1

CITIZENS COINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PUBLIC MEETING

Wednesday,
September 24, 2014

United States Mint 801 9th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

Reported by: Christine Allen,

Capital Reporting Company

2

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARKS, Gary, Chairman
JANSEN, Erik
SCARINCI, Donald
WASTWEET, Heidi
MORAN, Mike
BUGEJA, Michael, Dr.
STEVENS-SOLLMAN, Jeanne
HOGE, Robert
URAM, Thomas J.
LANNIN, Mary
VIOLA, Herman, Dr.

U.S. MINT STAFF:

PETERSON, Richard, Acting Director ANTONUCCI, Steve BIRDSONG, Betty EVERHART, Don NORTON, Bill SULLIVAN, Megan STAFFORD, April VASQUEZ, Roger WEINMAN, Gary

3 A G E N D A PAGE Welcome and Reconvene the Meeting 4 Review and discuss candidate designs for the 2015 and 2016 American Eagle Platinum Coin Program 6 Proposed Arts Medal Program 111 Discussion of FY2014 Annual Report Adjourn 148

4

PROCEEDINGS

(9:35 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Good morning. This meeting of the Citizen's Coinage Advisory

Committee for Wednesday, September 24th, will come to order.

(Amplified phone conversation in background.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: First, I want to go to the telephone and recognize that we have folks listening in and if, whoever the visitors are on the phone, could you please identify yourself?

(Amplified phone conversation continues.)

MS. STAFFORD: For anyone who's joining us on the phone, could you first please mute your phone?

(Amplified phone conversation continues.)

MS. STAFFORD: Hello, this is the United States Mint headquarters; we're

beginning the meeting today. If you are on the phone and participating, if you could please mute your phones? Thank you.

Chairman Marks is about to start the meeting. I'm not sure, Mr. Marks, if your microphone is on, so they may not have been able to hear you. There we go, okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Do you hear me now?

Okay. I would ask any press members on the phone to please identify yourself.

(Amplified phone conversation continues.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Apparently they can't hear us on the phone.

(Pause for technical assistance.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I've already called the meeting to order, so I'll ask April if she'll give us the report on the 2015 and 2016 American Eagle Platinum Coin Program.

MS. STAFFORD: It is 31 U.S.C. 5112(k) that grants the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to mint and issue platinum bullion

6

coins and --

CHAIRMAN MARKS: April, why don't you pause?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes. I agree. (Pause.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Give it a try, April.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. It is 31 U.S.C.

5112(k) that grants the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to mint and issue platinum bullion coins and proof platinum coins. The specifications and designs are left to the Secretary's discretion.

Beginning with the coin's debut in 1997, American Eagle platinum coin designs have depicted the Statue of Liberty on the obverse. From 1998 to 2002, proof versions of the American Platinum Eagle carried a different reverse design under a program entitled "Vistas of Liberty." Each year, a bald eagle was depicted in a different region of the United States or a United States-themed design. From 2006 to 2008, a three-year

series of designs, known as the "Foundations of Democracy," was issued to represent the three branches of government. And from 2009 to 2014, a six-year platinum coin design explored the core concepts of American democracy by highlighting the Preamble to the United States Constitution.

For the upcoming iteration of American Eagle Platinum proof coins, the United States Mint did not require artists to design to a specific narrative or theme. Based on a recommendation by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee, artists were given more latitude regarding design concepts. As platinum is the most precious of all the precious metal coins, we asked our artists to submit designs that are also of the highest quality: innovative, beautiful, and representative of the ideals of our nation.

The United States Mint is seeking a design recommendation for the 2015 Platinum Program. However, we have an opportunity to

identify two beautiful and complementary designs—one for 2015 and one for 2016—designs that relate to one another stylistically and/or thematically. This would, in effect, organically create a two-year series.

We notified artists of this
possibility and asked them to submit multiple
complementary designs, resulting in the
portfolio you'll be reviewing today. Some
artists supplied an alternate title for their
designs, and those titles will be shared with
you also today. Required inscriptions are:
United States of America, 0.9995 platinum,
\$100, and one ounce.

And on to the platinum designs.

Before we go to the reverse, we're going to take a moment so everyone is aware. This is the obverse that would be depicted, and we're selecting hopefully two reverse designs to complement this.

Okay. Reverse 1, called "Freedom to

Achieve, depicts a young girl reading. The book itself is ambiguous. It might be a literary novel or an astrophysics dissertation. This young girl has the freedom of self-determination and the freedom to achieve all to which she aspires.

The companion design is Reverse 2,

"Liberty Nurtures Freedom." This design

depicts Liberty kneeling to inspect the branch

of an olive tree. She extends her left hand

to a dove, a symbol of peace. A quiver of

arrows, a symbol for defense of freedom, lies

at her feet. While encouraging and fostering

peace, she remains ready to fight to preserve

it.

Reverses 3, 4, 5, and 6 depict Liberty and an American bald eagle representing freedom. In Designs 3, 4, and 5, Liberty encourages the eagle to take flight as an ambassador of democracy. Design 6, a companion design to any of the previous three, shows Liberty continuing to nurture and

sustain freedom. Here is Reverse 3, 4, and 5, and the companion design to any of those, 6.

Reverses 7 and 8 depict Liberty with flowing hair and robe waving in the winds of freedom. She holds a torch of enlightenment in her right hand and an olive branch in her left to symbolize peace. Thirteen olives are included on the olive branch to represent the 13 original colonies. Design 7 includes a bald eagle with its wings outstretched, representing its boundless spirit, as it clutches an olive branch in its talons.

Design 8 incorporates 13 stars into the composition. Here is Reverse 7 and 8.

The companion to either design,

Reverse 9, depicts a bald eagle while grasping
an olive branch in its talons to symbolize

peace. The eagle's wings are outstretched to

represent its boundless spirit of freedom.

The stars in a circle above the eagle's head

represents the 13 original colonies.

Reverse 10, "My Country 'Tis of Thee,"

and its companion design, Reverse 11, "Let
Freedom Ring," celebrate the patriotic spirit
and pride of our nation's youngest citizens.
For generations, one of the first patriotic
songs American children learned to sing is
"America." Design 10 depicts three grade
school children singing the song's opening
phrase, "My Country 'Tis of Thee."

To convey the rhythm, the musical staff flows from left to right and features the six notes that correspond to the phrase.

Design 11 portrays a dual image of the Liberty Bell, how it appears today housed in the Liberty Bell Center, and how it may have looked on July 8, 1776, when, according to tradition, it rang to summon the citizens of Philadelphia to hear the first public reading of the Declaration of Independence. The five dancing musical notes correspond to the song's closing phrase, "Let freedom ring."

Reverse 12, "Liberty and the American Dream," depicts an allegorical female falconer

releasing an eagle into the sky, representing liberty and the American dream of opportunity. In mythological symbolism, the hung represents the game of life, a search for success and opportunity, which is not possible without freedom and liberty. In this design, the female figure wears a wreath of olive leaves and carries a quiver of arrows. She also wears a mantle with 13 stripes to represent the original 13 colonies that formed the United States.

Reverse 13, "American Opportunity,"

depicts an outstretched hand reaching for the

stars to represent the United States as a land

of opportunity. The design features three

stars symbolizing life, liberty, and the

pursuit of happiness. The stars are shown not

as typical five-pointed stars but as more

complex stars that shine brightly in the night

sky.

Reverse 14, "Land of the Free," pays homage to the freedoms Americans enjoy by

featuring the Liberty Bell, an enduring symbol of freedom, rung to tell the world that 13 colonies had declared their independence from Great Britain. The bell is drawn at a tilt in the process of ringing, a symbol of freedom in action. The words "Land of the Free" are incused on the bell, encircling its cylinder.

Reverse 15, "Liberty Is America's

Strength," depicts Liberty cradling fasces to represent unity while waving the flag and boldly moving forward. Its companion, Reverse 16, shows Liberty shining a torch over various symbols of what makes America great: our unity, fasces; our love of peace, olive branch; and our tradition, classical architectural elements.

Reverse 17 features a male figure holding a sword in defense of our liberties while offering an olive branch of peace to the world. The additional inscription of "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness" is included.

Reverse 18, "Foundation of Our

Country," depicts Lady Liberty sitting proudly

on a classical capital while protecting the

fruits of our labor. Its companion, Reverse

19, "America's Future," shows Lady Liberty

protecting a child who holds the Declaration

of Independence.

Reverse 20, "Land of Opportunity,"

depicts a city, a house, and a farm,

representing different parts of the American

landscape, as well as different people's ideas

of the American dream. The design includes

the inscription "Land of Opportunity," an

American flag, and a soaring eagle to

symbolize freedom. The companion design,

Reverse 21, "Opportunity," also includes an

apple tree branch bearing fruit as a symbol of

opportunity.

Reverse 22 features an American bald eagle, a symbol of strength and freedom. The eagle is depicted in the heraldic tradition with an olive branch clutched in its right

talon to symbolize peace and 13 arrows in its left talon to symbolize strength and the ability to protect.

Reverse 23 depicts Libertas, the goddess of freedom, holding the American flag. She's wearing a crown of olives symbolizing peace and victory. The American bald eagle, seen in the background landing on a wild olive branch, is a symbol of freedom, power, and independence.

Reverse 24 depicts Freedom holding the implements of self-protection, a sword for defense and a shield, representing the Constitution of the United States. Held in the same hand as the shield is a victor's wreath. The artist has created the alternate title of "Freedom" for this design.

The companion design, Reverse 25, titled "Wisdom Seeks Justice," depicts Wisdom on the seat of Justice holding a Book of Knowledge and balanced scales which represent equality. She is not blind, but she sees all

and considers all in her judgment. The Sword of Justice lies across her lap. Her foot rests on a sphere representing the globe.

Reverse 26, Liberty reading to hear children, depicts an allegory of Lady Liberty reading to children. This design's concept emerges from American values regarding education, family, and freedom of speech. It suggests the importance of teaching the rising generation about our founding principles, including life, liberty, justice, and the rule of law. The companion design, Reverse 27, Liberty as a child reading, also underscores the importance of education and features Lady Liberty as a young girl reading a book.

Reverse 28 features an allegory of Victory holding an eagle aloft, which once appeared as a figurehead on the flagship USS Olympic.

Reverse 29 features a rose, America's national floral emblem since 1986. A repeating border of 13 eagles and 13 stars

circle the design as symbols of the 13 colonies.

Reverse 30 depicts Liberty stepping forward, her back to the rising sun, with 13 rays for the original colonies. She carries a sword in her right hand to signify vigilance against oppression and raises her sword in the left as a beacon of hope and freedom.

Reverse 31 depicts three figures holding a torch in unity, symbolizing a diverse American society moving confidently into the future with its path lit by the torch of liberty.

The CFA recommended Designs 9 and 22, both eagle designs, noting the text on the reverses should be altered to match the serif style that is featured on the platinum obverse.

And, Mr. Chairman, that concludes the designs for that program.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, April.

Are you all hearing me on the

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are you hearing me now? Okay.

All right. We have 31 designs in front of us, Committee, and normally we would go through a process of culling these out.

Before we do that—I don't want to make the assumption that we should do that. I want to have a discussion about how the committee would like to proceed. We have a bit of a challenge in front of us trying to determine a potential two-year program that's either stylistically or thematically linked. So if you have ideas—Michael?

DR. BUGEJA: I like the idea of going through all of them as the designs are--many of these designs are wonderful, but perhaps with a brief preface of what we find and what we like, what we don't like, and then limit our discussions very quickly to the ones that

we like and we don't like so that each one has a chance to come up on the board.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You're suggesting we would not cull through them but each member would just comment on a handful of those--

DR. BUGEJA: What they feel is the best. So, in other words, I will not go through all 31, but all 31 would be on the table. I might just go through five of what I like.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All right. Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: I think that would

take--you know, as much as I would love to go

through all of these, I think it would take a

long time to do that and really do justice to

it. You know, I think given the fact that

we're talking about a two-year program, I

think it might be more productive if we work

backwards from there and say, okay, you know,

we know the Mint wants to do something or we

hope wants to do something for the 20th

anniversary of this coin, you know, and do

something a little special. So we're really talking about a two-year program that precedes the Mint wanting to do something a little special. And that creates an opportunity that's very interesting, and, you know, because all of these designs are really traditional, you know, are in the best light traditional designs, right?

In the worst light, we're trying to re-create Weinman and Saint-Gaudens again with these designs, you know, the dead people.

We've got the Dead People Syndrome, all right, of wanting to resurrect them and redo them.

I think what we talked about in the Medal Program and what we're going to talk about next is about creating new images of liberty for the 21st century. This might present an opportunity, you know, to put this, you know, old, you know, desire to re-create the American Renaissance of the turn of the century, last century, to bed and begin, you know, in 2017 with something new and

something, you know, contemporary and vibrant-you know, depictions of liberty in new and
modern ways. And we started to see some
designs, you know, over the last several
meetings over the last year or so, and
yesterday, even yesterday, we looked at some
of these, you know, concepts of liberty in new
ways. And it took time, you know, really to,
you know, let those designs shine out from the
group. And we did that yesterday.

So what I'm wondering is, you know, let's create a two-year series, you know, along the lines of these designs, and let's just get it over with, you know, so that we can move on. Let's mourn the death of Saint-Gaudens and Weinman and all of those, you know, past artistic styles, and let's just mourn, it's over, and let's start with something new, you know, when we celebrate this coin. And this is a great coin, and I'm a collector of this series. I'm one of, I guess, 10,000 people who collect this series,

and that's all we're talking about.

So in order to do that, you know--and I think, you know, one coin, you know--and, you know, I know the Commission on Fine--or this incarnation of the Commission on Fine Arts wants--seems to like eagles and things. You know, but we're doing eagles. I'm very interested -- there are some nice designs here that you can pull out, and, you know, maybe you can do a complementary design. And, you know, one design that strikes me is number 17. What if you did, you know, a 17 for this year and then a design like 17 but with a woman as a mirror to it? So facing the other way, doing the other thing. You know, what if you did that? That really, you know, brings an end to that era, you know, and it--and you'd have two complementary coins that could be a side-by-side pair that you can subsequently market in some other way.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: A suggestion. Hold that thought. What I'd like to do is get the

committee's direction on how we can to approach--because we seem to have slipped into the design discussion. So I think it's an interesting thought, but do we want to cull through these, folks?

MR. SCARINCI: I don't.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You think so? Okay.

You know what? I'm just going to get that

done, and I think, Donald, 17 is going to

survive that culling because--

MR. SCARINCI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: --I know there are several of us who like it. Yes, go ahead.

MR. JANSEN: April, as you went through these, you identified a number that were intentionally pairs. Hello, is this on? Okay. You identified a number of these that are intentionally paired by the artist, and I think in at least one case, there were four that were paired, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Are there any here that stand as orphans? Because I tried to keep track of where you identified

the artist intended them to be paired, but I ended up with some orphans as well.

MS. STAFFORD: The way they were presented, if you refer to the descriptions of the designs that you were provided in your packet, we grouped them as the artist had presented them. But I stress we're not only looking at that, but if there are two designs by two different artists that work together through theme, through style, you know, through storytelling, creating somehow whatever the two-year series evolves into being, you know, that would work for us as well.

MR. JANSEN: So you kind of took it upon yourself to say, hey, these two work so they--

MS. STAFFORD: I'm sorry. Say that-MR. JANSEN: So, in some cases, for
instance, 1 and 2, they weren't submitted in
tandem, but they seemed to work in tandem so
you tandemized them.

MS. STAFFORD: No, they--well, they were submitted together by the artist, which is why we grouped them as such.

MR. JANSEN: Okay.

MS. STAFFORD: So as you flip through the design descriptions, you'll see the way things are grouped.

MR. JANSEN: All right. And not specifically to Donald's identifying of number 17, which is presented kind of as a singularity, there are some other singularities here. I'm just curious what would be kind of your thoughts to--I'm just going to--I see 22, 23, 24 are kind of presented as stand-alone, and 25 as well. 28 as well--

MS. STAFFORD: I would--I'm sorry. I was just going to say the program manager,
Reverse 30 and 31 are really the only two besides the number 17 that were submitted singly.

MR. JANSEN: Okay. All right. So

then--

MS. STAFFORD: So 24 and 25 are companion pieces, 22 and 23 are companion pieces in that they were submitted by the same artists.

MR. JANSEN: Right. Okay. So in the case of, what did you say, 30 and 31, what would your reaction be to going back to the artist who, say, did 30 and say, "What would you do if we liked 30 but we don't know what the tandem to 30 looks like?" Would you be comfortable going back to that artist and saying, "Draw me another one kind of like that one but not that one"?

MS. STAFFORD: I think we would perhaps be best to address that scenario after the committee has its full discussion of the portfolio.

MR. JANSEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, April.

We need to move on with the culling process. I apologize. Somehow the meeting

```
27
kind of got a little askew here, so I'm going
to -- if we could pull up the images here for
the platinum, I'd like to cull through those.
        Number 1, is there interest in 1?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside,
2?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 3?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 4?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 5?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 6?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 7?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 8?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 9? 9?
        UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: CFA.
```

28

CHAIRMAN MARKS: CFA. Yes?

MR. SCARINCI: That doesn't mean we

have to talk about it. I mean, let's just--

let it rest in peace.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Actually, let's talk

just briefly. Do you really want to consider

this?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. SCARINCI: All right. Let's do

it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Now, Donald. 10?

Interest in 10?

(Responses of no.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: No? 11?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 11 aside.

12?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.

13?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: No to 13. 14?

```
29
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.
15?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that one
aside.
       16?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: No to 16. 17 is yes.
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 18 is yes. 19?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: No. 20?
        (Responses of no.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: No? 21?
        (Responses of no.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 22?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. 23?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 23 aside.
24?
        DR. BUGEJA: I'll do 23.
```

```
30
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: You want 23. 23 is
in. 24?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 24 aside.
25?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that one
aside.
       26?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: 27?
        (No response.)
       CHAIRMAN MARKS: No on 27? Okay. 28?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.
29?
        (No response.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that one
aside.
       30?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes on 30. 31?
        (Responses of yes.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes on 31. Okay. So
```

what I've got in the pile to focus on are
Designs 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 18, 22, 23,
26, 30, and 31.

So generally what I would say at this point is let's try not to revisit the ones we just culled out, and that still stands.

However, given the nature of our discussion, if we pick one and are looking for a partner, we may go back to look at that again. But I hope to avoid that.

Okay. So with those designs that we've decided to focus on, are there any technical questions that the committee would like to have clarified before we move ahead with our discussion? Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Gary.

I want to thank April for clarifying a lot of
my questions that I sort of have confused in
my mind about how these were being paired and
how they were sent out, so that was very
helpful for me. However, I would like to know
what exactly is the obverse of this particular

coin.

That's it. Okay. So we have Liberty, thank you. That's what I needed to know.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are there any--Heidi, you have questions, don't you?

MS. WASTWEET: On Design 17, can you describe for us the depth on this, what is field, what is raised, et cetera? The way I see this, the field is raised and the image is countersunk, but I want to confirm that that's the intention. Either/both.

MR. EVERHART: Yeah, I see it as almost like an Egyptian relief where the field is raised and then--

MS. WASTWEET: Yeah, like the \$5 Indian gold.

MR. EVERHART: Yeah, and the lettering I'm assuming would be polished, and then the relief on the figure would be more or less the same height as the field, maybe a little higher in places.

MS. WASTWEET: That's the way I would

33

see it. Okay.

MR. ANTONUCCI: So the lettering is cut in?

MR. EVERHART: Yes.

MR. JANSEN: so in that sense it maintains its stackability.

MR. ANTONUCCI: It's very different--

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Say again, Steve?

MR. ANTONUCCI: It's very different than what we normally do.

MR. EVERHART: Can we do it as a three-inch medal?

(Laughter.)

MR. JANSEN: That's a lot of platinum.

MS. WASTWEET: I was going to suggest that we--that this might be well suited for another program, but we're not quite there yet.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That's a technical-or this is not a technical question. Let's
keep to the technical questions, please.

MS. WASTWEET: Yeah, we're not quite

there yet.

And then Design 31, can we also talk about what's raised and sunk, for example?

MS. STAFFORD: Don and Steve, Design 31.

MR. EVERHART: Well, obviously, the three figures would be raised. I could see the area that encompasses \$100 and one ounce as raised off the field, and then the sun image polished and incused with a raised border and incused lettering.

MS. WASTWEET: Now, the shading of this field area behind the sun is gradated with pencil. Would we try to mimic that gradation in any way? That seems pretty complex. Is that to be a flat--

MR. EVERHART: Steve?

MR. ANTONUCCI: I don't see any particular challenges with that. We can do that. We can frost that like that.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is that all?

MS. WASTWEET: That's it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Erik.

MR. JANSEN: Just kind of assessing complexity of some of these designs, and I think probably the quintessential example would be the series 3, 4, 5, and 6 where we have as many as kind of four dominant fields. Just looking at Design 3, for example, I've got a portrait on a stone precipice, I've got a globe, I've got an eagle, and then I've got a sun kind of in descending sequence into the background. Can we do that with the full depth of field that we have here in the relief?

MS. STAFFORD: They're consulting.

MR. EVERHART: What's the question

again?

(Laughter.)

MR. JANSEN: The question is: How many layers can you put in an Oreo cookie?

MR. EVERHART: I see four.

MR. JANSEN: What's that?

MR. EVERHART: I see four, not

counting the field.

MR. JANSEN: I see four, not counting the field. And there's no double stuff in there, either.

MR. EVERHART: No, I would step them down so that it accentuates the layering effect. In other words, step down from like where her leg is on the globe, you know, that could be--you want to keep that globe round or an image kind of an illusion of round, but, you know, step it back with each layer so that you get as maximum differentiation between the layers.

MR. JANSEN: Right. Do we have enough--

MR. ANTONUCCI: I don't think we have enough detail. I don't think we have enough depth to--look, this goes back to this design yesterday, Civil Air Patrol, with the propeller, and there's just too much going on here.

MR. JANSEN: Bingo.

MR. ANTONUCCI: The globe is almost going to have to be flat. Think about the relief you've got there. How are you going to put the bird behind that, the sun behind the bird? I mean, there's a lot going on there.

MR. EVERHART: I think we can do that.

My only problem technically would be keeping

the globe in a kind of round form, but I think

the rest--

MR. JANSEN: Yeah, we end up with the back of the Ike dollar.

MR. EVERHART: The rest of it you could step back and it would be effective.

But maintaining the roundness of the globe could be a problem when it comes to that. But I still think that we could do it.

MR. JANSEN: Roundness meaning the implied spherical.

MR. EVERHART: Yes.

MR. JANSEN: Not circular round.

MR. EVERHART: Right, right. The dome on it.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All right. I do want to preserve as much time for the committee as possible to look at and comment on the designs themselves. We're scheduled to 10:30 for this discussion, so if there are any other quick technical questions, let's get those out of the way so we can get to our main discussion. Are there any?

(No response.)

exercise the privilege of the Chair. I'm going to start. And I'm going to observe that we just came through a program from 2009 to 2014 that was based on the Preamble to the Constitution. I'm going to suggest that we look at what essentially is the Preamble--I'm calling it that, call it the theme of the Declaration of Independence, which is the second sentence of the Declaration. And as soon as I read this, you will all understand where I'm going with this.

It is: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, as you know, number 17 captures that last phrase--"life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

So what I'm going to throw out on the table right now is that that is 2016, and for 2015 we do an "All Men Are Created Equal" theme, and the two-year program will be essentially the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, which I think is a wonderful follow to the Preamble to the Constitution.

So I'm for this design. I am open for any discussions about anatomy. I know that there are some members concerned about that.

I think this is a wonderful design in that it is completely different than anything we have done before. It is certainly in the vein of

the art medal that we've talked about in the past, art medals idea. I think it would be a wonderful departure for the program, but in the same breath, it would keep us in the same vein as what we just came through with the Preamble to the Constitution going to the Declaration this time.

I would suggest that maybe if we did this, that "All Men Are Created Equal" would be a design that would be related stylistically to this design, but it would require the Mint artists, both internal and external, to go back to the drawing board, as it were, to create that first-year design.

So those are my comments, and I think --where do I want to go from here? Heidi, would you like to make your comments?

MS. WASTWEET: When looking at these designs, I like to keep in mind the broader perspective of all the programs that we have going rather than going in with blinders on and looking at this as an isolated project.

The CFA had denoted a preference for the two eagle designs, but we have another program that we're working on that is an eagle series. So I think these designs, while they're lovely, might be better bookmarked for our continuing eagle series rather than this project. So rather than talk about the quality of those designs and talking about the appropriateness of them for this project, I would hope that we could exercise that option to save these for another project rather than rejecting the ones that don't work here.

Gary, I like your idea--it's fabulous
--about using Design 17 and creating a
companion piece of "All Men Are Created

Equal." It's a lot to ask to go back and
design another piece, and maybe that project
would be better suited for our upcoming art
medal program. So that's something for
discussion rather than--because we also need
to consider our obverse here, if we can get
that on the screen, please.

We need to keep in mind that we want a front and back too that makes sense. So, Don and Steve, if you're going to weigh in a little on the filling coinability of having this incused reverse with this obverse?

MR. ANTONUCCI: Can we go back to that design?

We've never done anything like this before, and--

MS. WASTWEET: I do love that.

MR. ANTONUCCI: It's a great design.

I'm very concerned about the ability to fill
this--the amount of material we have to push
into this. There's a lot going on here.

MR. EVERHART: Platinum's very hard.

MR. ANTONUCCI: Yeah, it's extremely hard to move platinum, and I'm just concerned that we're not going to see the lettering fill the way we want it to incused like that, and we'll run into starvation issues with this.

If I had time to work this, I would certainly like to try something, but this

poses a lot of technical challenges. I think everybody knows me. That's what I like to do. But this one makes me take pause, I have to say. It's just very, very different.

MS. WASTWEET: Yeah, and so I love this design, and I don't want to lose it. But I--

MR. ANTONUCCI: No. I think this would be fantastic in a medal.

MS. WASTWEET: But I'm not confident it's the right design for this platinum program.

MR. ANTONUCCI: I would agree with that.

MS. WASTWEET: So then I'm going to move on past the eagles and past 17. I'm going to talk about Design 18. I really love this design. It's incredibly fluid. It has harmony of the rolling fields and the rolling stripes of the flag. This is not overtly Caucasian in the face. It could be a multitude of ethnicities, which we've been

asking for. I'm really attracted to this design. It comes to the top for me.

Design 26 stands out to me as very high quality, but I can't quite get past the strong Greek feel of it. I don't think it speaks to where we are in this country today. Even looking back to our predecessors, it's still a reach for me to have the costumes so very Greek.

The other design that stands out to me is number 6. I love the texture of the rays, the focal point of the hand and the bird, and the interaction between Liberty and Freedom I think is a really good contemplation point.

I'm very concerned about the lettering at the bottom, the 0.9995 platinum. We had this problem on another platinum coin, the one with the gears behind it. We had lettering running over a strongly textured rock, and in the finished product, it did not work well, in my opinion. And there's not really any good place to move this lettering, and I don't want

to start moving elements around. It's a problem and it would have to be addressed in the production. If you made that block below her feet, if you made that very smooth, then if you went very light on the continents, it could work. So if we go in this direction, I would ask a little discretion on the artist's part to keep--be careful in that area. But the design itself I like very much.

I'm also attracted to Design 8. 7, for example, is a little too busy. It's a very similar design on 7, but 8 is more clean. I think this is—the style of this is not trying to imitate too much of any one style in the past. It's not exactly modern, but it's not exactly classic either. It's a nice original look, and it flows well. I think the leg is a little short. That could be addressed. But I'm very attracted to that design as well.

Those are my favorites.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Heidi.

Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Gary.

I have to agree with Heidi and also with Don that this--is this one?

PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: That number 17, although it's very different, very innovative from anything we've had in the past, I don't think this is an appropriate design for this particular program.

Also, the other thing is I think we have anatomy problems here, and, you know, that left arm belongs to somebody else. So I would caution our artists to pay attention a little more to bodies. I mean, he doesn't even have a six-pack.

(Laughter.)

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: So from that, I would like to just talk about the two pieces that I think complement each other and would probably go best with this series, and that's number 6 and number 8. I like the fact that

these two Liberty's, if they were side by side, they would be looking toward each other. I think that that's a nice complement. I like the costumes in both of them. They are different from our normal drapery. I love the fact that, you know, there's some exposure here. It's quite elegant, number 8. She has kind of an ethereal quality about her that I think would be lovely to have.

Number 6 is a small problem for me in that Liberty is apparently feeding the eagle. We discussed this earlier. And I love this gesture. It's almost like a "come hither to me" gesture. If we took away that vessel that she's feeding the eagle with and just had her stretching out to the eagle as though, you know, this is an energy thing, a hope thing, you know, something else, I think this is a beautiful, absolutely spectacular design.

I love the fact that, you know, you've zeroed in on that sun and you have Liberty and the eagle there together. That's quite

48

lovely.

As far as the platinum incusing, that could just be moved and set someplace else maybe.

Those are my two choices, very strong choices. I can't really speak too much to Design 26. I don't think it's quite--although it's beautiful, absolutely beautifully rendered, I'm not sure this is appropriate for this program. I'd like to see it someplace else.

And I really appreciate the artist's vision in number 6 and number 8 to allow that design to spread out into the text.

And, Don, I don't think we're really going backwards. I think good design and good quality drawings, sculpting, is important. We don't have to jump always so far away from this and leave our minters behind.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Jeanne.

Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As soon as number 17 came up, I said to Jeanne, I said, "Boy, that's a great medal." And Dawn's comment in regards to having a mirrored piece would actually be outstanding. If you had done that for 17 and a mirrored piece, I think it would be great. You can always fix the anatomy and different things, but the only reason why I would not choose 17 now is based on what Steve and Don have said as far as the manufacturing part of it, because we don't want to have another gear issue as a trial. But I really did like the idea of having the last two years being something to this stylistic, especially after the Chairman's comments regarding the phrasing.

So having said that, I guess we're not going to be able to pursue that. That leaves me basically with number 6 and number 8, and one of the thoughts, exactly what Jeanne just said, I looked at it and said, "Oh, we're

feeding the bird here," and—the eagle, I'm sorry. But one thing maybe that might take the depth a little bit on either number 6 or number 8—and I kind of lean towards number 8 a little bit more because of the—I'm sorry, number 6—8—I'm missing one here. Go back to 4. I'm sorry. 4. There we go. I like either of those 4, 5, or 6 in regards to the eagle in flight. But what if we just took the sunburst out of that and had a three—layer instead of the four layers? Would that help us? Steve's nodding yes. You think that would be an opportunity to maybe make it work a little bit more?

MR. ANTONUCCI: What do you think, Don?

MR. EVERHART: What is the advantage?

MR. URAM: That you wouldn't have four

layers, and then you were concerned about the

Earth.

MR. EVERHART: Well, the sun actually is almost linear. It could be treated almost

MR. EVERHART: Well, yeah, that's a different issue. I think it's legitimate, yeah.

layers.

MR. URAM: So if we go with one of those, I think my motion would be to eliminate that and enhance the others in my thought there.

The other one that I did like also was 18. I thought that 18 was a dynamic design there, and it has all the motifs that we're looking for, and I think that would make a great one.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, those are where I fall.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Tom.

We'll go to Herman.

MR. ANTONUCCI: I just wanted to say

something real quick, Tom, about these designs like this with the multi-small rays. Would it be an issue for the committee if we had to reduce the number of rays and maybe widen them up a little bit. I have a lot of concern about how thin and spindly these are. These may become a problem to fill. It becomes a mechanical issue at some point. I don't know there's a significance to the number of rays here on the sun or not, but--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm betting there's 50.

MR. ANTONUCCI: This may be one of those things we find through the development process, that we have to reduce the number of rays and widen them up to get them to fill.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Steve, this is a technical question. If you did that, could you also extend those rays so that they fill more of that field?

MR. ANTONUCCI: We could certainly do that. Extending the rays would not be an

issue.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yeah, but if they were fewer and more extended, it might be--we'd have a--

MR. ANTONUCCI: Yeah, I would actually prefer to go that direction than short and spoke-like.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You know what? My concern if you extend those rays is then you're stabbing her in the face.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: No, the face--

MR. EVERHART: Getting back to the relief issue with the sun, I mean, the sun part in the middle where the hand and the eagle head are would be field, so that wouldn't be relief at all. So, I mean, technically--I mean, I'm not as versed on these issues as Steve is, but I don't see that as being a problem relief-wise. Whether it's a problem as far as the thinness of the rays, well, that's a different issue.

MR. URAM: I'm looking at more or less

on number 4, though, as far as what I'm looking at it more on this one where it would --if we went with this direction, we would have--I mean, it's just kind of plotted back there. Really, if it wasn't there, I think--MR. EVERHART: It would simplify the design.

MR. URAM: Yeah, I think it's cleaner.

MR. EVERHART: Yeah, I would agree with that.

MR. URAM: And I kind of like--I do like that better than the eagle being fed.

DR. VIOLA: Okay. First of all, I think these drawings are wonderful, but I have a technical question, I guess, because you keep referring to like little problems with anatomy and things. Are these drawings cast in stone? You know, because a number of them you'd want to make some technical changes, but can't you just fix that and say, oh, that arm, you're right, it doesn't belong to somebody else.

55

Capital Reporting Company

But, otherwise, I think like 17 is wonderful. I've never seen anything like it.

And I was glad to hear then you have an eagle series. You have to realize I have very little background in any of what has gone on, and I love birds and I love eagles. And I thought, wow, I loved 22.

My wife is a children's librarian, and I was really struck by 26. You know, we are a country of educators. We're trying to prove to the world, you know, that everyone gets educated. And I thought, boy, you put 26 together with 22, and, you know, it's America and education, reading is so profoundly important. But then, again, you know, I didn't think about she looks like a Greek goddess. So these are the kind of things I don't look into too much at this point.

So, you know, like I say, I would love to see 17 as a design, and, you know, I guess I would--my first choice would be 26. But then some of these other ones that you've

talked about, you know, I really like the idea of having the eagle in there with the Liberty. So I'd say I like 5--or 6, rather, and I'd go with that. I think it's a very powerful one. And I'm not sure she's feeding that eagle. I thought you might just say, come over here, wave at me or something. So that's where I am with this program.

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes?

MS. STAFFORD: After some conversation on this side of the table, I do apologize, but number 17, as you guys have eked out, really should not have been included in this portfolio for the metal that is being used.

It's platinum. I apologize that it was. But after conversation, we really should take that out of contention because of the vehicle.

So, again, I apologize, because it is a gorgeous design, and I really appreciate where you were going with that. It was--

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Well, thank you for

that. I was about ready to make a comment that--

MS. STAFFORD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: --I really didn't understand why that was in the portfolio and why I and others on this committee spent so much time and energy trying to figure out how to make it work.

MS. STAFFORD: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Just to come to this public meeting and be told that it won't work. So I do appreciate that acknowledgment.

MS. STAFFORD: We understand.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So, Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: Well, you know, I'm glad you showed it to us.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: You know, because it shows--it certainly shows me the kind of thing that's going on in Philadelphia, and this makes me have hope. It really does. So I appreciate that it's here, you know, even

though we can't do it for this particular coin. I hope, you know, the instruction about anatomy, you go back to the artist, give--definitely give the--I would speak for myself if not for everybody, but certainly for myself, give the artist positive feedback from us on this particular design.

Hopefully we'll see it--you know, let him work on it, him or her work on it, and, you know, maybe we can see it again. You know, maybe we can do a mirror image, you know, with a woman and do it as a medal in the medal program. But I hope we see this again on something. You know, so thank you for--you know, I think it was nevertheless a good inclusion just to allow us to see it.

You know, the rest--you know, first--you know, I honestly don't--I mean, this is one of the series of coins, of U.S. coins, you know, and I'm one of the people that I buy everything--you know I buy everything the Mint does except for, you know, the gold bullion.

And this is one of the series I buy and collect. I have no idea why I do it, because I really--it's just not my taste. These designs are not my taste. You know, it's not something I buy when I see an art medal. It's something I kind of pass over and gloss over.

MR. NORTON: (off microphone)

MR. SCARINCI: I, you know--well, I-(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: When you look at my account, you can--I probably employ a person every year with what I spend at the Mint.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: You know, but--so, I mean, look, this is just not my taste. You know, I mean, what can I say? And, you know, it's just done and over, and it's not what I'm looking for in the future. And I keep saying that and saying that. It's not what the rest of the world is doing. The rest of the world has moved on. I'm hoping we can move on.

And, you know, I'd probably, just to

get this over with by 10:30, you know--and because we're going to go with these designs anyway--and it's consistent with the rest of the series. I mean, the rest of the series is just like this. So there's nothing wrong with 6 and--you know, there's nothing wrong with 6 and 8. You know, as to Design 6, you know, I kind of--I kind of like the fact that the eagle is standing on Canada.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: You know, it kind of shows Canada the eagle's ours. And, you know, maybe--you know, maybe for artists, American artists who, you know, are always doing eagles, you know, maybe we should consider an employment agreement so that, you know, Australia can't take our eagle, too. You know, so that we don't have some new engraver from the U.S. Mint doing things for foreign governments using eagles that were worked on endlessly, you know, obviously here, in concept at least, in the United States Mint.

61

(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: See, I can write, too.

And, you know, I--so I think--and I

think, you know, what I would say to the CFA,

respectfully, is that, you know, we are--you

know, we are going to do eagles. You know,

when we do eagles, when the United States Mint

does eagles, they will be better eagles than

any mint in the world will do. And, you know,

these eagles, you know, are not our best

eagles. We've seen amazing eagles in this

committee. I mean, there are amazing designs

for eagles that our artists have done. These

are not those amazing designs.

And so, with respect, and obviously there's turnover in all of these boards, and there's turnover in the CFA as well as turnover here at the CCAC, you know, and coins are just a tiny fraction of what they do at the CFA, and we recognize that and respect what they do at the CFA. We certainly respect their training in art at the CFA. You know,

but a little more time, you know, and, you know, a little more study, you know, I'm sure will correct, you know, some of the selections that they have come up with during at least this last cycle, especially these eagles.

So they're on the agenda to say something about the eagles. I think it's a good opportunity to send that message to the Commission on Fine Arts with respect, you know, and--about the eagles.

So with that said, I mean, you know, with that said, you know, I'm just--I'm going to go along with to go along with--I'm going to go along with the feeding eagle on the top of Canada, and I'm going to go along with number 8. I think number 8 is a cleaner design than number 7. We got rid of the eagle out of 7 because we've got the eagle in 6. So, you know, that's it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Donald.

Let's go to Robert.

MR. HOGE: Thank you, Gary. Can you hear me? Thank you. I have a couple of

general observations on this series.

I noticed that there's an extreme amount of classicizing in these things, as some of us have already observed. We see these allegorical representations all in the Greco-Roman sort of mode with the exceptions of Designs 1 and 10, which we rejected, are the only ones showing people in modern garments.

Also, number 20 and number 21, we also rejected. They're the only ones showing any other modern aspects in the sense of the buildings that are portrayed. This is kind of curious.

Another thing is we see all of the classical representations of Liberty--Libertas here--mostly with bare feet, which is not so classical. This is a little bit more sort of a romantic element, although we do see perhaps in number 30 she appears to be wearing what might be bath sandals of some sort, and number 25, kind of a heftier sandal, sort of a

Birkenstock.

(Laughter.)

MR. HOGE: Number 6, I do like this design, and I might comment that this is another very classicizing image. On Roman coins, we very frequently see examples of the goddess representing health, Salus, feeding a snake from a dish. The dish is a patera.

It's not a little cup-like bowl of this sort.

But this is a traditional gesture of health and well-being. This is nourishing the animal. We might want to change that. It looks like here as though the eagle is perhaps trying to bite her finger rather than to dip into the bowl, but that's another story.

Several points. Number 18, a number of us have liked this. I'm wondering what has happened with Lady Liberty's legs. Now, having myself sustained a broken femur as a child, I think that there are elements of this which kind of make my stomach turn. And in the background, I see three enormous

watermelons. And in the size of a small coin, I'm wondering about those three watermelons and just exactly what the goddess with the broken leg is doing sitting on top of them. She's kind of a small feature. Thank you.

There are several points here. liked number 17. We're not considering that anymore, I guess, for our series. But it does have some problems, too. We see a very realistic-looking, finely detailed face and torso, and the rest of the anatomy, with the exception of the left arm of someone else, but look at the sword. This is an extreme caricature of a sword. It's like a little toy stick thing. And also the -- I suppose it's an olive branch in the left hand is also extremely stylized, and neither of these attributes is in keeping with the extremely accurate detail of the human figure, which is something we might want to address, should this ever come up in the future.

Number 4, to move back to that, is a

design which I do like. All of these, though --3, 4, 5, 6--seem a little bit overly detailed, and the layering of the mountains in the background, the foreground, to show the depth of these with the world and the sun, the eagle, the figure, I think this is just a little bit more complex than anything that should be attempted on the surface of as small an object as a coin. And the Earth needs to be shown as somewhat convex. This might be really too difficult for any of those particular designs.

It's hard for me to select anything as a particular favorite among these. There are some very attractive pieces, and I think I probably would have to go with the pair of 7 and 8. It appeals to me to see what we assume is Liberty here wearing this extremely diaphanous gown. This is the most alluring of all the images. And I do find that rather appealing.

(Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Careful.

MR. HOGE: Okay, okay. Yes, this is one that probably wouldn't have passed the censors in 1916, or perhaps either the educational series problems in the 1890s.

But speaking of that, if we look at number 26, the beautiful image of the Greek goddess with the two little curly-haired Greek children, this harkens back a lot to the educational series of the United States paper money, which was known as being the most beautiful but also the most difficult to portray in a sense where the printing could be controlled properly. I like this one, but here the goddess doesn't really say Liberty, if you look at her. It's a Greek woman with her children. Now, just who is that?

And in many other instances, Liberty is not shown exactly in a recognizable form.

My favorites, number 7 and 8, show her as a nearly nude woman holding a torch and a branch. We have to remember that Liberty has

specific attributes when she is shown as an allegorical personification. These are missing on many of our classical figures in all these representations.

Thank you.

DR. BUGEJA: I'd like to thank you,
Robert, for your detailed explanation. It's
important that we have educational or historic
or numismatic points when we critique these,
because we all are here because we have a
special expertise, and mine is in numismatics.
So I'd like to go first to number 26.

Now, in the description of 26, there is a concept that's used that's near and dear to my heart as a journalist, and that is, the First Amendment. Imagine if she was reading from a newspaper. Now imagine if it was from an iPad. Now imagine if it is from Google Glasses. There is a reason why we use classical images, because otherwise we get kitsch.

So now let's go to 17, and let's do a

serious exegesis of what's wrong with this.

At first I liked it because it was different,

and even though, April, it should have been

taken out; it is in this batch, so we have to

consider it based on open records.

If you take a look at this, there are so many things—the more Jeanne challenged me to take a good look at it—and I'm going to show you some things that I question. First, the sword. You're absolutely right. The nice thing about this sword is it's vibrating. The bad thing about the art is Mr. Liberty is vibrating. That's one problem.

Number two, this is not new. This is
Art Deco. And if you take a look at the
anatomy with the arm, that's off. He's
holding a stylized branch. I don't know why
that is. He uses two different fonts, one
with serif and then one with not under
platinum. If you take a look at "Life,
Liberty, and the," take a look at "and the,"
"the" is called a "widow" in graphic design.

It's hanging there. The "and" should be brought over, and they should be in lower font. "Pursuit of Happiness," there's no hyphen on "Happiness," suggesting it's misplaced. And then we have "United States of America" in somewhat different font.

Now, I looked up some art medals of Art Deco, and you see this all over the place. You know, this could have been on the yearbook of my 1970 graduation from St. Peter's College. This is not new. The second thing about it is if you look under "kitsch," you start to get this in the 1980s and 1990s. So be really careful when you do these types of medals. Think about the font, think about small things like the vibration, and stylized designs. What this is is different, and I respect that. It is different. But I can be improved.

I'd like to go to number 6, and I like, I really do like Jeanne's pairing. I think Jeanne's pairing is good for the

orientation of 6 versus 8 or 6 versus 7. I think that's--I'm aware of the 1960 and 1970 quarter issue coming back, but I'm not too bothered by it.

I would like to go to number 6, though, and this is another personification of the eagle. I can see Stephen Colbert putting this up there saying that she's feeding it pistachios. Okay? So what you've got--you've got to be really careful with personifications of eagles or treating them as animals. It's an icon. Icons don't eat. They're eternal.

So an outstretched hand that is welcoming is interesting. It changes the whole design. If you put a piece of laurel leaf or olive branch in there, it changes the focus. If you put arrows in there, it changes the focus again. So be really careful about this design. I would simply remove the dish, and I would almost make the hand a more welcoming gesture with the bird not looking to eat, but maybe the bird looking at Liberty.

That suggests an interaction between the eyes.

I do like some of the eagles. I think they work. I'm not sure about number 18. I'd like to go to number 18. It's very hard for me to disagree with my friend and colleague Heidi, but I do not know what those are. I think they're hills. But I think that might be lost.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael.

We'll circle over to Mary.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. I'm going to make my comments very brief.

Much as I love 17, it's not in consideration, so we won't be talking about it. I would like it saved for future consideration for another program. I thought it was very interesting, and I would like to see a female companion piece to it.

I have to say that my two favorites are actually what Jeanne suggested, number 3 and number 6, but perhaps I'm stating the

obvious, and no one has mentioned it yet. W don't live in South America. We live in the United States. And that's the same orientation on the globe on every single thing. So even though Don wants the eagle standing on Canada's head, I'd like to move the eagle a little bit north, if you don't mind. I would like to see the United States be on the globe.

I do like the idea that a number of people have mentioned, taking the patera, or dish, away from Liberty's hand. I like Michael's idea of having the eagle look up just a little bit. But on the whole, I think that those are two very good companion pieces, and I would vote for them.

MR. MORAN: Gary, I'm going to be mercifully brief as well. 6 I like. I like it because of the fact that you have the hand and the eagle's head in the negative space of the sun. I think that's what really does it. Regardless of how you shape the head or

whether you take the bowl away, it needs to be within that orb.

The comment on the choice of positioning of the globe is correct. We need to have the United States there.

I originally thought that 7 was the better one of the next series versus 8, but the more I look at it, the more I think that the eagle's wings get in the way of Liberty, and it needs to be simplified, and 8 is the better one. I'll be voting for it as well.

17 I would have voted for. I'm surprised nobody has talked about 31. I will just briefly, everyone though I don't think it's going to go anywhere. I think it's worth an honorable mention in that, again, you've got a nice, stylized sun, the flame. You've got the ethnic diversity here of the United States as to where we want to be as opposed to where we are. You see moving forward, the "United We Stand" with the hands.

There's a lot of symbolism here. The

sun, I really do like that sun. It's a worthwhile design, and it deserves some kudos from us as we went through this review.

I'm done.

MR. JANSEN: I'm going to say something about 17, and then I'm going to move on.

17 is a Coin of the Year winner, and if the Mint and this effort, this committee, aspires to elevate our position internationally as innovative thinkers, I don't think this is a reversion Art Deco, and I don't think the defects to the sword--yeah, it looks like a cardboard sword that my son made when he was eight. That can be fixed. And I think the fundamental feel of 17, feel of 17 is what is so powerful.

And so, I would ask--seriously I would ask that the Mint go back to the artist and ask for a pairing of that, if only to explore possible uses in the future. I think it is so different, it is so distinctive, and with kind

of a flat field, with incused features, you can stand out by doing what everybody else is doing better, or you can stand out by doing something that is better, just flat-out different better. And I think 17 should not be lost in the bone pile here.

Now, in terms of picking a pair of images for platinum over the next two years, I was fond of the 3, 4, 5, 6 series. I'm sensitive to the technical challenges that I asked early on, and I think image 6 gets around that multi-varied depth challenge. I'm sensitive to the eagle needs to sit on the United States and not Canada. I think the globe needs to spin around a bit. That is a very Northern Hemisphere-preferring view of the Earth, and it could be neutralized, the equator brought up, and the eagle moved to the United States, footing at least.

So I agree with all those comments, and I also was especially drawn to the comment--and I think, Michael, you started it,

and I think it was reiterated on my left here
--about the eagle and Liberty maybe needing to
make eye not hand contact. And I think that
is the correction here to--because, Michael, I
don't know what we're going to do the day we
don't have you as kind of the keeper of all
integrity of symbols and mottoes and
instruments. But I think that's right. So 6
is going to get support from me.

When I look at the CFA's election of 22 and 9, I can only come to one conclusion, and that is, "It's going to be an eagle, damn it."

(Laughter.)

MR. JANSEN: Sorry. Bicentennial.

And so in that respect, I would favor 7 over 8 in acknowledging their preferences, and perhaps coming to middle ground with the kind of image that otherwise 8 would carry.

I actually like the negative space in 8 better, but it's a compromise here. And so I'm actually going to spin a little support to

7 to accommodate that. That design, while not my favorite, 7 and 8 combo, it does carry the caliber--I think the word was "ethereal."

Robert may have had actually a better word than that.

MS. LANNIN: Diaphanous.

MR. JANSEN: And with such a word, I get away with the fears of 1916 again and the anatomical issues, because I don't think--I don't know what that word means, so I'm comfortable with it.

31 feels like an Olympic medal to me.

30 is not bad. It's gotten no attention. I think 30 could actually be made into a rather spectacular design through the art and magic of selective surface textures by Steve.

MR. MORAN: It's already been done. Saint-Gaudens did it.

MR. JANSEN: Fair argument.

I can't support 22. I think better and other eagles have been done. I can't

support 9. I think better and other eagles have been done.

So, please, bring 17 and more like it back for another program, another coin, another opportunity, because that—that's an image maker.

Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Erik.

I'm going to extend my remarks a little bit here, having seen the committee's direction and the focus that we're taking. When we think about Designs 3, 4, 5, 6, it's obvious to me it's the same artist, and I guess the problem I have with all four of these--and, yeah, I don't care which one you put up there. It's a little bit of stylistic overload.

Do we want to have seated Liberty, in this case on 3? Let's have seated Liberty and maybe a shield, but Liberty, the Earth, the eagle, a sun, it's just too much. While there's nice negative space here, I think this

maybe might be a case of stylistic crowding, where there's just too much here. It's hard for me to process really what the message is. There are several messages coming out of these four.

So I think we're going to pick number 6. We could go there. I wish that there were some--I wish some of these elements could go away. And it appears we're going to pair it with number 8, which, you know, 8's a decent design. This is an example where there's more of a focus to this design. There's a singular message coming out of this design of Liberty and holding the torch, the branch in her hand. I think that's--it's a nice drawing.

It's a little more classical than I'd like to see us go at this point, but as somebody pointed out, it is where the series has gone. And maybe that's okay for the next couple of years to continue that, and when we get to the landmark year, in '17, maybe we can do something different, or in '18 immediately

thereafter.

So I really don't want to design by committee, so whatever the committee does, I'll be fine with, I'll support. But I just have some concerns about whichever year it becomes, the one that's--whichever year ends up as Design 6. I think Design 8 will do well for the platinum series.

So with that, are there any quick follow-ups? We only have about five minutes left on this subject if we stay to our agenda, but I'd entertain a few follow-up comments, if there are any, that you feel important to be made. Robert?

MR. HOGE: One point I'm observing,

Gary. If we were to conceivably select number 6 and pair it with number 7 or number 8, I think it might be advisable in order to make them more of a pair to remove the linear interior border on number 6 so that it would be more of a match and try to make the lettering match between the two, if we were to

go in that direction.

Also, although I like number 8 a bit more than number 7, I think the inclusion of the eagle is probably necessary in this sort of thing because this is, after all, the Platinum Eagle Series, right? So I can see where the CFA was going on that—and not that we have to follow them, but I think the inclusion of an eagle is probably a good idea.

The inclusion of a Liberty on the reverse, on the other hand, is something of a redundancy, since we always have the Statue of Liberty obverse. That's also something to think about.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Those are good points, Robert. I appreciate those. It is the American Platinum Eagle Series for sure. So those are points well taken.

Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. So what we're going to do now is go to our scoring, and I'll

ask the members, even though 17 has been withdrawn, I would like to, for all of you who support that design, as a symbolic gesture that that is exactly the kind of thing we're looking for, I'd ask you to go ahead and vote for that, with full knowledge that if that ends up as the high scorer, that we know we're going to bypass that because it has been withdrawn by the staff. But I would like to send that message, if you will, that that's the kind of thing that we're looking for and we want to have that one come back.

But I'm fully aware that, regardless how that comes out, we need to pick two that we're focusing on here. And so if you go ahead and fill out your evaluation forms and get those in to Erik, that would be very helpful.

So I think what we'll do now is take a recess. I will give Erik a chance to tabulate the scores, and we can come back fresh for our discussion on the Art Medals Program. Thank

84

you.

(Brief recess.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: If I could ask everyone to come back to their places? Please come to your places. Okay, we're back on the record.

We have scores from our evaluation of the American Platinum Eagle designs. And as was with yesterday, I will focus just on those designs we kept in focus. So I'll start with Number 3, Design Number 3 received zero; Design Number 4 received zero; Number 5 received 1; Number 6 received 28--that is the highest score; Number 7 received 26; Number 8 received 19; Number 9 received 4; Number 17 received 23; and Number 18 received 7 points; Number 22 received 3; Number 23 was not under consideration, it garnered a vote

 $\label{eq:mr.jansen:} \mbox{ It was actually} \\ \mbox{reinstated.}$

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Was it? Okay, reinstated. It received 1 vote; Number 26

received 6 votes; Number 30 received 6 votes; and Number 31 received 4.

So I'm going to suggest to the

Committee that we need to focus on 6, 7, and 8

and if we could bring those up in succession

on the screen? The objective here, if we can

do it, I believe would be to get a pair out of

these three. It was suggested and well so by

Robert that this is an Eagle series. If we

were going to follow that line of thought I

think we'd end up with--which ones would be?

MS. LANNIN: Six and seven.

MR. JANSEN: Six and seven.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yeah, Number 6 and Number 7. So and those happen to be the two highest designs. So what are the Committee's reactions to this tally? Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: Between 7 and 8 I like the composition of 8, but Robert, you really swayed me as far as the content and theme. I think it would add to the pairing and to the Double Eagle. So if we can look at 7 for a

second? And I don't know for sure, but I'm considering if we take out the second branch, the one that the eagle is holding, and having the eagle just fly, maybe that would ease it up a little?

MR. HOGE: That would simplify it.

MS. WASTWEET: If we--

MR. HOGE: Yeah, I agree.

MR. SCARINCI: Isn't there a problem with this, though? The hair is blowing in one direction and the flame is blowing in the opposite direction.

MS. WASTWEET: I considered that, Don, and--

MR. SCARINCI: And she's also kind of crouching, I mean--

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:} \quad \mbox{It's global} \\ \mbox{warming.}$

(Laughter.)

MS. WASTWEET: The way I see that is she's spinning, she's turning, she's floating. It's ethereal, it's not wind, it's not

direction, it's just free.

MR. SCARINCI: Okay, I can see that. I get it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, and can we have a discussion on how that pairs with Number 6?

Can we have Number 6 on the screen? The suggestion was made earlier that we would eliminate that inner circle just under the text, United States of America.

MS. WASTWEET: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: If you did that, I think it would start to make the two designs match a little better.

MS. WASTWEET: What do you think about the bowl?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I'm not sure what I think about the bowl. I'd be interested in what others think, but on the higher question of, are we comfortable with this pairing? And if we are, I think the Mint staff would appreciate some input from us about what is the theme? What are we saying here with this

two-year theme? What is that?

MS. WASTWEET: To me it speaks of the partnership and symbiotic relationship between the ideas of liberty and freedom and how they work in tandem.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It's interesting how you said that because from an iconology point of view, of course, the female figure is liberty and the eagle is often seen as freedom. And April asked me during the recess this question, and what came to my mind--I didn't vocalize it--was liberty and freedom. I don't know--it's really generalized, but I don't know what the rest of you think about that?

MS. WASTWEET: Michael, what do you think?

DR. BUGEJA: I'll answer that. I've written about Liberty--I don't need that, I'll just talk loudly.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I don't think it will get on the tape recording.

DR. BUGEJA: Okay. The iconography of Liberty really is freedom of movement.

Freedom of movement comes from what we went to war over in 1812, when the British would capture our people and induce them to serve the king.

And so liberty means, in the naval sense, that you are free. You go on liberty, nobody can hold you back. The eagle often is considered--you're actually correct--the eagle is considered our rights that we will defend. In fact, the state of Iowa's motto is patterned after that eagle and it is, "Our liberties we will defend and our rights we will maintain." And that's what that eagle represents.

And often the eagle is seen as getting inspiration from Liberty and putting it into action, either peace with the olive branch or war defense with the eagles.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So this is sort of the quintessential American series of liberty

and freedom.

DR. BUGEJA: Yes.

MR. SCARINCI: Even though it doesn't mean anything to me because they're just ancient images, but I think the torch is the unifying element between the two designs that we've selected. So if you want to make it mean something, it probably means the torch of freedom around the world. Or freedom around the world.

It was after 1776 that monarchy began to fall, so something along those lines using that torch as the unifying element between these two things. Of course, that's just academic stuff, it doesn't mean anything.

MR. HOGE: One short observation. The sun here, actually is a setting sun, if you notice. It's beyond the western horizon and I don't know if we think of that as being good or bad? Another aspect of this, both of the figures of Liberty are shown barefooted and I wonder if it might not be appropriate to

eliminate the exergue platform on this piece, which might be part of the problem of an additional plane, and also the lettering with the 995 platinum? To show two barefooted liberties, it puts them much more in conjunction with one another.

MS. WASTWEET: I'll respond to that.

I think that you're thinking too literally about the sun being literally the sun. And I see this as a light, not as a sun. It's highlighting, it's focusing on the interaction between the two characters. And as far as what she's standing on, because the lettering is running over two solid items, if we got rid of that item then we'd have half the lettering in field and half in frost. And so I would envision that making it a smoother surface and being very gentle with the topography of the globe to make those letters maintain their legibility.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Let me follow up on that. I'll just throw into the discussion

that you have two lights here. You have a torch and you have a sun and I think it's too much. I said it in my earlier comments, this is symbolic overload. I think you could get rid of the sun, you still have the torch of enlightenment and hope, that's what the torch usually conveys. And I don't think you'd be missing anything without that sun. I think it would still be a good solid design, but you'd get rid of one of these layers that we've been struggling with. Go ahead, Michael.

DR. BUGEJA: I wouldn't mind that, getting rid of the sun, but I do want to make a formal motion to get rid of the pestle and the cup that she's holding. Have her hand be a little bit more welcoming and the eagle making eye contact with Liberty. I'd like to make that as a formal motion because I'm very concerned about this design, as long as she holds that plate.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. I would ask the Committee if we're going to make motions,

that we consolidate those in, so we can make one motion and I'd like to make them simple. We're starting to get into design my committee, which I want to be very careful about, but I think we need to do something here because we've been asked to create a pairing and right now I don't think the pairing really is congruent.

So if there is one omnibus motion we can make, incorporating all of our ideas, let's do that.

DR. BUGEJA: All right. I'll try to do that.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So I'm hearing--and I don't know what all the reaction is from you all about eliminating the sun, but that's what I have on the table. Michael's just suggested eliminating the dish.

DR. BUGEJA: Let me make that a formal motion, I'll incorporate your sun into it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, before you do that, I just want to ask, are any of the

members harboring any ideas that we would incorporate into a motion that Michael would make?

MR. JANSEN: There was Heidi's comment about lightening up the platform.

MS. WASTWEET: That would just be at the discretion of the artist, not a formal motion.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I agree that there should be the repositioning the globe.

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yeah, repositioning.

Okay, thank you, the idea of repositioning the globe--how would we do that? If we rotate the Earth up, then it's at an unnatural side angle. Are we saying we want the eagle on top of the United States of America?

MR. JANSEN: The two issues are spin the globe and then eagle standing on America.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: How do you get the eagle to stand on America and not Canada?

DR. BUGEJA: You must restrict

yourself--don't restrict yourself by saying the size of that globe must remain the size of that globe. I mean, that's the problem. The globe can be reduced and moved up and the eagle actually can stand wherever you want that eagle to stand by rotating the Earth. I think it should be over the Americas, for sure.

But the fact of the matter is, if you make that globe smaller and--all the globe is serving for, not only itself, it's serving as a perch for the eagle. That's what it's function is over here. So if you make the Earth smaller, move it up a little, you start to address the 995 platinum and then by moving it up, the eagle is not so much close to the hands, but also can make eye contact with Lady Liberty.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, Michael, I understand what you're saying, but how does that address the idea that Donald mentioned of the eagle standing on Canada, kind of thing?

96

And is that something we need to be concerned about?

DR. BUGEJA: If you reduced the size of the--

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Oh.

DR. BUGEJA: But first of all, I think the artist can do it. If you reduce the size of the Earth--he could be standing on the North Pole for all I care. The fact of the matter is I don't think we should get that literal, that this is something that the artist should take a look at, but what we're actually saying that is literal is that the bowl should go, and the eagle should make eye contact with Liberty, and the sun should be eliminated. Those are three--the rest is really artist work.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The outer band.

DR. BUGEJA: Yeah, I think outer band.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: If we did all of

those, then it begins to match up--

DR. BUGEJA: It does.

97

CHAIRMAN MARKS: --with Number 7.

DR. BUGEJA: It really does. It truly

does. It does.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It looks like a

pairing then. Do the rest of you agree?

(Responses of no.)

MR. SCARINCI: No, the fact the eagle is standing on Canada is the one thing about the design that I like.

(Laughter.)

MR. JANSEN: It's actually standing on none of it.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, was there

another comment?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Jeanne.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: The one thing that drew me to this design was the sun. The sun encapsulated the two figures. Why are we worried about the Earth and the platinum lettering? Why can't the eagle be a little

bit bigger and get rid of the Earth? Why do we have to have the Earth there, except that it is a roost for the eagle.

And then, when we do that, we are designing by committee and I don't like that. So it's like, what drew us to this--at least me--to this design? It was exactly what the artist did and, yes, I think it's fair to make an adjustment to remove the bowl, have the eagle look at Liberty, but to take out the sun, which I think was so important does a disjustice for this.

DR. BUGEJA: Point of order, I would like to have each of those three voted on, so that we are not designing by committee. It's just fairer to the artist.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So, Michael, are you suggesting three different motions?

DR. BUGEJA: Three different motions and then we'll see how the Committee feels about it, so that we're not--it's shared

governance. There are different opinions.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay.

DR. BUGEJA: And each Committee member should have the opportunity to weigh all three.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, we have some differences of ideas about how to bring congruency to the two designs by making adjustments here, so let's do that. I originally wanted to have one motion, but I see your point, Michael. Heidi, did you have a comment?

MS. WASTWEET: I respectfully oppose your opinion about taking out the sunburst. I think that the sunburst is very important. If we take it out, one, it makes the design even more classical. It's the thing that makes it most contemporary. The texture of that sunburst is going to look great in metal, the way it bounces the light. And because the interaction of the two characters is a very small point, the starburst highlights and

focus our point on the interaction of the two characters and I think it's an important element. I don't think it's too crowded. I think the shading of the drawing is making it look a little more crowded than it is.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I appreciate that,
Heidi. I guess I would suggest that this
design makes use of so many classical elements
that it almost defeats itself and it becomes
not classical because it's got all of these
layers, all of these elements on a not that
big of a coin.

MS. WASTWEET: I think we need it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I just think there's one too many, maybe two too many, of something. And I think simple is better. I understand what you're saying, but something's got to give, particularly when you look at what we're trying to pair it with. We're trying to pair it with another design that is fairly clean, without as many elements or as many stylistic messages being sent.

101

So, okay, Michael suggested that we have individual motions. I think any further discussion is kind of pointless, let's vote this thing out. So, Michael, why don't you-if you wouldn't mind--framing each of the motions and we'll just take the seconds from whoever wants to make them.

DR. BUGEJA: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So you have the floor, Michael.

DR. BUGEJA: Okay, I would like to make a motion to remove the bowl from Lady Liberty's hand for our aforementioned discussion that we had.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Second.

MR. JANSEN: And no changes to the eye contact, blah, blah, blah.

DR. BUGEJA: That will be the second motion.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yeah, we're singular motions here.

MR. JANSEN: Oh, okay.

102

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, so it's moved and seconded by Jeanne, to remove the bowl from the hand of Liberty. All those in favor raise your hand?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That's 9. And

opposed?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Two. The vote is 9 to 2, the motion passes. Next motion,
Michael?

DR. BUGEJA: The next motion would be to establish eye contact, according to the artist's discretion and proportions, between the eagle and Lady Liberty.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, so is there a second?

MR. HOGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Seconded by Robert.

All those in favor, raise your hand?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Three, four--are you

```
103
voting?
        MR. JANSEN: I am voting against it.
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, so it's 9.
Voting against would be?
        (Hands raised.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Two. The margin is 9
to 2, the motion carries. Next motion,
Michael?
        DR. BUGEJA: The third motion is was a
friendly amendment and now is a distinct
motion to remove the sun.
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a second to
remove the sun? I'll second it. All those in
favor raise your hand?
        (Hand raised.)
        (Laughter.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: I love it. Thank
you, that's a moment of history. All those
opposed?
        (Hand raised.)
        (Laughter.)
        MR. JANSEN: Wait a second, Mike
```

104

Bugeja, you initiated this thing.

DR. BUGEJA: No, I accepted it as a friendly amendment, just to--as for procedure I accepted it as a friendly amendment because I thought we were going to vote on all three.

MR. JANSEN: No problem.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I love you people,

this is great. Robert, did you vote?

MR. SCARINCI: I abstained.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You abstained, okay,

so--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Smart choice.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, we have 1 in

favor, 9 opposed, and 1 abstention.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think that's the first time ever the chair has had a motion with no support whatsoever.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not your day.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I appreciate it.

MR. URAM: You know, Gary, I

105

originally said that on Design Number 4 I wanted the sun out, but on this one it's not as layered as much, in my opinion. This is kind of like foreground, a background, and a center.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yeah, I bow to the Committee's will, okay? So let's move on.

 $\label{eq:mr.uram:} \mbox{MR. URAM:} \mbox{ I just explained my vote,} \\ \mbox{though.}$

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Did we want to address the band?

MR. HOGE: I'd like to make a motion-CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay.

MR. HOGE: --that we remove the inner border--

DR. BUGEJA: Yes.

MR. HOGE: --on Number 6 to make it more congruent with design (inaudible 20:44).

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, the motion is to remove the border appearing just below the text of "The United States of America."

DR. BUGEJA: I second it.

106

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It's been moved by Robert, seconded by Michael, all those in favor raise your hand?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It looks like it's everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, so that is--

opposed? Ten to one. Okay, motion carries.

Are there any other motions?

 $\label{eq:ms.lannin: Yes. I make the motion} % \begin{center} \b$

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this a military objective or is this--

MS. LANNIN: It's a military objective, exactly. I make a motion that we reposition the Earth so that North America is showing.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The motion is to reposition the Earth, so that North America is showing.

DR. VIOLA: Second.

```
107
       CHAIRMAN MARKS: Seconded by Dr.
Viola. All those in favor, raise your hand?
        (Hands raised.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Eight. Opposed?
        (Hands raised.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Two opposed? And are
the abstentions? You're an abstention? Okay,
so we have--what was the vote?
        (Laughter.)
        MR. JANSEN: Eight to two, with one
abstention.
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Eight to two, thank
you.
        MR. JANSEN: You're welcome.
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Eight to two, with
one abstention. Okay, now that we've totally
redesigned this thing--
        (Laughter.)
        MR. SCARINCI: After talking about not
wanting to design by committee.
        (Laughter.)
        CHAIRMAN MARKS: Well, in fairness--in
```

108

fairness to staff, you asked us to pair something here--

MR. SCARINCI: That's right.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: --and we're doing the best we can, so although we did some redesign here, I do--what's that?

MS. WASTWEET: They're small changes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: They are small changes, but I do think it helps, if we truly want to two-year program, I think it helps meld those two together so that it looks like it makes some sense. And the thematic program would be a celebration of liberty and freedom, correct? Nodding heads, yes.

Staff, is there anything else that you would like to ask or input?

MS. STAFFORD: No, we don't.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: No. Okay.

MR. HOGE: Gary?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, Robert.

MR. HOGE: I think we may need a

motion with regard to changing -- on the reverse

Capital Reporting Company

109

Number 7 to remove the olive branch from the eagle's talons.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Oh, yes, yes. Thank you.

MS. WASTWEET: I'll make that motion.

MR. JANSEN: What is the motion?

Which one is it, which branch?

MS. WASTWEET: The branch that the eagle's holding.

MR. HOGE: Number seven, on the left.

MS. WASTWEET: And the subsequent

claw.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, the motion from Heidi is to remove the branch in the eagle's claw in Design Number 7.

MR. HOGE: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: And Robert was the second on that. All those in favor, raise your hand?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Eight. Opposed?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, it's 8 to 3, motion carries. Thank you.

DR. BUGEJA: Did you want stars or not? I couldn't remember. Just empty, right?

MR. HOGE: Correct.

DR. BUGEJA: That's what I thought.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, I think we're done, folks.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Now that we've finalized this discussion, I'd like to make a comment. We did not have, in my opinion, enough time in the day to address all 31 designs and we should have maybe made an adjustment for that because I think there were some designs here that had we had another hour or two and we could have each felt that we could address more, then maybe we could have said more to the artist, to the staff, of why we sort of eliminated some of these. That might have been discussed.

So I think, given our amount of time this morning, we accomplished a lot, but I'm

not sure we accomplished in the right way, so I would ask the Committee staff, or whoever we need to ask the next time, when we have such a huge amount to cover that we have more time in a day to do that because I've felt very rushed. Thank you, Gary.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: A fair comment,

Jeanne, thank you. Okay, well that takes us
to our next item on the agenda and I'll start
that off by reporting, I guess is the word,
that on July 22nd the Committee held a
telephonic meeting and at that meeting we
considered the Mint's proposal for a 24-karat
gold, high relief coin for 2015, paired with a
high relief silver medal.

At the conclusion of that meeting I announced that I would appoint a subcommittee to develop a resolution giving further detail to a motion the Committee approved back on, I believe it was, June 2nd—the June 2nd meeting, I believe, I could be wrong on that. But it was a recent meeting that the Committee

passed a motion calling for an arts medal program, but there was not a lot offered in the way of a detail of what the program might look like.

So at the conclusion of the July 22nd meeting, I appointed all members who expressed an interest in being on the subcommittee and it ended up being a six member committee. I was not a member of that committee. I did listen in to some of the dialogue that went on in developing the resolution that you have before you today. But I asked Mike Moran to chair the subcommittee and he did a fabulous job doing that.

Also on the committee was Heidi,
Michael Bugeja, Donald, Jeanne, and Mary, and
I thank you all for your hard work in putting
the resolution together. These folks had some
good, honest and, sometimes difficult
discussion about what an arts medal program
should look like. And so as the Mint looks at
this, I want you to know that this was not

something that just came naturally, and this is truly a consensus document that was hammered out over multiple days of dialogue.

So, with that, I'm going to recognize Michael Moran as the chair of the subcommittee and ask him for his report on the resolution that we have in front of us today.

MR. MORAN: I was going to say much the same thing about the dialogue. It was spirited. I also feel that it's necessary to thank all of the members for the dialogue, it was open, honest, good and I believe fairly digested and put into this resolution.

I will today skip the whereases and just read the recommendations of the subcommittee for the Committee's consideration.

Section 1: The Committee extends its strongest possible recommendation for, and endorsement of, an annual United States Mint Art Medal Program in two separate series.

The Committee recommends that a United

States Mint Art Medal Program provide for the issuance of a dated American Liberty themed medal, the design for which would change annually. This medal would depict a new American Liberty on the obverse, while incorporating an American eagle on the reverse.

The Committee recommends that the
United States Mint specify the medal be
produced in .999 Fine Silver as a one ounce
40.6 millimeter, or 1.598 inch diameter medal.
And when appropriate to a particular design,
be produced also in bronze or silver as a 76.2
millimeter, or 3 inch diameter medal. The
larger size, when utilized, should allow in
consultation with the artist for variation in
finishes and the use of polish and patina.

Designs would be submitted for review by the Commission of Fine Arts Citizen's Coinage Advisory Committee and the Director of the United States Mint, and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. In addition, the

Citizen's Coinage Advisory Committee would reserve the right to request certain designs not chosen to be held over and resubmitted with the following year's submissions.

Section 3: The second annually produced medal should be a freestyle art medal. The subject matter would be of an American theme in the various, broadest sense of the word. The specific subject is left up to the artist and could include any non-living person, place, thing, event, or idea that they feel inspired to create.

The intent is to offer artistic

freedom to the artist in developing images, to

foster a greater sense of creativity using

innovative materials and techniques. This

program is meant to be an incubator for ideas

and daring designs that could inform future

numismatic programs at the United States Mint.

If possible, the artist should have the option of submitting an image of a sculpted model, instead of a sketch, should

they feel it better represented their design. The program will encourage the use of patina and high relief. The final medal may be of bronze or silver, with a 77.2-millimeter or 3-inch diameter, or an optional 33.3-millimeter or 1-5/16-inch diameter.

Future medals may utilize alternative shapes as advancing technology allows. The Committee wishes to foster more direct collaboration between artist and manufacturing. Once submitted by the artist, the appropriateness of designs would be determined through an internal United States Mint process.

Approved designs would be submitted for review by the Commission of Fine Arts, Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee and the Director of the Mint, and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. In addition, the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee would reserve the right to request certain designs not chosen to be held over and resubmitted

with the following year's submissions.

Mr. Chairman, respectfully submitted by the subcommittee for the Committee's review.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. And again, I thank each member of the Committee for your hard work in putting the resolution together.

For me this resolution represents a very important step forward, I hope, for the Mint. It's part art, but it's also part R&D, I think, for the Mint as far where we want to take our designs in the future. Right now we really don't have that outlet for our artists, so I think this is really important. If the Mint doesn't exactly go the way that this is all spelled out--I don't know if we expect 100 percent of this, but this was our best recommendation to you for proceeding forward with this sort of an idea.

As I think many of us are aware, the collecting community for the last six or seven

decades, literally, has asked for the return of Liberty on American coinage. There was a time when Liberty occupied several of our denominations that were in our pocket every day. And when we came into the 20th century, over the course of several years, there was a slow transition that saw Lady Liberty put away and honor given to various former Presidents.

Since then there's been this desire from the collecting community, the Mint's customer base that somehow Liberty be brought back. For various reasons I think it's evident that that may not happen. And clearly the last six or seven decades illustrate that it hasn't happened and may not. So this is an attempt, without denomination assigned, to provide to the collecting community this desire for Liberty themed medallic art. And I think it's a wonderful opportunity where we change the design every year. We give our artists a chance to render these icons of America in new and modern ways.

Our country's changed a lot in the last six or seven decades and, therefore, I believe that those icons need to change and reflect our current generation.

One of the wonderful things about the Liberty designs that we had in the late 19th century and coming into the early 20th century was that it said something about the people of the time, who they were as Americans at that time in our history. Their icons spoke to that, about their values, how they saw themselves as Americans, as a nation, and in the world.

We don't have that or have not had that articulation of ideas through national medallic art for some time and this is a chance for us to make a mark as a nation artistically about what these core values really mean to us in this current generation. And so that generations after us will be able to look back and see and interpret from the art that we produced just what was America at

120

that time.

There's only so much that can be understood through the written word and for those of us who are artistically brained--if that's a word? Oh, I probably just stepped on that, but--pardon me?

MS. LANNIN: Orientated.

MR. JANSEN: Endowed.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Endowed. Part of interpreting history is to look at the art of the time and it helps to understand who those people were and what their values were. So this is an opportunity for to, with this new Liberty series—which is one of the two series that we're proposing here—to put that in place, I think it's going to be a wonderful product from a marketing and sales point of view, particularly something that's produce in one ounce silver.

I think you have a wonderful opportunity here to package the traditional one ounce American Silver Eagle with a one

ounce of the same size American Liberty Medal. I can see that as a pairing and proof and you could call it the Double Liberty. We hear a lot about Double Eagles, and all that. I'm coining a new idea here, the Double Liberty, and that's a set that could be offered to the collecting community. In proof, I believe it would just be a huge home run for the United States Mint and a huge contribution to medallic art.

I would also suggest too that there would be a market for the medal in bullion.

If you go onto websites now that sell bullion, eBay is probably the biggest one, there is a proliferation in the private marketplace of privately produced one ounce bullion rounds.

They're not coins, but rounds. That is something that has blossomed just over the past five years or so. I think this is a growing market that would be a great one for the United States Mint to build market share in.

I think that an American Liberty medal that would be a product of the United States Mint would be a huge contribution to the silver round market that is currently out there. Just having the United States Mint as a participant would be, I think, just a very welcome contribution.

So that takes me then to the Art Medal Series that's a part of our recommendation today. That's the R&D part of this and it requires folks to step back and be willing to accept that idea that there may be some things produced here that might not really make a lot of sense in sales. I think that several of them will, but I think the bigger contribution here—and maybe not one that's not as solid to grip onto—is that through the process of experimentation there's some discovery that can take place in what works and doesn't work on medallic art.

And I think that there's going to be a transference for building this knowledge base

into the coins and the national medals that are produced that are a result of Congressional action. So I think if you look at countries around the world, several of the mints have programs where the artists are allowed to experiment, to bring forth new ideas, and I think out of that you see some of the countries out there producing some pretty amazing art.

Countries that come to mind are some that you might not expect: Latvia, Belarus, Poland, Austria, Italy--Don can probably contribute to that list--but I think pretty much those are countries that are in some way, shape, or form, providing opportunities for experimentation for research and development, really. I think there is a customer base for that, too.

There's a segment of the medallic collecting community that is specifically focused on medals, not so much denominated money, but medals. And they look for designs

in medals that are unique, different, that push the outer limit, and that's simply not something that to this point the Mint's been able to contribute to, at least in modern times.

I think this is a wonderful opportunity for the mint to move forward in that whole arts medal arena. So those are my thoughts about this program. I think it's very important to the future of the Mint, it's very important to helping our artists develop their skills, helping them contribute and feel like they are part of moving the whole medallic art process forward. I think it can be a very engaging process for them and I think that the Mint would be very pleased with some of the innovation that will come out of a program such as this.

So with that I'll relinquish the mic to my fellow members on the Committee and ask them to share any of their thoughts that they would have on the resolution that we have

before us. And once we all have a chance to speak then I'll entertain a motion concerning the resolution. Donald, would you please grab a mic?

MR. SCARINCI: I've been on this

Committee for I guess a little over 10 years

now and from the day I started, this is what I

have wanted to happen the most. For the U.S.

Mint to offer its artists the ability to

express their creativity unencumbered by

anyone telling them what they want, including

us, by the way.

To sit here today, 10 years later, and be able to vote for this is a very, very powerful moment for me. And I want to put this in some international context, if I may. It certainly is—and as those who know historical medals—certainly since the Louis in France, and even before, one would argue the royalty in the Renaissance commissioning Pisanello, and beyond.

To do art medals, to communicate or to

express is in the tradition of medallic art and coinage art. More contemporary, in 1898, the Paris Mint began a series of art medals, and that series—there have since been three separate series that the Paris Mint has sponsored. The last series began in 1963, when Pierre Duhaime became the director and Roger Bezombes was the chief engraver and they issued for a long period of time a series—close to 900 art medals over those years.

In 1972, the Finnish government and Finnish sponsored mint supported Kauko Rasanen when Kauko Rasanen made the first two-part medal in history. In 1974, the Leningrad Statement supported Alex Shagin before he immigrated to the United States, and Alex Shagin developed the first free-standing medal. A medal that challenged the conception of what is a medal and caused that question to be debated until it was ultimately, in my opinion, concluded at FEDM 1992 held in England, which many people still talk about

today, as to what is a medal and what is a sculpture and what's the difference.

Also in the 1960s, the Polish State
Mint employed artists who were taught by Zofia
Demkowska. Zofia Demkowska was one of the
early modernist, post-World War II medalists
and she trained a whole series of artist,
including Ewa Borys. Ewa Borys makes coins
and medals, and a series of medals--many
medals issued officially by the Polish State
Mint which are real objects of beauty and the
subject of a multivolume catalogue of medals.

In 1982, while not the British Royal
Mint, the British Museum sponsored the British
Art Medal Society, along with Ron Dutton, and
the British Art Medal Society since then has
issued four to five medals a year and,
certainly, beyond question, the support that
those artists received from the British
Museum, and then subsequently from the British
Royal Mint resulted in the groundbreaking
creative designs of the coins that you are

seeing to this day coming out of the British
Royal Mint which, no doubt has inspired other
coin issuing nations, and Britain certainly
takes the lead in the art medal today.

In the Unites States, who also goes without saying, in the 1980s, the Portuguese Statement with the support of their version of the Citizen's Coinage Advisory Committee, which happens to consist of artists, like Joao Duarte, like, formerly Helder Batista. I would certainly love to see their meetings, if you think these meetings are rough.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: If you know Helder
Batista, you'd know exactly what I mean. And
the result is the Portuguese Art Medal again
blazed a trail and created a generation of
artist trained in medallic art who make to
this day some of the most amazing coin designs
in the world, out of Portugal.

In America the Medallic Art Company took the lead in using this medium for

commercial purposes and they created the Society of Medalists in the 1930s--1932, I believe, which was really a commercial enterprise. The idea was not only to incubate artists, but to show the public what was possible, both by way of design and patina, so that commercial enterprises who wanted to give a medal instead of an acrylic plaque or something engraved or a certificate, could give a medal in the historical tradition of giving medals to symbolize achievement and success, as opposed to giving somebody a plaque.

And the Medallic Art Company was very successful in that enterprise until the series ended in 1995. And we are honored here to have Don Everhart who's series of dinosaurs was really one of the crowning achievements at the end of that long series of medals issued by the private Medallic Art Company.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: And there's also the dolphins.

130

MR. SCARINCI: And the dolphins.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yeah, his dolphins--

MR. SCARINCI: Yep, I could talk

about--

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ EVERHART: I might take orders after the meeting.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: In fact, that's a good point. Don Everhart's one of the very few American artists who actually has two-- he joins the ranks of Donald De Lue in having the honor of having produced two medals for the Medallic Art Company in the Society of Medalists series, notwithstanding the rule that only one per artist--one opportunity to make a medal per artist.

And our good old friends Mr. Weinman and Mr. Fraser, who produced medals for that series, only had one medal. Don Everhart had two.

And then in the '60s when Segel started realizing that you could make money

selling bullion if you make it pretty and you put designs on it and was the master marketeer and in the business schools, as I know the Mint is well aware, he pretty much-he and the Franklin Mint--pretty much defined how you market and make money at selling bullion and he did it by turning the artists into rock stars, something we talked about in our Committee report. In our blueprint, we talked about and we are heading in the direction of highlighting the artists and turning them into rock stars. Selling the artist. Market the medal through the artist. Market the coin through which artist did it.

And the American public certainly
likes its rock stars, it likes celebrity, it
cherishes celebrity. So creating celebrity as
a marketing tool is really the standard of
what Segel did and that is taught and studied
in the business schools today and something
that the Mint is well aware of, and I hope the
emulate, especially now that we've gotten the

artists out of their little cubicles into a much nicer space.

It was, in fact, the Franklin Mint knew how to invest its money and what they did in 1992 is they sponsored at an ANA, an AMSA exhibit on art medals, and I was there and that was one of the things that inspired me.

The first time I actually saw some of Don

Everhart's work displayed there was Fraggle

Rock, I remember. And I always remind Don

Everhart whenever I see a boring design or an unimaginative design; I say that doesn't come from the guy who made Fraggle Rock.

MR. EVERHART: Crocodile Rock.

MR. SCARINCI: Crocodile Rock,

Crocodile Rock. Very creative stuff, but it was that exhibit that again inspired people to be bold, to think outside of the box and I think that what we're doing today is in a tradition that goes back to Pisanello, which I just outlined briefly, very briefly, and cursorily, and I'm sure people will pick out

my mistakes, but the point is this is a very important resolution.

This is a very important statement that this Committee is making. This is a very important statement that the United States is making around the world. And I think that out of the seed that has been planted here some years and is shining through the dirt right I think we will eventually find the wisdom to budget money for artists to go to international competitions, participate in FEDMs, the next one will be in Belgium. one that just occurred was in Bulgaria and hopefully you Mint artists, not just Heidi and not just Jim, will have items on display for the world to see what America is doing and how great we are once again, taking the lead in art.

So, anyway, with that said, thank you for considering and for your support in voting for this resolution--and especially thank the Director, who really has been an incubator and

a father of this process, and a shepherd of this process to make this resolution possible.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Donald.

Before we go onto another member, I'd just add to my remarks that the silver medal that's been approved is part of the high relief program for next year. I'd like to suggest to the Mint that that is an opportunity to start this whole--if you wanted to do the Double Liberty, you could do it next year.

I kind of see that 24-karat gold, high relief coin and particularly the medal, the silver medal, as the first installment in this art medals program. Maybe not so much the gold because it's a coin, but I think the medal, certainly the silver medal falls nicely into what we've outlined here. So with that, is there another member who would like to comment on the resolution? Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and also as a collector of the Society of Medalists and medals, as well, I think that

this is outstanding and is really going to open a pallet of freedom for our artist, but more importantly, I think it sets a new path and a new direction for the opportunities that the Mint and the United States has down the road.

And I relate that to the fact that we're probably seeing less--if you're out with the younger group, you will see that this is their form of money. And or of those of you on the phone, I'm talking about the iPhone.

And so as we do less and less with monetary money, this becomes a great opportunity to continue on the tradition of recognizing and making in portrait the medals in significance of the United States and that opportunity.

So, as we go more paperless and coinageless, it certainly gives us new opportunities 20 years from now. Not to say that we're not going to be still doing some amount of that, but I'm thinking that it's certainly going to be reduced, as we're even

talking about it today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I would encourage other members to offer their comments, members of the subcommittee, anyone would like to comment? Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Gary. I want to thank Donald for a concise and wonderful history of medallic art, not just for the world and FEDM, but for bringing this program really to the United States. And it is also my dream that the Mint would support this program, to allow artists—our staff artists, as well as infusion artists—to participate in some new ideas and some new directions.

I especially like the second part of our program where we're allowing the artists to jump in and do some designs of their own.

I look at the designs that we had today as perhaps being resubmitted to this medallic art program. And not to have those artists be

discouraged because their designs weren't talked about today, but I think that they can be resubmitted for this program and perhaps have a better chance of being recognized.

Again, thank you very much, Donald, for helping us understand where we're going with this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are there others who would like to comment? Dr. Viola?

DR. VIOLA: Well, I just want to say that first I was surprised. As you know, I'm the newest member of this Committee, but I'm the historian on the Committee and I was shocked when I saw the resolution that we didn't have something like this in America.

And I said, well, where have we been?

And I think this is profoundly important and so I want to say as the historian on the Committee, I'm so glad to be part of this historic moment because I think anybody that really—if this gets out to the public, they'll want to see something like this

created and I just want to say I'm so pleased to be part of that effort. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: Thank you, Donald and Jeanne, for all your comments. I can't add much, but I have one little thing I wanted to add is that this art medal program is not intended to be an insulated and self-indulgent program, but rather fertile grounds to experiment and expand the Mint creativity, which will ideally then bleed over into all the other Mint programs. So it has that very important function in the broader scope of all that we do here.

In the theme of these medals, we debated quite a bit about how to word that and when we say "an American theme in the broadest sense of the word," we hope that the artist will take that opportunity to explore the vast diversity of this country. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Heidi. Is there anyone else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, well at this point then I would entertain a motion to consider the resolution, which is Resolution 2014-01.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SCARINCI: I would honored to make that motion.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The motion has been made by Donald and seconded by Jeanne. To approve resolution 2014-01, which recommends an annual arts medal program to the United States Mint. All of those in favor, please raise your hand?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It is approved unanimously, thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Now with that I have a motion to make. I would like to make a motion that Design Number 17 from the Platinum Series be referred to the new arts medal

Capital Reporting Company

140

program, the Arts Medal Series --

MR. ANTONUCCI: Just not in platinum.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: --and that that design be brought back to us for consideration in next year's portfolio for the Arts Medal Program for next year.

With that, that's my motion. Is there a second?

MR. SCARINCI: I second it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Donald seconded it.

Okay, it's been moved and seconded to refer

Design Number 17 from the American Platinum

portfolio that we had here today to our new

Arts Medal Program, all those in favor, please raise your hand?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It's a unanimous motion, thank you very much.

MR. MORAN: Here's what I have to say, for just a second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes?

MR. MORAN: First of all, I'm gratified that the Committee supported the subcommittee. It's a nice, warm feeling. But, secondly, we talked back with a telephonic meeting in June or July--whenever it happened--a little bit about the gold Liberty with eagle being considered by the Mint. We haven't heard about how that has progressed at this meeting.

It's my sense that the Mint has moved to a high relief, as opposed to ultra-high relief to give more flexibility to the artist. I think that's very positive. It certainly was the intent that, from my comments in advising on that program, that they make that move because ultra-high relief has a specific definition. I think the relief needs to be defined by the artist and by the Mint production staff.

The second area that I'm not as confident of, there certainly is a lingering thought that this design be struck on the

planchette that the--what I call the checker piece--the Augustus Saint-Gaudens piece--was struck on in 2009. I feel that's too restrictive and I would like a sense of the Committee that the Mint be encouraged to strike it on as large a planchette as they can possibly handle to give the artist more flexibility and incorporate varied elements into this design going forward.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is that a motion, Mike?

MR. MORAN: Whatever you want to make it, make it a motion.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, let me comment on that. Donald and I, I think, are the only surviving members from the 2009 striking of the Double Eagle. That planchette was used because the goal was to accomplish something that the Mint had not accomplished in 1907. And to do that it was an ultra-high relief, which required the 27 millimeter planchette, which was the planchette that the men had been

unsuccessful trying to strike in ultra-high relief in 1907.

At the time, the current Mint director saw this as a challenge for the Mint of something that had failed in the past and once that challenge had been met and accomplished, the Mint would then move forward. And so I would concur with Mike Moran's comments that we've accomplished that. Organizationally, the Mint accomplished the challenge of an ultra-high relief on a 27-millimeter planchette.

The distraction or the downside of using the 27-millimeter planchette for a one ounce gold coin is that it is so small and it's very thick. And it limits the ability to, with the naked eye, see the fine detail and experience the grandeur of a design because it becomes so small. And if you look at the Double Eagle, the Double Eagle was mainly struck on something like a 34-millimeter planchette--a much larger

planchette, more along the lines of what you're familiar with, with the half-dollar.

And I think it's actually a little bit bigger than the half-dollar.

That gives the artist an opportunity to more fully display the details and to have designs that have more--for lack of a better word--pop. So I would encourage, as Mike has, the use of a larger size planchette for a high relief gold coin. We don't need to do ultrahigh relief. And so I would agree with Mike. I'm not sure we need a motion on that, but just for the record--and I would add to that, too, that the opportunity to pair the silver medal with the Silver Eagle is made all the more congruent, if you will, if that art medal is also struck on the same planchette as the Silver Eagle. Then you have a natural pairing and you have the Double Liberty idea that I suggested.

So, are there any other comments before we conclude our meeting today?

MR. SCARINCI: I would just be remiss if I didn't emphasize something, since you referred to a period, an epoch. The previous Mint Director said all the right things. The current Mint Director, Richard Peterson, has done all the right things. And really, the kudos, the credit, the praise--while he's modest and doesn't accept kudos and credit and praise--those who write history will give Richard Peterson the credit, kudos, and praise that he deserves.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Donald.

Okay, we have reached--oh, Greg?

MR. WEINMAN: I wouldn't be doing my job as counsel if I didn't do this because there are media on the phones say that, obviously, any medal program will need to be approved by the Secretary before it becomes formalized.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Oh, absolutely. Yes, yes. The only thing that's happened today is that this Committee's performed its

Capital Reporting Company

146

Congressionally mandated function to comment on designs.

MR. WEINMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: And to move the whole exercise of medallic art and design forward.

And so we've provided our recommendation to the Mint. From this point, it's up the Mint and the United States Treasury to work all of that out and determine what they'll do with our recommendation.

MR. WEINMAN: Absolutely.

MR. JANSEN: I think you have a motion on the floor.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: What was that?

MR. JANSEN: To accept Number 17.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We voted on Number

17, right?

MR. JANSEN: Did we vote on that?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, that was a

unanimous vote.

MR. JANSEN: We've got it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay, we have reached

Capital Reporting Company

147

the end of our --

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Oh.

MS. STAFFORD: To just add, a couple of our liaisons that participated in this meeting ask that I convey their gratitude to this Committee for the work that you do. They acknowledged that it's no easy task, especially, for example, in the "America, The Beautiful" program to distill or try to distill the subject matter down into a coin design and they said that they really respect the seriousness with which you approach that work.

One of them actually noted that her father, who is an avid coin collector, feels that it is a tremendous honor for his daughter to be part of that process with you and he said he thinks it's the coolest thing that she's ever worked on.

(Laughter.)

MS. STAFFORD: So I just wanted to pass that along. The program manager felt that it was important to pass that along to you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, April.

I'll tell you, I think I speak for many of us when I say, we think this is the coolest thing we get to do. So with that we've reached the end of our agenda and we--well, before I adjourn I'll just extend my thanks to the Committee for your hard work the last couple of days. Certainly to the Mint staff for all the work you put into not only preparing this meeting to happen, but also your engagement in the proceedings as we conduct them.

So, with that we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:54 a.m., the public meeting was concluded.)