Uram? Tom Uram? Tom?
No.

Michael Olsen?

MR. OLSON: Here.

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

6

MR. WEINMAN: Donald Scarinci?

MR. SCARINCI: Here.

MR. WEINMAN: Michael Moran?

MR. MORAN: Here.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. And should we -- so,
for the --

MR. WEINMAN: We have a quorum.

MS. STAFFORD: -- folks on the phone, we'll
just let you know the United States Mint Staff here
that's present. Of course we have our court reporter.
Greg Weinman, you just heard from our legal counsel.
Myself, April Stafford. Mike White, from our Public
Affairs Office. Betty Birdsong, Sharon Bowen and
Carolyn Brown from the Design Group. And Jack
Szczerban, who is our Precious Metals Manager from
Sales and Marketing. Okay?

MR. WEINMAN: And a message from Heidi.
"I'm trying to call in, but I'm having a computer
issue. I'll be on as soon as I can."

MR. JANSEN: So, I show absent Tom Uram,
Heidi and Mike Ross. Is that correct?

MR. BUDEJA: This is Heidi. I'm here.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

7

MR. WEINMAN: Heidi's here. So, the only ones who are not on the call right now would be Tom and Mike Ross.

MR. JANSEN: And so I show one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine present.

MR. WEINMAN: That's my count as well.

MR. MARKS: Okay, very good. Thank you all. We have a quorum.

MR. DENARDI: And we have Tom and Steve in Philadelphia.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you. Tom Denardi and Don Everhart from our Philadelphia facility. Thank you guys for joining us.

MR. DENARDI: Steve.

MR. WEINMAN: And Steve Antonucci.

MS. STAFFORD: Apologizes, and Steve Antonucci.

MR. DINARDI: Yeah, I'm here, too.

MR. MARKS: And for those of you who joined us late, we have I believe it's five members of the press on the line also. Does staff have a list of those folks, we can just make the community aware of

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

8

who's on the line?

MR. WHITE: Yeah, it's Debbie Bradley of *Numismatic News*, Paul Gilkes of *Coin World*, Mike Unser of *Coin Update* -- I mean, *CoinNews.net*, Les Peters of *Coin Update*, and Louis Golino of *Coin Week*.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Great. Okay, I think we know who's on the phone at this point.

So, with that I want to go to -- there's an item for us to discuss, the letters of the previous meeting. I'll just make it known that those letters still need to be circulated to the membership, so we will schedule the approval of those letters, along with the minutes from the March 10th and March 11th CCAC meeting, at our May meeting, which will be I believe held in Philadelphia.

With that, I want to cover a couple points before we get into the main points of the discussion for today's meeting. And I just want to bring everyone's attention to the fact, maybe some of the members have read this, but there was a *Numismatic* publication that published an article about our meeting in Washington D.C. on March 11th, where I

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

9

announced the subject matter for the meeting that we're holding today, namely our discussion about the one dollar American Eagle and a proposed change and the reverse design for that coin.

There was a statement made, and I don't know, I think I must have been misunderstood when I announced it at the March 11th that we'd be having this meeting and what it would be about. But the article came out and said that it looked like there might be a door open for the existing reverse, the Heraldic Eagle Reverse to still be used in the proof version of one dollar American Eagle coin.

And I want to, just for the record, to clarify if I said something that brought the reporter to that conclusion, it wasn't accurate. In fact, the discussion for today is one that recognizes a statute would allow for the change of designs on a coin after a design has been in existence for at least 25 years, and that change, if it does occur, needs to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

So, as we talk today, I just want it understood that the subject matter here would be to

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

10

propose or recommend to the Secretary a change to the reverse of the one dollar American Eagle. And that change would take effect for both the bullion version and the proof version. That would be the intention of our discussion today.

Now, I want to ask counsel, did I get the law correct?

MR. WEINMAN: That's correct.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Thank you. Also, in that same story, there was a statement that said, and I'll just read it, "Marks is obviously hoping that a CCA recommendation would put pressure on The Mint to make the change." I want to clarify, again, that what we do here is a recommendation to the Secretary. And having been on the committee now for several years, and acting as your chair, it's not my style to pressure anybody.

So, that's not obvious to me, that I was obviously, I suppose pressuring The Mint. That's not my intent, whatsoever. My intent is to merely fulfill the mission of this committee, which is embodied in its statute. And that is to make recommendations that

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

11

we believe are relevant to American coinage and the designs that those coins bear. So, that is my only purpose here. Once we make that recommendation, it will be up to others, I believe chiefly the Secretary of the Treasury, whether or not that change is made, and I'm sure there'll be lots of calculations that go into any kind of decision like that.

So, with that clarification, I also wanted to have a brief discussion about the reason that we're moving forward with looking at a potential change in the reverse design of this coin. And it just so happens that I was having a conversation with Erik Jansen about our subject matter today. We talked, what was it, yesterday or the day before, and Erik articulated it very well, and I asked him if he would share his thoughts with us. And so I'm going to recognize Erik now, if he could just kind of help us frame the basis for what we are considering today with the one dollar American Eagle. Erik?

MR. JANSEN: Yes, thanks, Gary. Can you hear me?

MR. MARKS: Yes.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

12

MR. WEINMAN: Yes.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah, Gary and I very often have a good conversation on administrative issues, just so we kind of know who's taking a vote and so forth, so I'm prepared to do that today. And he had called to my attention an email which I had sent to the group saying how important I felt this was. Not so much that a given decision was made, because I don't think that is necessarily the goal today, but that we respect and really honor and take with extreme care and concern, this image.

Because just as the reverse of the penny was changed in the anniversary of Lincoln, just as the ongoing features of the quarter have always been considered substantial, the portrait of George Washington, here we have something a little even different and more special, in a way, than a circulating coin. We have a bullion coin, a bullion coin which carries the sovereign assay, the assurance, I don't know if it's a legal term, the guarantee, represented by the reputation of the U.S. Government that this coin is in fact the purity and the metallic

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

13

content that it is advertised to be, (inaudible)
prevents edge grinding, all of the protections.

And so this coin circulates worldwide. And over a long period of time stays in possession of a store of wealth. This is a bullion coin, and so it -- I believe it must demonstrate and show the very, very core of what this country stands for. And if a picture's worth a thousand words, and we have a few words that have to be on there by statute, the picture is what people will remember. What it makes them feel, what it makes them emote, what it makes them sense, what it makes them believe about this country.

And so to me today what we're doing is really we're visiting an issue, an opportunity, 25 year statute, enacted several years ago, we're visiting the issue of do we have the best image on our sovereign assurance to the world's bullion for a value selected.

It's been 28 years. This committee has, on many occasions, felt difficulty in the decisions because good designs featuring eagles were passed over because they might not have been the best design at

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

14

that time. And I can remember multiple members of this committee asking that these images be put aside, only to be brought later for consideration, as we are doing today.

So, simply put, I don't know and I would invite others on the committee to weigh in, according to the chairman's managing time today, but to me, this is not a dictatum, this is not an ultimatum, this is not a done deal that there's a new image here. This is a responsible visit, by this committee, charged to assure that we have the best images on our coins that we can muster.

And so I appreciate the chance to state that, Gary. I feel very strongly about that. This is an iconic, iconic production of the U.S. Mint and I'm just pleased that we're going to take the time to review some really quality art and see if the committee believes it's of the caliber to be considered. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Great. Thank you, Erik.

Now, I'll add to what Erik said, that even today, if we do determine that there's a design we'd

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

15

like to recommend to move forward for this project, the design still needs to go through process and stuff. It needs to be reviewed by the CFA and then ultimately go to the Secretary. And so ultimately I do believe that we'll probably -- if we do make a recommendation today, there'll probably be another opportunity for us to look at this design, once inscriptions have been changed, we'll get into a little discussion about that here in just a moment.

And so we're going to get another stab at this, even if we make a recommendation today, because what we're looking at today is the collection of eagle designs back several years that have accumulated through the various projects that The Mint has executed.

So, and on that note, I'll just say that my first meeting on the committee was back, I believe it was in 19 -- or I'm sorry, 2007. And the first program I looked at was the American Eagle Commemorative Program. And there were designs in that collection, even back then, that there were comments from the committee members stating, "You know, if we

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

16

don't use this design or that design for this program, we'd sure like to make sure that we get another opportunity to look at this artwork, perhaps with another program down the line.

And since that first meeting of mine and moving forward, those sorts of statements have been made, as we've looked at the various programs along the way. And so I thought when all this kind of came to a head with the U.S. Marshals 225th Anniversary Commemorative Program, that the committee just looked at in March, and in that portfolio there were some wonderful American Eagles in the design work. And that kind of stirred my memory about the discussions that we've had in the past as a committee, multiple times, asking The Mint to make sure they put certain designs aside, so we could look at them again.

And it seemed like the timing was right. Also, you have, for the last three years, in our annual reports, we've recommended, in fact this very idea of perhaps changing designs on the one dollar American Eagle. And so, that's just sort of the chronology of bringing us forward to today, and why

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

17

we're here today to talk about this.

So, with that, there was a portfolio designed that was sent out to the committee and in its final count we have 44. I trust that all of the committee members have those designs. Prior to the meeting I asked the members, in recognition of the fact that we had 44 designs to look at, to give some thought about which ones they wanted to focus on and to send me their selections in that regard.

And so the first item of business I want to do today is to establish a polled list of the designs, so that our discussion can be more focused and perhaps we can move more expeditiously through this.

So, for the record, and once I -- what I'm going to do here, I'm going to go through the list of the designs that were indicated to me, by committee members, that you wanted to focus on. Once I get through this list, I will ask for a motion from the committee, for the sake of public record, that we actually adopt this whole list just so we're clear how we're moving forward, and that we established this polled list on the record.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

18

So, with that, each of the designs is numbered 1 through 44. The initial list was 43, and Michael Moran, in his study for this meeting, identified another design that was added, so they are numbered 1 through 44. And the polled list that I have to announce to everyone is as follows. And these are the designs, by number, the number signage design. These are the designs that separately we've all asked to focus on, and once I'm done, again, let's have a motion to approve this that this is the list the committee deems appropriate to move forward with.

Those are: Design Number 1, Design Number 10, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 44.

So, I'll ask now, members of the committee, is this the full list you want to move forward with?

MR. OLSON: So moved.

MR. MARKS: Moved by Michael Olson. Is there a second?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Second.

MR. MARKS: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion before we take the

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

19

vote?

(No audible response)

MR. MARKS: Okay. All those in favor,
please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes)

MR. MARKS: Opposed?

(No audible response)

MR. MARKS: Okay. It sounds like a
unanimous vote. So, that is our polled list.

So, at this point I want to just make clear
again, there's been some brief mention of it, we
understand that these designs were created for other
programs. Because of that, the artwork contains
descriptions that are not relevant, in many cases, to
use on the reverse of the one dollar American Eagle
coin. So, it's understood that if we select one of
these designs for a recommendation today, that we
would be asking The Mint to make the appropriate
changes to the inscription, and as I said previously,
we'd very likely be looking at this again.

So, with that, is there someone who wants to
being our --

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

20

MR. BUDEJA: I would like to -- Michael Bugeja, Gary, chiming in. I would like to begin, if I can.

MR. MARKS: Yes, please do.

MR. BUDEJA: I just wanted to point out something numismatic that I hope will inform the process of our selection. By the very nature of choosing the eagles from various coin proposals, we're going to get a number of different types of eagles. And I wanted to speak to those briefly and then talk about what I consider some of the more favorable ones.

There are four types of eagles that we find at this posed selection, and really only one is appropriate for a coin, two, probably, if it's done well, but the ones that we have here, on different categories, would not fall in that category.

One is a stylized eagle. You would find that on the 1936 Bridgeport Commemorative. It's one of the more famous stylized eagles, beautiful rendering on the reverse. The other would be a personified eagle, you would see that on Number 1. It's an eagle holding lightning. And it's

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

21

personified and those typically are not very well thought out for a coin. The third is just a bird, a bird flying. You get a lot of those, because we've looked at America the Beautiful type of quarters and other types of coins, and there are several, 10, 16, 18, 19 and 22 are birds. They would not be appropriate for the reverse of a coin.

And then the rest are symbols. Those are what we often find on the reverse of coins and have found since the beginning of coinage by the U.S. Mint. And that is, it's not a bird, it's not a drawing, it's not an animation, it's a symbol of power, a symbol of peace, something that would go on the reverse of one of America's most popular bullion pieces. We have one right now on the reverse that is a symbol.

And in that regard, you see that 23, 24, 25, 36, 38, 39, 40 and 41 are all symbols. And it was heartening to see that the committee was drawn to symbols. And I know that we could amend logos and legends and things of that sort, but there are some wonderful symbol or flying eagles in this selection.

My favorites come down to the most popular

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

22

of the pre-selections by the committee, and that is 40 and 41. Forty, perhaps can be criticized as a little bit too much symbol. Forty-one is an actual -- which garnered the most votes, eight votes, is a lovely symbol that, to my knowledge, is a combination of the typical emblematic eagle, holding either a laurel or arrows, and the eagle in flight, which we've had on some of our most popular coins.

So, I just wanted to put that on the record. I think the most popular among these designs, by the committee, all gravitate towards that symbol. And 40 and 41 are my favorite. And with that, I thank you, Gary, for letting me begin. And I yield back to you, sir.

MR. MARKS: Okay, thank you, Michael. And I'll just clarify something Michael mentioned. As I was doing the tally, members were responding to me about which designs they wanted to focus on before the meeting. I did do a tally of how many members were selecting which design. And just for the record, there were -- there were actually two that -- and only two that garnered a majority of the committee's

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

23

interest, and they were the very ones that Michael just named, 40 and 41.

I had eight members responding to a call for their preferences, and six of them chose number 40 and eight, all eight, chose 41. So, that wasn't a formal vote, but just it was an indication of some commonality among the initial selection.

So, with that, I'm ready to call for the next member, whoever would be ready to go.

MR. OLSON: Gary, I'd like to go.

MR. JANSEN: Gary, can I intercede with a procedural note.

MR. MARKS: Please?

MR. JANSEN: Gary's asked me to take votes today. I was unable to get a ballot printed prior to the meeting. So, express your preferences however as you wish, but after we're all done making comments, I'm expecting the Chair to do a round robin, the vote casting verbally that I will take and echo back. So, just know that you don't need to vote when it's your turn to make comments, that we will do that discretely, separately at the end.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

24

Is that your understanding, and preference,
Gary?

MR. MARKS: Yes.

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

MR. MARKS: Yes?

MS. STAFFORD: Could I just ask, I should have mentioned at the beginning, as we have in other telephonic CCAC meetings, if anyone speaking could identify themselves for the court reporter, we would appreciate that. And also, anyone who is not speaking, if you could please mute your phones, because we can hear some background noise as well. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, April. And I'll now recognize Michael Olson.

MR. OLSON: Thank you, Gary. I share a lot of the same comments as Erik impressed. This is certainly the coin of the realm, for folks that are selecting and building up their stellar reserve. It's also a widely collected coin in the spirit of the Morgan dollar. (inaudible) given this coin over its history.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

25

My belief is this is a flagship coin for the United States and therefore it needs to demonstrate the strength and majesty and greatness of the United States. And I really see a couple of designs here that do that for me. I would prefer to see more emphasis on the eagle, less emphasis on shields and other devices.

My belief is, is that the eagle should occupy as much real estate on the reverse of this coin as possible. It needs to be a bold eagle, a strong eagle, as it is the representation of our country and all that's good about our country. I would prefer not to see a posed eagle. There are certainly some of those here. And Michael Bugeja eloquently describes the different types, but the ones that appear in an unnatural state, or posed, I think we can do something different here that collectors will appreciate.

When I look at Designs 3, 9, 40 and 41, what I see there is a little more sculpting and more of relief than I see in any of these other designs. In particular with 40 and 41, they really jump off the surface of the coin.

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

26

With that being said, when I look at 41, which garnered the majority of the pre-selection culling process vote, it reminds me, in some fashion, of the Gobrecht dollar. We've have talked on this committee and The Mint has done some surveys asking for both designs to be reissued on some of our bullion coins. That's something that I'm not in favor of, because as we can see here, we've got artists today that can come up with excellent designs that could play out in a modern fashion.

And when I look at 41, that one just gets it for me, out of the 42 that we've been presented, that one, in my view, is clear in a way the winner. And it will be receiving my full support.

I did want to, Gary, this may be a question for the committee, is there any reason why we are not taking a look at the gold coin? Because I see a few designs here that display a family of eagles, which I believe is what's on the gold eagle. Is that something that might be discussed at a future meeting?

MR. MARKS: I think that's possible, Mike. We just haven't discussed it. So, I would say that we

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

27

should just take that thought under advisement and, you know, if that's something that looks like it might be viable to do, we'll bring it back later.

MR. OLSON: Okay. Well, with that, I will conclude my comments at this time, with strong support for Number 41.

MR. EVERHART: Gary? Gary?

MR. MARKS: Yes, Michael?

MR. EVERHART: This is Don Everhart.

MR. MARKS: Oh, don.

MR. EVERHART: I'd just like to interject something at this point, before we go too much further. Design Number 40, we have chosen that as the gold reverse for the Marshal coin. And I just wonder how that impacts what we're looking at now.

MS. STAFFORD: Don, that's one of the designs that was preferred, and you're right, if that's one indeed the Secretary selects, we would have to --

MR. WEINMAN: That has not occurred yet.

MS. STAFFORD: -- which hasn't occurred yet, we'd have to revisit that. But, that would be pending

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

28

the Secretary's official selection.

MR. EVERHART: Okay.

MR. MARKS: I'm going to add to be precise about this, the design that our committee recommended for the gold for the U.S. Marshals had a shield on the eagle's breast.

MR. EVERHART: That's right.

MR. MARKS: But other than that, it is pretty much the same design. So, that's a good point to be made and I believe the members all knew that.

MR. EVERHART: All right. I just wanted to make sure.

MR. MARKS: Yep. Okay, who wants to go next?

MR. MORAN: Gary, it's Mike Moran.

MR. MARKS: Please go on.

MR. MORAN: I think it's very simple, from the -- I think what you have here on a completed product, Number 41, is good. It will carry the inscriptions around the center of the coin satisfactorily. I have only one suggestion, in this image the depiction is of an eagle flying on a level

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

29

plain. It's very close to the Gobrecht dollar. One thing the Gobrecht dollar does is it's very dramatic, it is -- puts the eagle on a rising plain, in terms of it's line of flight, which means you rotate the die just slightly here. I think that that would very much help this coin, in terms of its presentation and its beauty.

I'd also like to take a minute to talk about Number 44, it's one that I stuck in there. And it, I think, in terms of composition, is excellent to be considered. It has plenty of negative space to stack the inscriptions instead of putting them on the perimeter of the coin, which was done in the past. I would point out to you that, you know, on the obverse of the original Weinman design, the half dollar, the bottles were stacked, Liberty was not across the top perimeter of the coin. And the stacked inscriptions I think would be a pleasant change and a nice (inaudible) to consider.

The one problem with Number 44, and probably why it didn't get more votes is simply that the composition and the design concepts are excellent, the

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

30

execution needs improvement. And that is one of the drawbacks, in terms of looking at these designs, and pulling them out of the past record or archives, if you will. In that I think if you were to go back and work on 44, you would see an improved design, in terms of the execution on the eagle.

And my final comment is, do we really want to just recommend one? Because we may get into a situation for the inscriptions, can we get them correctly on there, and as good as they ought to be. And to me it would make more sense if you pulled the top three and gave those as our recommendation, in order of preference.

MR. MARKS: Michael, this is Gary. I believe that's something that we could do at the end of our tally, as far as our preferences. If the committee wanted to, we could make a motion to recommend the top three. So, let's hold that thought, and when we get to that point in the discussion, let's talk some more about it.

MR. MORAN: And the only other thing is, if anybody else feels like the eagle out to be rising on

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

31

41, I hope they'll chime in on that. That's it.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Thank you, Michael.

Who's next?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Gary, I'll go next.

Jeanne.

MR. MARKS: Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

MR. MARKS: I recognize you, Jeanne. Go ahead.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you. I first of all want to comment on Erik's introduction, which I think was very inclusive and very thoughtful. And thank you, Erik, for stating those thoughts for us all.

I had been thinking we need to make this coin be fully fantastic in the eyes of the world and as well as in the eyes of our own people and collectors. And for that reason, my top pick was 40 - - 41. I tend to agree with Michael Moran, I think it would be really just that be eagle rising just a little bit. And if we choose this design, just have him not quite come -- the V come quite to the edge of

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

32

the coin, if it was just a little -- maybe by having him rise he wouldn't be coming up so close to the edge.

It's a beautiful piece of work and I compliment the artist who has done it. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Jeanne. I think I mean going to go ahead and offer my comments here. I, too, am very favorable to number 41. And I guess I'll talk about a couple things that we haven't really touched on yet. One is the pairing. And that is, how does the design picked pair up with Adolph Weinman's Walking Liberty image, which of course is on the obverse. I believe this eagle that's represented on 41 is a beautiful pairing.

With that, I'd like to hear other members, whether they agree with me on that. I think these two, together, because let's remember, this is a two-sided or even three-sided sculpture, but mainly a two-sided sculpture here that we're considering. So, I want to make sure that we're comfortable with how this pairs up, because that's a major factor in making this

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

33

the beautiful coin that we want it to be.

Also, I'll just note that the inscriptions on the back of the one dollar American Eagle coin are fairly simple. It's the United States of America, there's a denomination, E Pluribus Unum and then the inscription of the silver and it's fineness. And if you look at Number 41, there's very few changes that need to be made. Change the denomination and you remove the words Justice, Integrity and Service and you put in the inscription for the metal content, the .999 fine silver inscription. So, it's a fairly simple change to be made, there's not a lot of tinkering that needs to be done with this design, which is not the case with many of the others that are presented here today.

I agree that a slight tilt of the eagle could aid to its pleasing nature. I would be very careful about doing too much of that, as to get to the point where it would be, you know, an unnatural incline and appearance. But I would support the idea of a slight rising of the eagle, if you will.

So, with that, I'd like to recognize that.

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

34

Who would like to go?

MR. HOGE: This is Robert Hoge.

MR. MARKS: Robert?

MR. HOGE: Yes. I'm very much in agreement with the rest of the panel on Number 41. I think that's an outstanding design. I like its similarity to the old Gobrecht design. And I think, as Gary mentioned, it would go very well as the counterpart to the obverse, the additional liberty figure by Weinman.

Some of these other designs really are quite handsome as well. I particularly liked Number 23, with the head of the eagle, also, similar to the Olympic piece. It's something a little bit different. Number 24 I also liked, it's a fine background, but I think that one is a little bit out of drawing somehow, the proportions of the eagle don't look quite right. Number 25 has received several votes, as well as Number 40, I thought both seemed a bit busy. Utilizing the flag and all the symbolism and the draperies and the wording kind of crowd the image a little bit, not quite as pleasing as Number 41.

In general, I think Michael Bugeja's

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

35

comments were quite good about identifying the kind of eagles we're looking for, and I think that this is what we're doing. I like the selections that our group has made. I think if we can clean out a lot of the background, it's a good idea. And I like, particularly, the idea of having the olive branch in the talon is a nice touch, as you see in Number 41.

I'll pass to whoever cares to speak next.

MR. MARKS: Okay, thank you, Robert. Heidi, can I call you on?

MS. WASTWEET: Sure, I'm here.

MR. MARKS: I'd like to get our next -- our other artist on the record, if you're ready to go.

MS. WASTWEET: Sure. I think that we are headed in the right direction, and we clearly have a favorite. I would like to see a couple variations of Number 41. The thing that strikes me about this is, the beak is a little crowded towards the edge of the coin, I'd like to see a little more breathing room around the eagle. And in looking at the existing design that we have, it has an olive branch, it could be laurel, I think it's olive and arrows. I would be

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

36

open to adding some arrows next to the branch, as it symbolically stays in line with what we already having, sending the message of strength and peace, as part of our national goal. I think that was all the comments I had.

Oh, as Don Everhart pointed out to Design Number 40, it possibly might be chosen for another program, or one similar, and that does matter to me, I want this one to be distinct and unique. So, better to consideration, I am very much in favor of seeing a couple varieties and Number 41 for us to look at. That's it.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Heidi.

MR. MORAN: Gary?

MR. MARKS: Donald?

MR. MORAN: Gary, this is Mike Moran again.

MR. MARKS: Yes.

MR. MORAN: Just a point here to raise as we seem to be moving towards 41 rapidly, with my concurrence, by the way. But is everybody aware that (inaudible) did a sketch for the Gobrecht dollar that included the olive branch, the arrows, eagle rising,

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

37

very close to this one, with the exception of the non-defined feather detail this one has. And it was struck off as a re-strike in the 1850's. And is there a problem with that?

MR. MARKS: That it's similar?

MR. MORAN: Very similar.

MR. MARKS: If you're asking me, I don't have a problem with it.

MR. MORAN: I guess I'm really asking The Mint staff.

MR. MARKS: Oh, okay.

MR. MORAN: Or at least they need to be aware. Because I know we had some problems with the sheaf of hay -- I mean, of wheat on the penny, designed earlier, several years ago, because it was close to a German design. Somebody just tell me that it's not an issue, and I'm just going to go full speed ahead on 41.

MR. MARKS: That sounds like a legal question.

MR. WEINMAN: I don't see --

MR. JANSEN: Yeah, I think you're referring

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

38

to the design on the (inaudible), aren't you?

MR. MORAN: No. No, I'm not.

MR. JANSEN: Oh, okay.

MR. MORAN: Didn't we not use one of the re-strikes that was done, between 1855 and 1860. You'll see it in the patterns.

MR. JANSEN: Okay.

MR. MARKS: Well, I'll add this, and then I will ask Greg Weinman to chime in. But my perspective is, while it's similar, it's not the same. This is a different and somewhat unique design, in its own right. And I personally don't see a problem with it. Greg, is there any concern we should have?

MR. WEINMAN: No. I mean, I think it's a unique design as well, but more important, we didn't have -- it was included in the recent portfolio, because we determined that it was a legally sufficient design. And I haven't heard any evidence to sway me otherwise.

MS. STAFFORD: But certainly it's something we can look into.

MR. WEINMAN: Right.

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

39

MR. MARKS: Thank you. We still need to hear from Donald Scarinci. Donald, are you ready?

MR. SCARINCI: Sure. A lot of these designs are old friends of ours and I certainly want to -- and everyone seems to be focusing really on 41, which is a very fine design, and very familiar.

But I certainly want to give honorable mention to Number 4. I want to give honorable mention to -- and I love the circle, circle, circle thing. The wings are not accurate, understand that, but the circular patterning of the design creates a feeling of motion and that's a very artistically meritorious design. And I really like that design. So, I just wanted to make sure that didn't go unsaid, unnoticed, and unappreciated.

Design 15 also, a nice design. I think we had issues with the wings on that, and I forgot what program that came up on, but certainly an old friend, beautiful piece. What I like about it is the very clean feel, you know, the focus is really on the eagle and your focus isn't taken off by any Greek symbol or ancient symbol or 19th century symbol. We don't have

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

40

an olive branch there that distracts from the eagle, it's about the eagle, and I think there's a certain beauty in the simplicity and the cleanness of that design.

Number 22, what I really find gorgeous about the way the eagle embraces the coin, it embraces the center with the eagle's beak and head dead center. I forgot where we saw this before, no need to remind me, but I think this is beautiful. I like the way -- and I mean very, as you all know, I've been very consistent about really loving the design when it reaches the edge of the coin, because it creates an embracing. The image is an embracing image. And again, this is clean, it's about the eagle and we don't have anything in it that distracts from that.

I would really not like to see Number 40 on this coin. I think I'm hoping the Secretary chooses Number 40 for what it was -- for what we had originally intended. But for this coin, I just think there's too much going on with the eagle. And, you know, so we've kind of got the eagle, we've kind of got the flag, we've got -- you know, we've got the

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

41

thing, the olive branches, the talons. It's just too much happening and I'm having -- and I have a toughen time dealing with the need for the olive branch in 41. I really like -- I just want to say, can you just take the olive branch away, please? Can we just have an eagle? You know, do we have to have these symbols that do something other than the eagle?

So, I think I'd be pretty happy, I'd be pretty excited if we didn't have to have the olive branch with Number 41, and I'm certainly very interested in a lot of the comments that have been made so far in this discussion. We always tend to have -- look at things differently after we hear each other speak, than we do prior to getting together, whether it's a meeting or a phone call.

So, hopefully there's other people that can persuade me. I'm hearing people kind of liking the olive branch, I just don't. You know, I just wish it was just an eagle. But they're all certainly a fine design. I hope we don't go with -- you know, I certainly would not be supportive of Number 40 for this coin, even if it doesn't get -- honestly, even if

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

42

it doesn't get selected by the Secretary, I just don't think it's right for this coin.

So, for those people who are in between 40 versus 41, and I know there's a real groundswell here for 41, I don't think 41 is as clear as we all think it is, but if it's a choice between 40 and 41, you know, I would certainly prefer to see 41. That's it.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Donald. Donald, I would suggest that if we do indeed go ahead with a recommendation for 41, that given your feelings about the olive branch, to make a motion and that would give the committee a chance to discuss your specific concern there.

MR. SCARINCI: That would be great.

MR. MARKS: That would be my suggestion here.

So, with that, we still need to hear from Erik? Are you ready?

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. Can you hear me?

MR. MARKS: Yes, we can.

MR. JANSEN: Okay. I want to kind of recap a number of things here. Michael Bugeja led off with

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

43

a description of the symbolity and use of the eagle. He is always quite the authority on element features of our coinage. Thank you. However, he highlighted the points that I think he made the point that a bird was not a preferred design as kind of a (inaudible) symbol. But if you look at the gold and the platinum bullion coins, they are both birds. Birds in action, birds in motion, they are birds. They are not symbolic birds. And so to say that a symbolic bird would be the way to go on this coin, I think is really kind of missing the point of the bullion, as indicated by the others. So, an active bird, if not a realistic bird, by the other bullion's presence, seems valid to me.

Posed versus action, I tend to prefer action, although one of the coins I'm going to mention is not so much action, but it is full of intent. So, if I can use action and intentional as what I'm looking for in this design, I put that out there. And before I mention any in particular, I'm going to encourage, as you vote, and I'm the one that tabulates this, but not that it matters, but as you vote, please

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

44

vote with the following thought. Let's not give a single intention here, because I see a train leaving for 41 and I'm really sad about that, quite frankly. I think that is cutting short this process.

I think this process needs to highlight our first, second, third, fourth or a basket of four ideas, maybe in order of preference. But I would encourage you, when you vote try not to vote to make a single selection, but vote so as to show a series of preferences, because today is not the end of this process, today is the beginning of a sacred review here. If I dare use the word sacred, I'll replace that with sovereign. So, please vote early, vote often and vote on many designs so that we can put some kind of a basket of preferences.

Now, this is a large coin. This is not a dime, this is not a penny, this is not a nickel, this is not a quarter, this is a large design. And so I think, and I'm going to, today and in the future, I'm going to up the charge to the sculptor that inherits the charge to sculpt whatever design we end up with in the weeks or months ahead. Because I would feel

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

45

really, really, really let down if we got the bird feather equivalent of spaghetti hair here.

I look at Design 40 and 41, those aren't feathers, those are scales. And I look at a lot of these designs and if these designs, and excuse me Mint Staff responsible for die life and so forth, but these are sculpted in a way to maximize die life and throw away artistic intent, I am going to be very, very, very disappointed. And I will encourage the public audience to weigh in on that issue. We all hated spaghetti hair, and it was listened to and changed on the America the Beautiful Washington quarter, and that Washington image is gorgeous, again, as it was in '32, when it was originally designed, sculpted and implemented.

And so I'm going to put the charge out there, to the sculptors to use relief and sculpt detail and not Photoshop this stuff. If we've got to strike 50 million of these a year, quite frankly I think it would be tragic say, "No more than 500 die, guys" and requires that they get 100,000 strikes per die. I just think that is a misplacement of this

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

46

country's sacred integrity and trust in the world. I feel pretty strongly about that.

I don't like Item 41. It was part of my list, because I was one of these that submitted preferences. Forty-one, the beak is crowded, that could be fixed. The leading edge of the olive branch, there is no way an eagle is going to carry an olive branch, in the wind, and have the leading edge of that olive branch look like that. Ain't gonna happen. He's not going to grab the olive branch that way. The leading edge would be blown back in the wind, so that needs to be corrected, if it's included. Adding arrows, it's certainly more consistent with the historical presence of eagles and talons high prominent. I think this thing looks European, 1910 to me, and that's not America, 2014. So, 41 would barely make my list.

And I'm going to ask you guys to please reconsider jumping on 41 as you think the train is leaving the station. I'm going to put some more ideas out here for you.

My back up favorite, if I were not to do 41,

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

47

would be tough, because I shared three or four. I actually liked the layout of 24. I think the eagle could be reduced slightly, I think the flag could be brought a little bit more attention in the visual draw. I think there's plenty of room to manage the text, which is pretty simple in this one. I think those could be sculpted to feathers and not look like scales, pretty nicely.

I will agree with Donald, I don't think we need olive branches on here, Weinman's obverse has her carrying a bouquet. So I think 24 is a really fascinating potential design. Not as is, it needs to be adjusted.

I also like 23. Twenty-three is full of so much intent. If that eye is sculpted halfway with the skill that the artist put in it, and that beak is made just right, those are feathers, those are not scales.

I think 19 is an interesting design. Plenty of negative space. The obverse of this has a fair share of negative space. I like the active bird. I also like the fact that there are two of them. I think there's a subtle message, with two eagles versus

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

48

one, a subtle message to many, many social battles being fought in the world today, the inclusion as opposed to the singularity. The temptation to think it's a pair, the implication of working together, the expanse of these eagles' wings. I think the symbolic messages in 19 are deep and broad and really fascinating.

Finally, I love Design Number 44. I don't think it's the right one here, because I remember what this came from, and the textual message was really important in this one and those balance of that design really depends on that text. It's so integral, not so much in its words, but in its visual mask to balance out the design. So, I put 44 out there. I like it, I don't think it'll work here.

But as you vote, guys, if you think the train's leaving for 41, I'm really sad about that, because I think 41 is the wrong design here. Nice design, but it's the wrong design. It doesn't reflect this country here today. I think the wings are a little disheveled and awkward, which speaks to me of an eagle that's not stable and powerful. It speaks to

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

49

me to an eagle that's kind struggles. Is that what we want to say about this country right now? I don't think so. In fact, I know it is not what I want to say. So, there you go Train Number 41. I'm not on board and I (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We might want to have a discussion to that editorial, Gary. That's an editorial.

MR. JANSEN: Gary told me to come here.

MR. MARKS: Tom, are you on the line?

MR. URAM: Yeah, I've been on.

MR. MARKS: Well, you're the last one. Are you ready to make your comments?

MR. URAM: Yeah. I just want to preface some remarks as I gave some thought, and I really appreciate your opening comments, as well as Erik's opening comments. And I look at this on changing two different coins, the bullion piece and the proof item.

I look at it and say, "What's the upside of changing an already successful design, number one." And we've heard some of that in your opening remarks, as well as Erik's in regards to we have the stability

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

50

of the bullion piece, it's recognized and importantly the international acceptance.

So, from my opinion, and the comments that I'm going to make in regards to the designs here that we're looking at, would be related to the proof version, if we go down the row. I guess what I'm really saying is I'm totally against any kind of change in the bullion coin as it stands. I think it represents exactly what we want it to represent. And it reminds me of Coca-Cola wanting to change their taste here. I think we've got the best coin and I think if we change it, I haven't found our upside yet.

Now, having said that, on the proof, we have an anniversary of this coin coming in 2016. And I've listened to some of these designs and we've had some reverse proofs in the past, we've had enhanced proofs, we've had other issues. And in 2016, when we have the 30th year, a couple things. I thought a high relief of the coin would be an outstanding compliment to the other metal techniques that we -- that The Mint has used in the past anniversaries.

And then having said that, that would be

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

51

then the ideal time to change, from a collector's point of view now, unlike the bullion point of view, collectors might like to see something different in 2017, as it would relate to one of these other eagles.

I really like the idea of a high relief to close out the proof's series, if it would be possible. Having said that, I'm not sure about being on board the train, as was just stated, but I do like 40 and 41, as it relates to that.

And I do -- I think my top pick, though, is Number 22, if we could take that Liberty and put the Liberty into the field and have the eagle for the majority of that diameter, and then also strengthen the eagle's eye and beak as it relates to that point. I think 22 would make a nice coin, without the Liberty going all the way across and subtlety put in like we have on the platinum designs.

So, that's really my comments. And I really just feel strongly about not messing with the best bullion coin that's out in the world, not just anywhere, but in the world. We are just so well respected with that design and that image that it

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

52

portrays. And those are my comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Tom. Okay, at this point, in the interest of time, I think we're at a little after the hour now. We've got about 55, 56 minutes left in our scheduled meeting, and we have one other item to consider. So, I think it's important that we wrap this up, this item, in the next 20 to 25 minutes.

So, with that in mind, I'm going to ask people to -- we've all had a chance here to really express our opinions. If there are some brief follow ups, and I do mean brief, I'd like to entertain those now. Is there anyone who wants to be on the record with anything before we move to our voting?

MR. BUDEJA: Yeah, Gary, it's Michael Bugeja, I would. I'm going to be the conductor of Train 41.

You know, I want to caution the committee against what my friend Erik has suggested, for some reason that are different than perhaps Erik or even Donald has thought of. And actually, if we stray too

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

53

far from the reverse of the bullion coin, I'm actually in favor of keeping the reverse the way it is.

And let me back this up a little bit. This is -- we're dealing here not only with the most popular coin, one that's seen worldwide, we're dealing with convention. And it is awful -- you know, you talk about Coca-Cola and changing the formula, in magazine journalism, for instance, if you change the title of a magazine even slightly, or something as conventional as the title of a magazine, like *Ladies Home Journal*, or *Lady's Home Journal*, or *Ladies' Home Journal*, the whole world takes note, so we're dealing with convention.

If you take a look at 41, Gary's comments earlier, and how it fares with the current obverse of the bullion coin, is very well taken. The Gobrecht's dollar is not a bird flying, the Gobrecht's dollar is a symbol flying through stars. And the Liberty dollar is a symbol flying through stars.

In the history of the U.S. Mint, when the eagle has been used, since its earliest use in 1792, you're going to have a symbolic for except a few coins

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

54

in which we start to stray and we stray terrifically in the modern series, where we actually personify the eagle, which is an embarrassment to coinage.

So, I would like you -- and I happen to love 24. I think Erik is absolutely right on 24. That's my favorite design, but it doesn't couple well with the obverse. This obverse is an older, more classic design. And to put a stylistic eagle, as you might find in Number 4, for instance, against the Weinman obverse, is going to invite real scrutiny. So, I'd like you to just think about the term "convention" and any change in that reverse is going to be scrutinized.

So, if you want to have -- if you're just going to have an olive leaf it's going to be scrutinized as what -- does this stand for peace and not power? If you don't put the arrows in there -- and incidentally, the (inaudible) reverse is one that we have seen ad nauseum, and it is really just a takeoff on a presidential seal. I think at the last CCAC meeting I noted all the coins with eagles that are reminiscent of the presidential seal.

So, with that in mind, I yield and will vote

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

55

for more than one, but I wanted to express that, from a numismatic perspective.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Michael. Are there any other quick comments?

MR. OLSON: Yeah, Gary, real quick. I'm riding the train, I'm a paid for passenger here on 41. I think when we talk about the stability of the design, this design is not turned, as it's never changed. And I would believe that it probably wouldn't change for a long time to come, so the design that we select would need to stand the test of time.

So, there were some comments about keeping the bullion piece as the proof piece, separate, the different reverse design. In my view, that would bifurcate the collection and it would cause you to really have two different series of coins, maybe not being thought of as a set anymore.

With that being said, I'm still on board with 41 and I could take the eagle without the olive branch, but if it's got the olive branch, as Heidi had stated before, it must have the arrows. That's it.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Michael. Anyone

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

56

else?

Okay, I'll just say, for the record, I don't ride on trains. (Laughter) I'm glad you're all on the train, I support the same thing you do, I come to this not because of -- I'm clearly influenced by all of your expert opinion, but at the end of the day, I have to go with what I feel in my soul and I just feel like 41 meets the standard.

There's a standard to be met here. Oh my gosh, Adolph Weinman's Walking Liberty may be one of the greatest American designs ever, and recognized as such. Whatever we do to this point has to be fabulous and has to look like it belongs to that iconic image that Mr. Weinman produced, that's used on the obverse. So, I just think this is the one.

So, with that, we're going to go through our voting process. It'll feel a little different to members, because we're on the phone and in the interest of time, Erik and I talked about this, just the best way to do this is if we do it in roll call style. Just go through and ask each member to report their votes.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

57

We'll do it as we usually do, with one through three intensity vote. In other words, if you want to give it your strong -- a design your strongest support, you'd give it a one -- or I'm sorry, a three. If you wanted to provide a lesser intensity support, you'd go with a two or a one. So, you can vote for as many as you wish, from the polled list. And so, with that we need to go through the roll call.

So, Erik, are you prepared to call the roll?

MR. JANSEN: I am. If I could ask you just to give me the design number and the score you want. Skip all your zero votes, just give me your design number and a one, two or a three. And then I'll repeat them back to you, just if you'll confirm them.

Michael Bugeja.

MR. BUDEJA: Thank you very much. I'm going to go with a 3 for 41.

MR. JANSEN: 41 - 3.

MR. BUDEJA: And a 1 for 24.

MR. JANSEN: 24 - 1. A total of four votes.

Robert Hoge?

MR. HOGE: I'll do 3 for 41. And I'd like

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

58

to give a 3 to Number 36.

MS. STAFFORD: Could we ask you --

MR. WEINMAN: Speak up, please.

MR. HOGE: I'm sorry. Number 23 for a 3

also.

MR. JANSEN: Any more?

MR. HOGE: And -- hello?

MR. JANSEN: Yes? Any more?

MR. HOGE: I think I'll just let it go at that.

MR. JANSEN: I have 3 for Design Number 41. I have a 3 for Design Number 36. And I have a 3 for Design Number 23. A total of nine votes.

I am next in the roll. I am giving Design 9 - three votes. Design 23 - three votes. Design 24 - three votes. A total of nine votes.

Gary Marks?

MR. MARKS: I'm going to give Design Number 38 - 2 and Design Number 41 - 3.

MR. JANSEN: Is that all?

MR. MARKS: That's it.

MR. JANSEN: Design 38 - two votes, Design

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

59

41 - three votes. A total of five votes.

Michael Moran?

MR. MORAN: Three votes to Number 41. Two votes to 44. And one vote to 24.

MR. JANSEN: A total of six votes. One vote for Design 24. Three votes, Design 41. Two votes, Design 44. A total of six votes.

Michael Olson?

MR. OLSON: Design Number 10 - one vote, 39 - one vote, 40 - one vote, 41 - three votes.

MR. JANSEN: Mike Olson, one vote, Design Number 10. One vote, Design Number 39. One vote, Design Number 40. Three votes, Design Number 41. A total of six votes.

MR. OLSON: Correct.

MR. JANSEN: Donald Scarinci?

MR. SCARINCI: I'm going to do two for Number 15.

MR. JANSEN: Number 15 is not on the list of votes.

MR. SCARINCI: Twenty-two.

MR. JANSEN: Design Number 15 is not on my

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

60

list of voteable candidates.

MR. SCARINCI: How about Design 22?

MR. JANSEN: Design 22, how many votes?

MR. SCARINCI: Three votes for that.

MR. JANSEN: Three votes.

MR. SCARINCI: And then three votes for 36.

MR. JANSEN: All right. Anymore?

MR. SCARINCI: I don't ride trains.

MR. JANSEN: I have three votes for Design Number 22. I have three votes for Design Number 36.

A total of six votes.

Jeanne Stevens?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I'm going to give 24 two votes, 38 two votes and 41 three.

MR. JANSEN: I have two votes for Design 24, two votes for Design 38, three votes for Design 41. A total of seven votes.

Tom Uram?

MR. URAM: Twenty-two, three votes. I'm sorry. Twenty-two, three votes. Twenty-three, two votes. Forty, two votes. And 41, two votes. And that's it. I'd just also like to reiterate that I am

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

61

viewing this from the proof side of the house.

MR. JANSEN: I have three votes for Design Number 22. Two votes, Design 23. Two votes, Design 40. Two votes, Design 41. That is a total of nine votes.

MR. URAM: Thank you.

MR. JANSEN: Heidi Wastweet?

MS. WASTWEET: This is very uncharacteristic of me, but I'm going to give my full vote for only one design, Number 41. Sorry, Erik.

MR. JANSEN: Three votes, Design 41, three votes. A total of three votes.

That is full voting from one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten members. That will require for our traditional (inaudible) being 16 votes needed to select. I'll have results for you momentarily.

MR. MARKS: Okay, while Erik is -- Erik, you're going to need, what, a couple minutes?

MR. JANSEN: Yes. I'm adding this right now.

MR. MARKS: Okay, while we're waiting, in the interest of time while we're waiting for this, I

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

62

want to dive just quickly into our next item, and that is a potential recommendation for our National Medal Program. And I think this is a great opportunity right now, with this little space and time, I don't want to take Greg off notice here, but Greg, it's my understanding, I just need you to confirm this, it's my understanding that The Mint has the authority to strike medals and to do such with any kind of a program that might be devised, without any other approvals necessary. Is that correct?

MR. WEINMAN: Yes. We have statutory authority to strike national medals, so long as it doesn't interfere with any other resources needed for the programs. The Mint, on its own authority, can select designs and strike national medals which could be art medals. But we have done -- as you know, we've done national medals before, The Mint has had a building series in the past, it had a --

MS. STAFFORD: Fish and Wildlife.

MR. WEINMAN: -- it did specifically a national medal for the 100th anniversary of the Fish and Wildlife Act, back in 2003, maybe or thereabouts,

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

63

or even earlier.

It's had a series of national medals for the Secretaries of the Treasury, for the Directors of The Mint, for the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court in the past. So, for without the need for statutory -- or for legislation, The Mint can, on its own authority strike national medals.

MR. MARKS: Okay, thanks. I wanted to establish that fact.

And then Erik, as soon as you're done, please speak up and let me know. Until then, I'm just going to keep this discussion going.

MR. JANSEN: I am done.

MR. MARKS: You are done?

MR. JANSEN: Yes. I am.

MR. MARKS: Fabulous. Okay, can you report your results, please?

MR. JANSEN: I summarize the report. With ten members voting, 16 votes is a threshold to select. One design has achieved that, it is Design Number 41, with 23 votes.

I will run down the total votes for each

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

64

design, by design. Design Number 1, zero votes.
Design Number 10, one vote. Design Number 16, zero
votes. Design Number 18, zero votes. Design Number
19, three votes. Design Number 22, six votes. Design
Number 23 would be our runner up, but not achieving
selected status, with eight votes. Design Number 24
would be the second runner up with seven votes.
Design Number 25, zero. Design Number 30, zero.
Design Number 36, six votes. Design Number 38, four
votes. Design Number 39, one vote. Design Number 40,
three votes. Design Number 41, as stated earlier, 23
votes and our selection. Design Number 44, two votes.
A total of 64 votes cast.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Our indicated
recommendation, by the tally, would be Design Number
41, with 23. So, at this point I'd like to have a
discussion about if we want to go with one or more.
And as soon as we establish that fact, then we can
look to the tally for -- if there's more than one,
we'll look at the tally and probably ask for a motion
on that.

And then, if there are specific changes or

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

65

recommendations people would like to make on specific designs, let's do that at that time, but let's keep this ordered.

So, I'm looking for discussion on one or more. Do we want to recommend one or more?

MR. JANSEN: This is Erik. I would like to reiterate my earlier comments that the committee advance multiple choices. I personally, in looking at the voting here, the logical way to handle that would be our top four votes. There's a line of demarcation at that point, although it was a strong vote for the single number, 41. If that were the case --

MR. BUDEJA: Gary, I would like to bring a point of order concerning that. The CCAC has always, since I've been on it, proceeded with multiple votes that have to have at least -- have met a threshold. I'm wondering whether or not we should change that process for this particular exercise.

MR. MARKS: I think that's the heart of the matter, Michael. The committee has also made some decisions by a majority vote. And I don't think (inaudible) the rules, but there have been times when

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

66

we've had little diversions here and there.

So, you know, in the interest of time, and if there is a desire to move forward with more than one vote, I'd like someone to put a motion on the table now, so that our discussion would be to that point.

Here again, folks, we've got a very limited time. So, let's get a motion on the table. If you have comments that you are burning to make, make those, but please make them brief. So, is there a motion?

MR. JANSEN: This is Erik. I would move that we include the verbiage of our formal selection, those designs accruing six or more votes, which would give an additional four designs into the discussion.

Those designs would be 36, 24, 23 and 22, by vote.

MR. MARKS: Is there a second?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I second that.

MR. MARKS: Is that Jeanne --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

MR. MARKS: -- who said that first?

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

67

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

MR. MARKS: Okay.

MR. JANSEN: Are you getting the other stuff that's going, Gary?

MR. MARKS: Pardon me? No, I'm not.

MR. JANSEN: Are you getting the --

MR. MARKS: No, I'm not.

MR. JANSEN: Okay. I'll get -- okay. I'll take -- the motion on that, that was me, and who was the second?

MR. MARKS: Jeanne.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Jeanne.

MR. JANSEN: Okay.

MR. MARKS: Okay, so the motion's on the table. The motion is for essentially five designs, 22, 23, 24, 36 and 41. Is there any discussion before we vote on this?

MS. WASTWEET: This is Heidi.

MR. MARKS: Heidi, go ahead.

MS. WASTWEET: I was referencing more than one design, it has further evolved, but we have quite the discrepancy in our voting. We don't even -- you

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

68

know, the runner up isn't really even close top to our top pick. And so therefore I would be in favor of seeing more variations than just the one.

MR. BUDEJA: Gary, I would again say that we're dealing with convention and it is important to be careful not to change the rules. You know, I conduct faculty meetings and if motions have so few votes and some have so many, it really is having a minority view speak for the majority. So, that's why I would be against this.

MR. MARKS: Right. Understood. Any other quick comments?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I just ask what would a yes and a no vote mean to this?

MR. MARKS: Well, right now as it stands we have an indicated recommendation for Number 41. So, absent any other action from the committee, our normal process would indicate that we would be recommending Number 41, the singular design, should this current motion fail.

If this motion is passed, then we would be forwarding five designs which like I said before,

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

69

we're going to see these again.

MR. JANSEN: A point of correction, Gary.

That was not my motion.

MR. MARKS: Okay, what was it?

MR. JANSEN: My motion was to indicate that 41, Design 41 was our selected design, by a vote, 23 (inaudible) 83:11 total of 16. However, in this case I identified the four other best vote getters being Design 36, 24, 23 and 22. So, I am not lessening or removing the verbiage of our formal selection, I am merely giving the (inaudible) the ability to see depth into our process.

MR. MARKS: Okay. So, let me clarify that further, please. Let me clarify that further. So, what are we asking The Mint to do? Are we asking The Mint to prepare appropriate inscriptions solely on Number 41, Erik, with your motion, or for all five designs?

MR. JANSEN: I would say that would be subject to the process of the director's bid in consultation with the Officer of the Treasury would determine. I don't think we're here telling them what

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

70

their project order --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I --

MR. MARKS: I just -- go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why would we do this?

We have never done this before.

MR. JANSEN: The reason I believe this motion is important is this is an iconic coin that I believe deserves a little more consideration from the administration as well as the public, in terms of how they might be responding to these designs.

MR. OLSON: Yeah, this is Mike Olson. I don't even remember seeing 44 designs for any one coin, and we've been through the process, we voted and our intent to recommend is clear. I think we muddy the process if we start including both designs that have got six designs, when the winner has 23.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Gary, I will rescind my second.

MR. MARKS: Okay. The motion is now without a second.

MR. MORAN: Gary, this is Mike Moran, I'll still make the second.

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

71

MR. MARKS: Okay. We've preserved the second. So, we still have the question on the table. Now, I believe at this point that we've defined a clear line of demarcation between the views on this motion, so I'm going to go ahead and I'm going to call the question.

And Erik, can you call the roll? I think this is something I want to do simply as a mass voice vote.

MR. JANSEN: A yay supports the motion. A nay does not support the motion. And there will be no motion on the floor as to our action other than our standard indication of our selected design.

Michael Bugeja, yay or nay?

MR. BUDEJA: Nay.

MR. JANSEN: Robert Hoge, yay, nay?

MR. HOGE: Nay.

MR. JANSEN: Erik Jansen, yay.

Gary Marks?

MR. MARKS: Nay.

MR. JANSEN: Michael Moran?

MR. MORAN: Yay.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

72

MR. JANSEN: Mike Olson?

MR. OLSON: Yay.

MR. JANSEN: Donald Scarinci?

MR. SCARINCI: Nay.

MR. JANSEN: I hear nay.

MR. SCARINCI: Correct. It's a nay.

MR. JANSEN: Jeanne Stevens?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Nay.

MR. JANSEN: Tom Uram?

MR. URAM: Yes.

MR. JANSEN: I hear yay.

Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: Nay.

MR. JANSEN: The vote fails. One, two, three, four, five, six seven nays. Three yays. The motion fails.

MR. MARKS: All right. So, I'm going to move us through this as expeditiously as possible, folks, but the indication here is that we're recommending Design Number 41. I know there's some concerns about some particular aspects of this design.

May I please have a motion, if there is one,

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

73

to address those sorts of subjects.

MR. OLSON: Gary, this is Mike Olson. I make a motion that The Mint be allowed to incorporate various elements of what we've discussed and present that to the committee, on Design Number 41.

MR. MARKS: Is there a second?

MR. OLSON: Where are the -- the arrow and the olive branch or no, the orientation of the eagle, the placement of the inscription, let The Mint present some designs based on this one theme.

MR. MARKS: So, your motion, Michael, is that -- let me sum this up. You're trying to not micromanage and give a free hand to address the concerns that we've heard today, about this design, and then they bring us back something that they have cleaned up, if you will. Is that what you're getting at?

MR. OLSON: That is correct. And to make no motion to modify that design, let's let The Mint present some options.

(Multiple speakers at one time)

MR. BUGEJA: I second the motion, Gary.

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

74

MR. MARKS: Okay, it's been seconded.

Let me further clarify. Mike, that also means now we heard the comments about some feeling the beak was edging up against the edge of the coin too much and maybe getting a little more room, I'm assuming that's part of your intent, to address that, if The Mint artists feel it's warranted?

MR. OLSON: Yeah, everything that we've discussed, anybody that's had a comment on that, that could possibly make it different or better, let's see all the options and let the committee vote on that.

MR. MARKS: Okay. All right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That includes removing the olive branch completely?

MR. OLSON: Yeah, none was an option he described as he (inaudible) arrows and olives to be readdressed or not.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excellent.

MR. MARKS: So, it's an all inclusive motion, folks.

MR. HOGE: Seconded by Michael Moran.

MR. MARKS: Yes, it is seconded by Michael

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

75

Moran. Is that --

MR. BUDEJA: (inaudible) seconded by Michael Bugeja.

MR. HOGE: Yeah, I didn't get my second in there soon enough, Gary.

MR. MARKS: Oh, okay. Okay. My apologies to the Michaels.

So, we got that straight. So, barring any other comments, I'm not sure why we'd need them at this point, let's vote on this. So --

MR. JANSEN: Gary, a voice will work. I think a voice vote will work.

MR. MARKS: Yep.

MR. JANSEN: I think a voice vote will work at this point.

MR. MARKS: Okay, all those in --

MR. JANSEN: (inaudible) 89:31 call it? Go ahead.

MR. MARKS: All those in favor, please say aye.

GROUP: Aye.

MR. MARKS: Opposed?

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

76

(No audible response)

MR. MARKS: Okay. Motion carries unanimously. That is recognized by the chair as a ten to zero vote. Ten yays, no nays.

MR. JANSEN: Got it.

MR. MARKS: So, at this point we leave this in the good hands of The Mint.

Correct me if I'm wrong, Committee, but my thought on this is that The Mint, as they work through their time line would make some changes to this design and bring that back to us. We would look at this, and at that point then we'd need to make a recommendation, sending out the final version and then it's going to need to go to the CFA and through the normal process. So, is that how we understand this?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's how I understand it.

MR. MARKS: Okay. I'm not hearing any feedback on that, so I'm going to assume that that's our direction. So, we'll just go forward from there.

Okay. With that, our next item on the agenda is discussion of a (inaudible) 90:48

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

77

recommendation for a National Medals Program. This item also refers back to a recommendation that has been in our annual report for the last two years. And this idea was initial conceived as a way to provide our artists with an opportunity to design perhaps a freer hand than a lot of the programs that they're given.

When those programs come down there's usually specific direction about subject matters, about inscriptions and so forth. So, the thought here was, as we were looking through the blueprint in 2010 and 11, that it would be, I think, helpful, to this whole experience of pursuing design excellence if our artists were given a free hand and an ability to show us what they've got, if you will, to exercise some real creativity with a program that The Mint has authority to execute.

And it would be designed in a way that there would be of course very limited parameters. Perhaps there would be a subject matter established on an annual basis, some very generalized themes, and no other parameters put on it. Artists could then

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

78

submit, we'd go through a selection process like we always do and that would also go to the CFA. And perhaps there would be a medal or two produced each year and through time we would build a series of art medals that would explore various different types of design, modern -- just all the various techniques that we don't always get to see because of the limitations on some of our coinage programs.

So, that's the idea here. It's a recommendation we've made for at least the last three years. So, I don't know if we need a lot of time on this subject, but I want to open that up for discussion, with the idea that if that's something that we feel would be of interest that we might make a formal motion here today with a request that The Mint consider implementing that on some time line that they would be able to put together and bring back to us some time in the future.

So, what are the committee's thoughts on such a recommendation?

MR. OLSON: Hey Gary, this is Mike Olson. I think that is an excellent idea to generate additional

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

79

new thoughts and processes into the artists' thinking that we might see back when we take a look at our coin designs, that the CCAC reviews. It's certainly less restrictive than some of the commemorative coins and (inaudible) 93:54 coin programs that we have. And I would be fully in favor of it.

My only concern would be would it be commercially successful for The Mint to produce these? Would there be enough customers that would get the word, that would buy them?

MR. MARKS: Well, you know, I think that has everything to do with the art that would be produced in this program. Being an optimist, I really believe that it would be successful. But that's something that will prove out over time, one way or the other.

MR. SCARINCI: Gary, if I may?

MR. MARKS: Oh, go ahead. Is this Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: Yes. You know this is something that I would resoundingly support and encourage. And it's in the blueprint, actually, as a recommendation. You know, I think as to the commercial viability, on the commercial viability, I

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

80

think the results you're getting from the baseball commemorative are proving, versus the Civil Rights commemorative, you know, are consistent with what we actually said in the blueprint and what we've been saying for the last several years, that attractive designs sell, people buy them. And unattractive, or un-exciting designs do not sell, people do not buy them. And except for those of us who have to collect one of everything in the series by every date, Mint mark and every finish. So, you know, and there's a lot of those. And then that probably accounts for the entire sales of the Civil Rights commemorative. You know, not that I'm picking on that particular coin, of course, lack of artistic merit.

But I think -- it's 2014, in September (inaudible) 96:07 once again reviews -- once again will exhibit art medals from 30 -- between 31 and 34 countries in the world and probably other than Heidi and Jim, and I think Don might have something in this years, I hope he does, but you know, outside of a handful of people, the U.S. Mint artists are unrepresented and don't participate in that. And

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

81

that's a shame.

I think that doing what you're suggesting, and what we've suggested and voted for, when we voted for the blueprint, its time -- I think its time has come. And I think it's a great thing to do. It's a great way to encourage the artists to be artists, which is what we have said since the -- since before the blueprint and I think it's a great way to experiment and to let the creative energy flow.

Because out of that creative energy maybe we will have a new Liberty that's designed in a 21st century way. And we won't be talking about olive branches and arrows and shields and images from the Civil War and from the American Revolution.

And, you know, I think it's time to rejoin the world and to do things in a more modern and post-modern style and see how the public reacts to it. And I think if it's pretty, if it's appealing, the public will buy it. If it's ugly, they're not likely to be buy it any more than they bought the Girl Scout coin or the Civil Rights coin, since I don't want to just pick on that coin.

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

82

So, I'm completely in support of this, and I think it's long overdue.

MR. MARKS: Any other comments on that?

MS. WASTWEET: This is Heidi.

MR. MARKS: Um hmm. Go ahead, Heidi.

MS. WASTWEET: Obviously I would be very supportive of this whole idea. I echo everything that Donald said.

I'd also like to open it up to some comments by Don Everhart and get his thoughts on this whole process.

MR. EVERHART: Yeah. First of all, I like the way you guys think. I consider myself a medalist more so than a coin designer and I would jump at the chance to be able to have the freedom to do something for us, for The Mint, for the country, for art sake that would be emblematic of, you know, still this country. I don't know if it's historical or what it would be, it could be wildlife, but something that would just -- you know, we'd be free to just think of something and then design it and sculpt it.

Yeah, I'm on board with this 100 percent. I

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

83

would love the idea. And I also think that once we do it, we should patina it.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: If I could weigh in on this. This is Jeanne. I have to agree with Donald. You know, the (inaudible) 99:50 the international program that was initiated back in the '30s was designed specifically for The Mint artists of the world to show what they can do and give an opportunity for lots of exhibitions and creativity.

So, I think our Mint, our U.S. Mint could participate in this program, it would be excellent. We are at a durth with our Mint artists participating in the (inaudible) exhibitions worldwide. And I strongly urge this program to go through.

MR. MARKS: Well, we'll have some more comments here in a minute, but with Don Everhart's comment and the fact that this idea's been something near and dear to my heart from the beginning of my service on the committee, it's an idea that I've had in mind, I'm going to go ahead and I usually don't make motions, but this one's important to me.

I want to make a motion that we make a

**Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014**

84

recommendation to The Mint that the National Art Medals Program be considered and that an outline of how The Mint would proceed with such a program might be submitted to us at a future meeting of The Citizen Coinage Advisory Committee.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like the honor to second that motion.

MR. MARKS: Okay, is there --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I third it.

MR. MARKS: Is there any further discussion on this motion? Is it necessary?

Okay. I'm going to go ahead with a voice vote. All those in favor, please say aye.

GROUP: Aye.

MR. MARKS: Opposed?

(No audible response)

MR. MARKS: Motion carries unanimously. I will recognize that as a vote of ten yays, zero nays.

With that we've concluded our business for today. I want to thank everyone who has participated and has listened in on this call.

I want to give the staff an opportunity to

Capital Reporting Company
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Public Meeting 04-08-2014

85

interject anything they feel is necessary at this point. Members of the Mint staff, is there anything you'd liked to communicate to us?

MS. STAFFORD: No, I don't believe we have anything on this side, Gary.

MR. MARKS: Okay. With that, again, thank you all for a great meeting and we'll see everyone in May. This meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 3:46 p.m.)

* * * * *