1

CITIZENS COINAGE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

902 North Cascade Avenue
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80907

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2016 6:00 PM

Reported by: Martha Loomis, CSR

Capital Reporting Company

2

APPEARANCES

CITIZENS COINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Chair Mary Lannin

Robert Hoge

Erik Jansen

Steve Roach

Donald Scarinci

Jeanne Stevens-Sollman

Dennis Tucker

Tom Uram

Herman Viola

Heidi Wastweet

UNITED STATES MINT:

Betty Birdsong

Pam Borer

Don Everhart

Ron Harrigal

April Stafford

Megan Sullivan

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR LANNIN: Good evening. I would like to say thank you. It's nice to see a live audience. Good evening. It's nice to see a live audience.

This is the meeting of the Citizens Coinage
Advisory Committee. It's being held in Colorado
Springs.

It does need to be louder. Okay. Let's start all over again.

Okay. I'd like to call to order the
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee, United States
Mint, here in Colorado Springs. Thank you very much
for the audience who is here.

Okay. The members that we have present are Robert Hoge, Erik Jansen, Michael Moran, Steve Roach -

MR. ROACH: Hi.

CHAIR LANNIN: -- Donald Scarinci, Jeanne
Stevens-Stollman, Dennis Tucker, Thomas Uram, Herman
Viola, Heidi Wastweet, and I'm Chairman, Mary Lannin.
And I would like to ask Donald to say a few words
about --

4

MR. SCARINCI: Before we begin, I'd like to offer a moment of silence for Chet Krause. He was a giant among giants in numismatics. And we all owe him the greatest of debts, and America owes him the greatest of debts.

I'd like to offer a moment of silence. Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Can the people who are on the phone with us this evening please state their name and affiliation?

MR. GILKES: Paul Gilkes, Coin World.

MR. GILPIN: Rob Gilpin, North Light Commission, Block Island.

MR. BOWERS: Dave Bowers, Wolf Hollow, New Hampshire.

MR. ADLER: Mike Adler, Coin News.

MR. KRUMENAKER: Bob Krumenaker, National Park Service of Apostle Island National Lakeshore.

CHAIR LANNIN: We have any more? Okay, thank you. Welcome.

All right. Before we start our meeting, I would like to have a really big thank you to the

American Numismatic Association, to Kim Kiick and to Susan McMillan and to Amber Bradish, who really helped us set this entire thing up.

It isn't always easy to do a roadshow, and there's lot of hard work that went on behind this.

And so a big thank you for being our hosts. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. We've got a big plate to fill tonight. Tonight what we're going to do in this session is review and discuss the candidate designs for the 2018 America the Beautiful Quarters Program.

There will be a review and discussion for candidate design for president Barack Obama's presidential medals, both the first and second terms of office.

There will be a discussion about the future palladium program with the United States Mint. And we're going to have a brief update on the 2017

American Liberty high relief 24 carat gold coin.

So Mint staff, do we have any questions?

Any comments? We're all good? Okay.

So the first item on our agenda is the discussion of the letter to the secretary, the minutes from our previous meeting, and these were in your binders. Have you had a chance to take a look at them?

Erik, I know you had a comment you wanted to make.

MR. JANSEN: There was a section that was missing. On the motion following the score on the 2017 high relief reverse second paragraph, it's missing a second.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. We'll check that out.

Any other comments? Okay. No further

discussion, I move to approve the minutes.

MR. JANSEN: Second.

CHAIR LANNIN: Second? Okay, okay. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. Opposed?

(Vote.)

CHAIR LANNIN: The ayes have it.

Okay, because we have so many designs that we're doing for the 2018 America the Beautiful Quarters Program, what we're going to do is vote at

the very end rather than interrupt five separate quarter discussions. So I just wanted to let people know about that.

So April, I'd like to ask you to begin talking about that program.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The America the Beautiful Quarters Program is a multi year initiative authorized by public law 110-456, the America's Beautiful National Parks Ouarter Dollar Coin Act of 2008.

The act directs the United States Mint to mint and issue 56 circulating quarter dollars with reverse design emblematic of a national park or other national site in each state, the District of Columbia, and the US territories.

The quarters are issued sequentially each year in the order in which the featured site was first established as a national park or site. The coins obverse continues to feature the familiar portrait of George Washington by John Finnigan including inscriptions United States of America, Liberty, in God we Trust, and quarter dollar, the reverse inscription

or the designation of the site in the jurisdiction, the year of minting or issuance, in this case 2018, and e pluribus unum.

We have invited each of our site liaisons for the five quarters that we'll be reviewing to join us on the call. So we hope to have each of them with us. I'll pause and invite them to make comment after I introduce their site.

So we'll start first with Pictured Rocks
National Lakeshore in Michigan. Pictured Rocks
National Lakeshore in Michigan, located on the coast
of Lake Superior, is a narrow strip of a park that
hugs the coastline for more than 40 miles. The
shoreline consists of 200-foot high colorful sandstone
cliffs, numerous beaches, and 300-foot tall sand
dunes.

I'll go ahead and scroll through the designs, and then hopefully the site liaison will be with us and make a few comments.

We'll start with Design 1. This depicts two people in sea kayaks exploring the waterways of Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore. This is one of two

second choice designs of the Pictured Rocks liaisons.

Design 2 features a man in a sea kayak paddling near Miners Castle.

Design 3 depicts a stylized Chapel Rock and the white pine that stands upon it being battered by waves during the storm.

Design 4 features a kayaker appreciating the beautiful mineral streaks that line the cliffs of Pictured Rocks. Design 4 is one of two second choice designs of Pictured Rocks liaison.

Design 5 and 6 depict views of Pictured Rocks. This is Design 5 and 6.

Design 7 depicts a robin, the state bird of Michigan, on a birch tree branch with the cliff walls in the background.

Design 8 depicts Chapel Rock and the white pine tree that grows at the top. This is the preferred design of our Pictured Rocks liaison as well as the Commission of Fine Arts recommendation.

Design 9 depicts a kayaker paddling towards Lovers Leap.

No. 10 features a deer with the cliffs in

the background.

No. 11 depicts the point of view of a kayaker pausing to take in the sights of Lovers Leap.

No. 12 depicts Chapel Rock with the white pine growing atop.

And 13 features a view of the cliff at Pictured Rock.

Now I would like to ask if Susan Reece, the chief of interpretation of Pictured Rocks of National Lakeshore is with us. Susan, are you with us?

MR. WEINMAN: Susan?

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. We'll invite the community for comment.

MR. WEINMAN: Go forward.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. Apologies.

Let's move forward to Apostle Islands
National Lakeshore, Wisconsin.

I'd like to note for the Committee that

Apostle Island and Pictured Rocks are considered

sister parks, so you'll see some similarities in the

depictions.

Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in

Wisconsin includes 21 islands in Lake Superior and a 12-mile long strip of mainland shoreline. The park features pristine stretches of sand beaches and coves, spectacular sea caves and the largest collection of national registered lighthouses and lighthouse complexes in the national park system.

Design 1 depicts two kayakers paddling toward the rock formations at Devil's Island. This design is the second choice of Apostle Islands.

Design 2 features a kayaker gazing in wonder at the setting with rock formations and a lighthouse behind him.

Designs 4 and 4-A feature a sea arch topped with a variety of trees growing atop. This is Design 4. In this design, a pair of kayakers paddle toward the arch, and 4-A.

Design 5 and 5-A feature a view into a crevasse in the sea cave. In Design 5, a pair of kayakers begin to paddle towards the opening. This is Design 5 and 5-A.

Skipping to Design 9 and 10, these designs depict the sea cave at Devil's Island with the

lighthouse in the background. In Design 9, a kayaker paddles by, and 10 features the added inscription,

Jewels of Lake Superior.

If we could go back please to Design 9, I'd like to note that this is the preferred design of Apostle Islands. It is also the Commission of Fine Arts recommendation.

Design 11 features a kayaker passing through a sandstone arch at Devil's Island.

Okay, I'll pause and see if we have the superintendent from Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Bob Krumenaker. Are you here?

MR. KRUMENAKER: I am on the line, yes.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. Would you like to make a few comments to the Committee?

MR. KRUMENAKER: Well, I appreciate the opportunity very much. We have enjoyed working with the Mint staff and the artists on these.

I think all of them are good. They reflect some similar aspects of the park. Like we saw at Pictured Rock we are a coastal area where we have beautiful rock formations.

I'm actually quite pleased that Pictured Rocks selected something very different from what we are recommending, so there's very little chance that people would be confused if these are the two designs that we have.

But the preferred Design No. 9 is, reflects really three iconic things in the park all at once and quite accurately. The sea caves at Devil's Island, the lighthouse which dates from 1891 at Devil's Island, and of course the kayakers.

We like that design very much. And we look forward to your comments on it.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

MS. STAFFORD: Moving on to Voyagers

National Park in Minnesota, this park protects over

200,000 acres of land. And is comprised of miles of
undeveloped shoreline with hundreds of islands and
numerous large lakes.

The combination of rocky shoreline, the meeting of southern boreal and northern hardwood forest and the open water creates a distinct home for

many different species of wildlife.

Design 1 depicts a campfire in a ring in front of a lake with small islands in the distance, and the northern lights visible in the sky.

Design 3 pictures an eagle soaring above the interlocking network of lakes in Voyagers National Park. In its talons it clutches a walleye, the state fish of Minnesota.

Design 4 depicts an aerial view of the network of lakes of Voyagers National Park.

Design 5 features a view of a few of the small islands found in the waters of Voyagers National Park. This is the preferred design from our Voyagers liaison.

Design 6 depicts a common loon with a rock cliff in the background. This is the recommendation by the Commission of Fine Arts.

So now I will ask if the chief of interpretation at Voyagers National Park, Tawnya Schoewe, are you with us?

Okay. Moving on to Cumberland Island
National Seashore. This seashore is in Georgia. It's

one of the largest and ecologically diverse barrier islands on the Atlantic coast. It protects the largest designed wilderness area on the east coast barrier island, and also contains a rich concentration of cultural resources recounting 4,000 years of human habitation.

Design 1 features an adult and young child walking through the live oak trees of Cumberland

Island. This design is the preferred design of our

Cumberland Island liaison.

Design 2 depicts sea oats holding the wind-shaped dunes while gulls fly overhead.

Design 3 depicts a loggerhead sea turtle swimming along the undeveloped beach of Cumberland Island. This design is the third choice of Cumberland Island.

Design 4 features two brown pelicans on the beach of the island.

Design 5 depicts a blue heron capturing a fish in the marsh waters along the western edge of the island.

Design 6 depicts a snowy egret posing on a

branch on the edge of a salt marsh ready for flight.

This is the second choice of our Cumberland Island
liaison, and the recommendation of the Commission of

Fine Arts.

Okay, moving on to Design 8, this depicts a Loggerhead sea turtle nesting on Cumberland Island.

Design 9 features a quiet moment as a visitor enjoys the wind, surf, and abundant wildlife of Cumberland Island.

Design 10 features a couple watching the sunrise over the Atlantic ocean, the beginning of their day of shell hunting and exploration.

Design 11 depicts a close-up view of the Dungeness ruins.

No. 12 features a photographer exploring the twisted branches of live oak trees and sand dunes that line the boardwalk path to the beach.

No. 13 depicts a woman walking along the beach in a gentle breeze while a sea turtle nests in the sand.

No. 14 features a photographer exploring the flora and fauna surrounding the ruins of the Dungeness

mansion.

I'd like to ask if Gary Ingram, superintendent of Cumberland Island National Seashore, are you with us, Mr. Ingram?

MR. WEINMAN: Mr. Ingram?

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. We'll move on to Block
Island National Wildlife Refuge, which is in Rhode
Island.

This is a critical migratory bird stopover point on the Atlantic coast. The islands are known internationally for spectacular birdwatching and breathtaking vistas along the barrier beaches.

Design 1 features a pair of piping plovers

flying near the nesting areas on Block Island,

footprints form a path towards the North Light

lighthouse. This design is the second choice of Block

Island.

Design 2 depicts a black crowned night heron flying over a view from the beach at Cow Cove looking toward Sandy Point. The North Light lighthouse is seen in the background. This design is the preferred design of Block Island as well as the recommendation

of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Design 3 features a mother piping plover with four chicks.

Designs 4, 4-A and 5 feature two piping plovers flying over the North Light lighthouse. This is Design 4, 4-A, and 5.

Design 6 and 7 feature a mother piping plover with her young on the shore in front of North Light. This is Design 6 and Design 7. And in this design, two American oystercatchers fly overhead. This design, Design 7, is the fourth choice of Block Island.

Design 8 depicts a pair of common yellow throat warblers over the roaming landscape with the North Light lighthouse in the background.

Designs 9 and 10 feature piping plovers on the rocky beach in front of the North Light lighthouse. This is Design 9 and Design 10. This is the third choice of Block Island.

And Design 11 depicts a piping plover being banded as part of the conservation efforts to study migratory bird patterns.

So now I'll pause to see if our outreach coordinator with the Rhode Island National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Janice Nepshinsky, are you with us?

MR. WEINMAN: Janice?

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. We'll pause for Committee comment.

CHAIR LANNIN: Do we have any technical discussions about these before we begin the discussion?

MR. JANSEN: In general we haven't entertained designs that had bled outside the circular area of these quarters. We've got a number this time that bleed out.

Any issues there with relief? Is that something that we want to entertain? It's kind of something out of normal.

MS. STAFFORD: I would add, before I pass it to Don Everhart, that we have actually broken the border on several designs in this year, yes.

Do you want to comment on that?

MR. EVERHART: Yes. We would like to lower the relief towards the edge so it wouldn't be a

problem. I think it adds to it myself as to the composition. It creates more of an impact, I think.

CHAIR LANNIN: Any other questions? Okay.

We are going to discuss our voting procedure here a little bit. We have traditionally voted 3 for the most popular, then 2, 1, and zero.

And I've asked a subcommittee to be formed consisting of Erik Jansen, Michael Moran, and Heidi Wastweet to work and fine tune this, and to come up with some really great ideas. I'll ask Heidi to explain it to us, please.

MS. WASTWEET: Thank you.

So to when we begin our selection process, we're going to start with what we call a culling process. So as we had a chance before our meetings to review these designs, we each pick out some favorites and some not favorite.

And so in order to save time and negative comments, we will not be discussing designs that no members are interested in. And we will just focus on the designs that any one of us deems to be a viable choice.

And the way we do that is the chairperson will go through each design. And by a show of hands, if we have even one single person that's interested in that design, it will stay in the discussion. If there are no hands, the design will then be set aside.

When it comes to the scoring process, we have a zero to 3 score that we can give each design, 3 being the highest score, meaning this is a very excellent design, and I support it to my fullest. A 2 score means it's an adequate design. I think it's fine. A 1 score means it's barely adequate and of course a zero means we would not like to see this on a coin. This is the way that we nail down and select the best design for the program.

As a second step, we're also going to, as of today, start a second process where next to the score we're going to give a simple checkmark next to those designs that we want to give a merit.

A merit means that we admire this design; we like the effort that the artist put forward, but we think that, for whatever reason, it's not quite right to be chosen for this project. We like to give this

kind of feedback to the artist so that they know where to concentrate their efforts in the future, what we like, what we don't like. It's a way to get a little report card back that helps them out.

The other thing that we're going to do is, when there are designs that are submitted as variations of themselves, sometimes those compete against each other. And by variation, I mean it may be just a cropping in or a slightly different angle, maybe one element is removed; basically the same design, but just offering us some different options to look at.

We're going to, as of today, try scoring those together as a set. And then if that is chosen, we'll decide which variation we want so that those are not competing against each other but working together.

Did I cover everything?

CHAIR LANNIN: I think you did.

Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: One thing, one thing we really didn't discuss is when we cull the design, that obviously gets a zero on our checklist.

So do you want to put that in your notes that we're not going to score ones that we cull?

MS. WASTWEET: We will note for the ones that we cull because that means no one is interested in that design, but the design still eligible for a merit.

We think it's not right for this program and therefore we don't want to discuss it, but maybe there's something about the design that we think deserves some mention, we'll give it a merit; it's still eligible for that.

MR. SCARINCI: Technical question.

So a merit is a like. And where do we want to put the like? You want to put it on the same side where it's described, and not by the scoring? Okay.

Everybody understand that we put the like by the where the --

CHAIR LANNIN: Numbers are.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SCARINCI: Where the numbers are? All right.

This is the first time we're doing this procedure, so it's the first time. The culling by the

way is the CCAC version of the purge so where artworks will die.

MS. WASTWEET: I want to add that, because we're giving merits this time, just put your scores on the designs that you have a strong preference for so we have a little more concentrated scoring, all right?

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. So I would like to begin with Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore,
Michigan. Begin with No. 1. Anybody have any interest in No. 1, in retaining it?

MR. JANSEN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 2?

MR. SCARINCI: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 3? No.

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 4?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 5? None for 5.

MS. WASTWEET: Keep in 5. Sorry.

CHAIR LANNIN: All right, Heidi, 5.

No. 6? No. 6 is out. No. 7? No. 7's out.

No. 8?

THE PANEL: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 9?

MR. TUCKER: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 10? No. 10 is out. No.

11. No. 11 is out. No. 12?

THE PANEL: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: And No. 13? No. 13 is out.

Okay. Let's go to Apostle Islands, please.

Okay. Any interest in keeping No. 1?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: I'm sorry, what?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 2?

MR. TUCKER: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 4.

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: 4-A?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 5? No. 5 is out. 5-A?

5-A is out. No. 9?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 9 is in. No. 10?

Nothing for No. 10? No. 11? No. 11 is out.

Okay, Voyagers National Park in my home

state of Minnesota.

No. 1, please?

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 1 is in. No. 3?

MR. TUCKER: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 4? No interest in No. 4.

No. 5?

PANEL: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: And No. 6?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Cumberland National

Seashore in Georgia. No. 1?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 2?

MR. JANSEN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 3?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 4? No. 4 is out. No. 5?

27

Capital Reporting Company Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee Meeting 06-27-2016

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 6?

PANEL: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 8?

MR. ROACH: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 9? No No. 9. No. 10?

MR. TUCKER: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 11? No No. 11. No. 12?

No No. 12. No. 13? No No. 13. No. 14? No No. 14.

Final one, Block Island National Wildlife

Refuge in Rhode Island, No. 1?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 2?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 3?

MR. SCARINCI: Yes, yes, yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 4?

MR. SCARINCI: Oh, no, no. I'm sorry.

CHAIR LANNIN: Are you taking back your No.

3?

MS. WASTWEET: Taking back 3.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 3 is out. Checks are

gone. No. 4? No. 4 is gone. 4-A?

MR. SCARINCI: Wait, wait, 4 is gone? No,

let's keep 4.

MS. WASTWEET: No. 4.

CHAIR LANNIN: Have to be fast on the

uptake. No. 4-A?

MR. SCARINCI: Keep it.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 5? No. 5 is out. No. 6?

No. 6 is out. No. 7?

MR. HOGE: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 8?

MR. MORAN: Yes.

MS. WASTWEET: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 9? Nothing for 9. No.

10? No.

PANEL: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: And 11? Nothing for 11?

Okay.

Let's begin our consideration, please. Due to the somewhat late hour, if we could all keep our discussions for the coins at about five minutes, I would appreciate it.

So Dennis, I'm going to start with you.

MR. TUCKER: Starting with Pictured Rock?

CHAIR LANNIN: We're starting with Pictured

Rocks. We're going to do these, we'll do them group by group.

MR. TUCKER: Okay. I think the most engaging and successful designs are those that show people engaging with the environment beyond the recreational aspect. So I like a lot of the loon designs, all of the loon designs.

Some of them cast the viewer, the person holding the coin, as an observer and some cast the viewer as a participant. I think the ones that cast the viewer as a participant are the most successful. And for that reason, No. 9 is my favorite choice.

I like the dramatic aspect of No. 3. It reminds me of Charles Vickers' design for the Hawaiian Volcano National Park. It was very popular in the community.

No. 9 is my preferred design.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Thank you, Dennis.

I think that we'll just do park by park. I

think that's easiest.

Robert?

MR. HOGE: I think I agree with the, I would like to agree with the recommendation. They made very good use of positive and negative space in No. 8, and it shows phenomenal landscape in a relatively straightforward way. That's why I'm attracted to it.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Erik?

MR. JANSEN: As an overall comment, I think we're getting back to more pictures on metal. And I think that's a direction I don't think any of us really want to go.

I would again encourage the artists to think in terms of key symbols. I think the kayaker was encouraged as a key symbol here, but instead of using a symbol I think we ended up putting kayaks in pictures so I'm a little unhappy about that.

Second comment would be, as we all know, when we go to the proof versions of these, negative space is our opportunity for mirrored surfaces. A number of these designs really lack negative space, and that makes the proofs end up a frosted mess.

A number of the candidates -- and I'm not going to mention them on those two scores -- some of the, in that light, whereas I don't really care for the artistic strength of 5 or 6, they do have the best negative space for the coin with the best proof outcomes, I think.

My favorite design is a bit of a risky design -- I echo comments that Dennis just made -- is Design No. 3. Admittedly the waves are a little almost Japanese style, and I'm concerned that the waves will end up being sculpted almost identically with the forest profile kind of in 2 to 3 o'clock position on this design.

Fundamentally I think it's the most high energy design here done well. And I happen to be a fan of that lava design in the Hawaii state quarter. Done well, I think this is a high-energy design with good balance, good negative space.

So subject to the confidence that Don would have on the sculpture -- and I know you kind of gave us a bit of a warranty on the Alaska or the Hawaiian lava design. It really came out wonderfully on the

five ounce silver. That's a spectacular design.

MR. EVERHART: So you trust me then.

MR. JANSEN: Will you sign up? Can you do this?

MR. EVERHART: Yes. I mean, the leaves on the trees on the right would be more textured and the water would be more of a flowing type of treatment to it, so there will be a contrast.

MR. JANSEN: So given that warranty, 3 is going to go probably into my favorites list here. And I think that's probably the extent of my comments.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Erik.

Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: Per my usual reminder, I like to say that we are voting on designs for coins, and not drawings. Many of these are nice drawings, but that doesn't mean that they'll make nice coins.

Design No. 1 is such a design. There's a lot going on here. And when I see it enlarged as you see it on the screen it's very well drawn, very thoughtfully laid out. But this is a very shallow and

very small quarter.

Just today I was holding some recent quarters in my hand from the America the Beautiful program. And when I look at them with my bare eyes, not looking at a page or drawing or screen, we have got a lot going on on those coins.

And I want to urge everyone to try to pull that to the more bold images if they're going to show up on that small pallet.

On design No. 3, I really like the attempt here with the splashing wave; I think that's creative. I wish that the background trees on the far right-hand side, I wish those were treated more like a silhouette because that texture, the texture of the trees, texture of the rock, the texture of the waves, they're all competing against each other.

In the drawing here we see there's some shadows drawn here. You don't get that in the coin. It's going to be texture next to texture next to texture. I don't have a whole lot of confidence in this design. I think it's a good attempt; it might work, but I'm not 100 percent.

I like Design 5 because it is a very clean and bold design. It has detail but not too much detail. It has scale. I think it's clear what it is. I think it would read well as a coin.

When I first saw my packet I thought Design 8 was very nice because of the negative space of the proof piece. But when I saw it reduced down to the actual size I thought it looked a bit busy. And that drew me to Design 12, which is the same feature but drawn in a more bold way, more clean way; has lots of negative space. And the bird there is basically just a silhouette. It becomes a symbol. Instead of trying to put too much there it becomes a symbolic shape. I like Design 12 as well.

That concludes my comments.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Thank you very much, Heidi.

Herman?

MR. VIOLA: Thank you.

I agree with what my colleagues have to say. My only feeling, when talking about these geographical features, I like to see geography. A couple of these

look like the Audubon Society has gotten into this somehow, even though I'm a birdwatcher.

I would have to say though that, while I'm intrigued by No. 3, I do think it would be very hard to, as Heidi says, figure it out once it's made into coin.

So I really like the idea of No. 12, which is kind of representative of what the stakeholders want but is again much more dramatic and effective.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Herman.

Michael?

MR. MORAN: I ran a small poll before I got here. And I asked Don Everhart on No. 3, could he do it. I asked Heidi and got pretty much the comments you just heard. So I've got a yes and a no on No. 3.

I like No. 3. I wish the artist would have put a little more lean into the white pine because there's a wind blowing there. The texture on the forest is unneeded. I have some real concerns that we could get that one to show.

It's a nice design. It's one of the few

opportunities I've seen where we can put some motion into a quarter. And I'll probably challenge them with the vote on that one.

No. 5, nice quarter, nice negative space.

That's why I'm saying that today, there's a better one here. No. 8, I want to spend just a minute on No. 8 because CFA chose it.

I'm a photographer. I'm looking at Castle Rock, I'm going to frame it, and I'm going to put things on either side. I am a photographer, by the way.

But I'm framing it for a three by five or four by six or an eight by eleven or an eight by ten; I'm not putting it on a quarter. I don't know what they were thinking about by adding the trees to this. It's a mess.

Now we'll go to the one that I really like, which is No. 12. Yup, well done all the way around.

And you can't go wrong with the waves splashing. This is really a good one and deserves to be coined up.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Michael.

Steve Roach?

MR. ROACH: Thank you.

I grew up in Michigan. I spent the first 22 years of my life in Michigan. We spent summers up north. Pictured Rocks is a place that is known for being calm. It's a place of serenity.

For me, I love the design for 3 because like Erik says, it reminds me of a Japanese woodblock print; it has the innovation to it. But it doesn't capture the nature of the Pictured Rocks, which is a place of calmness. For that, I'd get rid of No. 3.

For No. 8, the first thing I thought about was Bob Ross, Imagine a happy little tree in the corner. It just seems a little bit busy. It seems a little bit more like, while I think it looks nice when it's large, I think when it's small it's going to be really problematic especially in proof.

That leads me to 12. No. 12 was my favorite because you get the things that the site wanted. You get the rock, you get the tree, you have a bird there for a sense of scale. And as Heidi said, I think that's going to look really nice in proof so I'm for 12.

But I'd really like everyone to consider if they support 3 because Pictured Rocks is calm, and this design is very agitated and I think it goes against the nature of the park.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thanks.

Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm going to agree with my colleagues, Heidi and others, about No. 3. I think it's a beautiful design. And we have the waves and the forest.

But again, when we get down on it, that small planchet, that little quarter size, that's all going to be lost. I think I'm going to skip past 5, which for me in my opinion is not a very strong design. And it will make a nice quarter, but it's rather boring.

No. 8, when I opened the packet I thought that was just really spectacular. I thought there was a nice contrast there. I like the fact there was some reflection in the water. I agree with Michael Moran about the fact that we've got maybe too many trees

around there.

So based on all that I'm going to have to go with No. 12, which is strong and simple. And this is what we've been asking the Mint to do is give us something more powerful. I believe that they've done it.

The only thing that I don't like about this piece is the tiny little bird, which is going to be even smaller on that quarter size. So maybe we might put a couple more spots in there, a few more birds, or make it a little bigger if we choose this design.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Jeanne.

Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: You know, I discarded No. 12 initially because of the bird. And the bird's just going to look like a contact mark or a bug or something. So I'm just really bothered by the bird.

You know, I guess you're going to make the argument that the bird gives it perspective. Yeah, if you're looking at it with a loop, or maybe on the three inch version of this thing. But I think it

really bugs me.

Is the person from, is the person from Pictured Rocks on the phone? No pictured Rocks person?

MR. URAM: Susan.

MR. SCARINCI: Susan? No?

I'm glad you mentioned, you know, that you view, you view Pictured Rocks as a place of serenity because I think that's an important comment. You know, I guess I like, I liked No. 3 as well. You knew I would, right? I like No. 3 as well. I think it's bold. I think it's different. I think it's like the volcano. I think we're doing something interesting and fun on one of these coins. I think this is interesting and fun and I think it's a challenge. We may or may not carry it off.

But, you know, I think the problem, you know, I've never been to Pictured Rocks, you know. I think we do have to, I do think we have to capture the place. I think we have to capture the mood of the place.

If in fact you think it's a place of

serenity and you think this is not fitting in with the mood of the place, since I've never been there, I really kind of have to go with what he says on this.

And the people from Pictured Rocks are not - clearly they didn't recommend it. I understand why
the CFA went with No. 8. That's the recommendation of
Pictured Rocks, right? No. 8? It's the conservative
play. It's like, Okay, we're going to do that; it
looks like everything else; it's not going to stand
out; it's not going to be a coin you care about, you
know. So why do it, you know? Why should we do it?
I think we shouldn't do it.

And I do like, you know, if I could get beyond the little thing, the little bird in No. 12, I would go with that.

I do like No. 4. I really like the way, you know, in this case I like the perspective, I like the canoe, you know.

I feel the same way Dennis did about No. 9.

I feel I like the canoe. I feel like I'm in the action. I feel like I'm in the coin. So No. 4 and No. 9 are nice from that point of view. No. 1

overdoes it. It's the second canoe in the background that takes it over the top.

So I guess I could be persuaded to go with No. 12; otherwise, No. 9 or No. 4.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Donald.

Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

As I look at the whole series, you know, some of them will have to have picture looking things, some will have the people and some will have the formations or whatever. It's just the nature of the whole series of the parks that we've had to go through.

I originally thought No. 3 was going to be the pick that I would like simply because I thought that the water and that the movement there would really come off well. But I too agree that we could have some issues with the striking and the frosting and so forth.

But after hearing Steve talk, I kind of discount that based on his expertise of having lived there and having been to the park because I, likewise,

have not. So I look at No. 9 as being, as Don had mentioned, you're in the motion. The coin is moving. You can create the water in such a way on this coin that it would give a lot of movement and statement to the guarter.

And I'll also consider No. 12, although it isn't as serene I don't think as to what you have in No. 9. I think that that might -- I certainly like it better than No. 8 for all the reasons that were stated.

I'll be giving some votes both to No. 9 and No. 12, and maybe a little bit better to No. 9 actually because of some of the other designs that we're going to be looking at that might not have individuals in them.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Tom.

I'll make a couple of comments. We voted to save No. 2, which I believe is sort of the effect of erosion water, and I just thought that the rippling effect in that was fairly interesting. It's not high in my list, but I liked the way that it looked.

I can see why the CFA voted for No. 8. But I do prefer as my choice No. 12. I think it's bold; I like the negative space. Don and I disagree about the bird.

Don Everhart, what can we do about the little bird?

MR. EVERHART: We can shoot it down.

CHAIR LANNIN: Other than that.

PANEL: Shoot it.

MR. EVERHART: Like Don said, it could be a Zika mosquito on that. Who knows? If we eliminate it it's not going to hurt the composition, that's for sure.

CHAIR LANNIN: I don't mind it in there at all. I think it adds perspective.

MR. EVERHART: It does add perspective, yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: And yes, Don, we're all getting old and we all wear glasses. But I just think No. 12 is a really nice design. It's simple, it's clean.

Certainly if you go to the park -- Steve, how many times have you seen it?

MR. ROACH: Probably five or six.

 $\label{eq:CHAIR LANNIN: It's very recognizable from the park.}$

So I think with my comments we can conclude the comments for this particular national park. We won't vote until the end. And we're going to start next with Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin.

Okay, who would like to start? Dennis, want to start again?

MR. TUCKER: Sure. Thank you.

I'm the person who spoke out for No. 2. And I think it captures the natural architecture of the Apostle Islands with the rock formations. It has the lighthouse, which is an important part of this park, and has some activity with a very bold figure in the front kayaking and enjoying the natural environment. So that's why my vote would go for No. 2.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Robert?

MR. HOGE: In general, these look as though they're perspectives of somebody with a distant

telescope looking across the island. And not that there's anything wrong with that.

I think I would prefer again the site that's the CFA preference No. 9. It has a nice landscape. It does include the lighthouse. I think it's important that we include the lighthouse. This is the great lighthouse site of the entire series.

The figure of the kayaker is a bit small, but I think it probably would work. It maybe adds to the perspective. The design is fairly well balanced and pleasing, and it's focusing on the cave in the center. I kind of like that. It gives a sense of mystery.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Robert. Erik?

MR. JANSEN: I'm generally disappointed with this set. Again, I'm finding it difficult to support pictures on metal that are so busy that certainly in a proof version they're just going to turn into just some massive frosting. And even in the business strike I think the busyness in I would say Design No. 2, when you reduce that to the pallet of a quarter

you're going to get the guy's silhouette of his head and you're going to get him looking at a tower and the rest of it is going to disappear maybe.

I'm finding it difficult to really recommend any of the designs personally.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Erik.

Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: I would like to see a way to represent the recreation on this quarter for both Apostle and Pictured Rocks, either/or, but I'm just not seeing any designs here that do so in a way that's appropriate for the size of the quarter.

If we had a canoe that was more in profile, maybe silhouetted, very pared down and simple so it would read well and doesn't interfere and compete with the texture of the surrounding geography, then I would support that. I'm just not quite seeing that here.

Especially No. 2, which is beautifully drawn, is a nice design, has all the elements and the action, but for the scale of this, if this were on my table and I were sculpting this I would be banging my head against the wall because there's so many layers

in such extremely shallow sculpture.

I think Design 4-A and even 4, much more simplified, I could go with either of those. Design 9, if the water texture is really muted, this might be okay. But I just don't see the approach. There's so much texture everywhere there's no depth, there's no fading the texture into the background to differentiate the back from the front.

Yes, there's a lighthouse; there's a lot of detail there for being so far in the distance.

There's challenges all around.

I'm not sure what I'm going to support.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Heidi.

Herman?

MR. VIOLA: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

 $\,$ And I have been to the Apostle Islands, but when I went there I went hunting.

CHAIR LANNIN: Shoot that bird .

MR. VIOLA: I wasn't in a canoe or kayak.

Actually I was rather disappointed in the whole set. But having said that, I know we have to make a good decision here. And I'd like to keep the

kayakers off so I could go for 4-A, but I could also support No. 9.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Herman.

Michael?

MR. MORAN: All I'm going to do is voice what everybody else has said.

I really liked the overall package of quarters. But this was by far the weakest of the ones. And 4-A is a bit boring; nothing fancy there. But our option is to throw this back at them and have them do them again, and 4-A is better than that.

Beyond that, I don't really have any that jump out and get me. I could go with 4 with the canoe if we feel like we got to have some people in these things. But 4-A is probably my preference, but a weak one.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Erik?

MR. JANSEN: One of the points raised earlier on by Heidi was when very similar designs end up competing with themselves. And I'm sensing in this

one we're not going to get a strong vote on any number. And 4 may be the strongest of the weak, and 4-A maybe closely the weak of the weaks.

I'm wondering if we should merge those in our voting just to see if we can get a decision.

MS. WASTWEET: I was wondering that myself.

CHAIR LANNIN: Merging 4 and 4-A together?

MR. JANSEN: On a vote, and then come back to see what we can pull out of the votes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Erik, you're making a motion?

MS. WASTWEET: We don't need a motion, do

we?

MR. JANSEN: If you want a motion I'll -CHAIR LANNIN: Is there any objection if we
do not make it as a motion and just a general
discussion? Discussion it is.

Okay, Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have to agree with my colleagues about this canoe business. We have two small canoes in too small space.

It's a great drawing. I think that was already discussed. We have No. 1 with the canoes, but the background is going to be so lack of detail I think when it finally is reduced to a quarter size.

No. 2, although this is a lovely drawing, again I think we're just talking about the canoe; we're not talking about the Apostle Islands.

I'm not happy with this group of drawings.

In fact, I'm a little disappointed.

I didn't jump up and talk about 5; 5 has been rejected. But it's probably, now that everybody else has not talked about it, it might be something to consider.

And when we get to No. 4 and No. 4-A, it resembles so much No. 12, which we are really thinking about. I know it's sister islands, but I think it gets to be kind of confusing. The pine tree is almost on its side.

Somehow we need to distinguish Apostle

Island from Pictured Rocks. So by putting the canoe
in, much as I don't want to, that would make the
distinction.

Thank you.

MR. JANSEN: It has three birds in it.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Correct, there are three birds in this one.

CHAIR LANNIN: Steve Roach, have you ever vacationed here?

MR. ROACH: I have not been to the Apostle Islands, unfortunately.

Given that there is going to be a lack of human element in the Michigan quarter, I think it's important that there is a human element in the Wisconsin quarter.

That being said, between No. 4 and 4-A, of course No. 4 has the human element. No. 9 is problematic to me because it just feels very perfunctory: Yup, there's a lighthouse, yup, there's a rock, and yup, there's a canoer, but it doesn't really read as an integrated whole.

And I don't see how this is going to look really exceptional on either a three inch five ounce coin or a quarter dollar.

CHAIR LANNIN: Mr. Scarinci, I'm sure you

have an opinion.

MR. SCARINCI: So I think it comes down to is the lighthouse important in this park or not, right? I mean, we don't have the Apostle Island people, right? Oh, beautiful. Thank you. I would love to hear from the Apostle Island person. That would be wonderful.

I think what I'd like to know about is two questions specifically. One, is the lighthouse important to this park or is it not important to this park and 2, is this an active park? So these depictions, particularly in No. 2 of, you know, the kayak, is that something that happens at this park? Or is this a sitting kind of a passive park?

MR. KRUMENAKER: This is Bob Krumenaker from Pictured Rocks. I can answer this for you.

There are six light stations, nine standing light towers in the park. The lighthouses are extremely important to the park.

No. 9, which I heard many people say is perhaps perfunctory, it's a very realistic scene. I'm not a coin judge so I can't tell whether it's a good

coin, but it's a very realistic scene.

No. 2, we like the fact the lighthouse is bigger, but I think it's too much about a kayaker personally. I mean, that is a scene that happens but the kayak becomes more important than the lighthouse.

My personal opinion would be No. 2 without the kayaker, but kayaking is the most common way to visit this park. And in contrast to Pictured Rocks, kayaking happens there but it's not nearly as common there as it is here.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you for helping us with that.

MR. SCARINCI: That's very helpful.

I think, I mean, CFA is always going to pick the most conservative thing, right? So No. 9 is conservative. It's another coin you're going to look at, look at, and put down.

It's got all the elements, you know, so yeah, it probably does look most like the park and it's got everything in it. But if the lighthouse is important, then the lighthouse, you're just never going to see the tiny lighthouse on the upper right.

CHAIR LANNIN: Kind of like the bird?

MR. SCARINCI: It's kind of like the bird in the last one: It's there, but is it a tree or is it a lighthouse or what really is it from the point of view of it being on a quarter size planchet don't forget.

It's a quarter size planchet. That lighthouse, you're barely going to notice it.

It's more noticeable in No. 2. You know, if in fact people kayak in this park and that's what they do, we've asked the artist to give us perspective; we've asked the artist to put the viewer in the coin; we've asked the artist, you know, to do things exactly like this artist did in No. 2. So, you know, and the lighthouse is bigger. It's more prominently featured, you know.

So it's clearly on a quarter size pallet.

That's how you really have to look at it, you know.

On a quarter size pallet you really get the kayak and you really get the lighthouse in No. 2. So, you know, the other ones without the lighthouse, I think we're losing it.

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Scarinci, I just want to

make sure. I don't know if I read it out, talking about the lighthouse with the kayak.

Design 1 was the second choice. Did I indicate that?

MR. SCARINCI: Yes. No. 1's okay; it's just not as, you're not as in the scene as you are -- artistically I think Dennis is right. I think artistically you're in the scene, you're in this coin, you know. You're going to look at it and you're going to kind of be in the coin.

I think I like this one in the perspective of this is the conservative play is No. 9, boring.

CHAIR LANNIN: Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I, in reflecting back on the Pictured Rock, it looks like No. 12 is going to be, based on my colleagues' comments, is going to be the one with the rock and so forth. I'd like to see the canoe then in this one, particularly if they are sister parks.

And with No. 1 being the second choice, and you do not have the prevalence of the person in No. 2 where it's overtaking, plus I think in frost, boy,

we're going to lose a lot of that in No. 2. You're talking about a blob all through here. I think we'll lose a lot of it.

I do like No. 9 for the same reasons that were discussed. When April read the description,

April said it reflects the three aspects of the park just as Bob said in his comments a second ago from Apostle Island.

So in fact, if we want to reflect the three aspects of the park, I think my choice would now go to No. 1, which would then complement No. 12 in Pictured Rock, and still provides the three aspects, and doesn't have as much negative space as probably would be desired.

But on the same token, I just think No. 2 is going to be too much, and No. 1 can achieve the goal.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Tom.

My only comments would be that I actually agree with Tom. I'm in a coin club in the Bay area. And there are a remarkable number of people who collect lighthouse and lighthouse-related things.

I think we're doing an incredible disservice to this park by not having a lighthouse on it. And it should be in as prominent a position as possible and not in a really small sort of space at 2 o'clock on No. 9.

I think No. 2 is going to be far too busy on a quarter. And I think with some negative space in No. 1, I would have to go with No. 1 because it's got a prominent enough lighthouse, and seems to me it would represent the park.

Any further points? Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: I just wanted to add, as I'm listening to everyone I'm looking at these again and again. I've gone back to design No. 1 because the lighthouse is more prevalent, and that's an important aspect of the park.

I noticed here that the water is represented as a negative space. Would that be polished, Don?

MR. EVERHART: That would be polished, yes.

MS. WASTWEET: That would add the needed contrast that would be lost in some of the others, where I've mentioned it get busy with the textures.

The fact that the water is polished adds interest in No. 1, and it's piquing my interest now.

CHAIR LANNIN: All right. Now we're going to go on very carefully --

MR. MORAN: I have one question on that.

CHAIR LANNIN: Sure.

MR. MORAN: Going back to No. 1, I'm concerned. We did a quarter on the BlueRidge Parkway in which we had the flowers and tunnels and then this highway going off with no texture in it at all. It was a complete failure.

If we do that here --

CHAIR LANNIN: I like it.

MR. MORAN: -- the boat down there like that, there's no tie into the shoreline. If you do too much wave action you clutter it up.

Can you keep --

CHAIR LANNIN: Michael --

MR. MORAN: -- like they're floating? I know they're supposed to float.

MR. EVERHART: I don't quite understand your question, Michael.

MR. MORAN: Well, I'm afraid when you see a quarter -- and I'm not talking about a proof. When you get into change, the canoes are just going to be sitting out there in the foreground of the quarter, and they're not going to be connected to the rest of the composition.

MR. JANSEN: Can I making a suggestion?

Those canoes sitting in the water should have almost a linear profile, as opposed to a curvacious hull. And I think it's that cue that's lacking that's making you think they're flying, whereas if it's in the water you'll have more --

MR. EVERHART: Well, it depends on the perspective that you're looking at them from.

MR. MORAN: -- the kayak in the water, the water ripples rather than the mirror surface. I don't think they'll show in a circulation quarter.

MS. WASTWEET: I think there's enough clues around it that people aren't going to mistake that for sky. It's clearly saying there's boats, there's a rock above it. It's going to read as water.

MR. EVERHART: There are two options here.

I mean, you can show the water as a polished negative space, or you can sculpt it, and that leaves you with just a little bit of polish at the top.

There's actually a third option, which I don't think would work, is you would just show where the bow is breaking some waves there but I think it would draw too much attention to itself, and it would detract from the overall composition.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Don. It's okay, Michael.

Okay, Minnesota, Voyagers National Park, my home state. All right. Why don't we begin with Dennis again. Say nice things about Minnesota.

MR. TUCKER: A wonderful state.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

MR. TUCKER: You're welcome.

I have a first choice and a second choice with this set. Minnesota is very close to Canada, of course. I'm from upstate New York so I'm used to that connection.

And my second choice is the common loon, No. 6. When I first saw that, I saw the connection to

Canada's old dollar. Of course Canada's silver dollar and its last copper dollar feature the Voyagers themselves, the French trappers who worked in this region.

But then more recently, the Canadian dollar coin has featured a loon in a very similar depiction, so I like that connection to our neighbor to the north; that's something that stood out to me.

But really my first choice from this set, I think No. 3 is just spectacular. It's an outstanding design. It's remarkable within this series. It's a different perspective than what we're used to seeing. It's a bird's eye perspective literally.

And I like the way the eagle's wing breaks through the central tonneau, that ring that we're used to seeing enclose these designs. So that to me is a very dramatic design and it has my first vote.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Dennis.

Robert?

MR. HOGE: First of all, I'd like to say I think No. 1 isn't something that would work. To show

the flames in the fire static with no color, I think that's not a good idea. No. 1 also combines the Aurora Borealis, which is spectacular because it's not something that you can sculpt; you can barely draw it. It's just a very poor choice of design.

No. 3 I think has an eagle, which is outstanding and beautiful. I don't think we've seen eagles quite like that. But on the other hand, having bird's eye perspective in aerial views like No. 3 and No. 4 I think presents some difficulty because of the probable scale and distance.

No. 5 is a well balanced design. It might not be terribly interesting, but it's attractive and I can see why they selected that as the preference.

I like the loon even though his head is partly obscured perhaps by the tree in the background. I like the idea of stealing from our neighbors to the north.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

All right, Erik?

MR. JANSEN: I don't really like the drawing in Design No. 1. I'm aware of the challenge of the

dynamic nature of the flame and the static sculpt.

And I think the sculptor had a chance to put the northern lights up in a higher relief than certainly the backdrop.

It's a challenging sculpt.

MR. EVERHART: Yeah, it is. I agree.

MR. JANSEN: I don't get a warranty on this one?

MR. EVERHART: No. What I would like to suggest on this one is to sculpt the water and polish the flames.

MR. JANSEN: Incuse the flames in polish?

MR. EVERHART: I don't know if you could incuse the flames, but you could polish them, you know. And that would --

MR. JANSEN: Reverse.

MR. EVERHART: Yes, right.

MR. JANSEN: I think we've got -- I've canoed in Minnesota multiple times. And the memories I have are of a fire on the rocks over the water, and the northern lights. We can't make the coin do the wolf howl, but those are my memories every time I've

been there.

There's a line on this Design No. 1. I'm curious. What is it? There's a bit of a swooping horizontal dark line that connects from the rock at about 4 o'clock over to the flames, and then the flames out at about 7 or 8 o'clock. What is that line? Anybody know? It's awful strong in his drawings.

MR. EVERHART: I don't know what it is either. I would eliminate it.

MR. JANSEN: Okay. Design No. 3, how do you sculpt that tow boat, that distance tow boat and get any visual cue what it is?

MR. EVERHART: We'll, you'd use perspective in your texturing, texture the foreground not so much that you would compete with the eagle, but you would have a definite feeling of undulation and you would fade that out as you go back.

MR. JANSEN: Like a gray scale.

MR. EVERHART: Yes. So when you get up to where "Voyagers" the word is, it would almost be smooth. It would give you a feeling of sfumato. Like

that?

MR. JANSEN: Yes.

Design No. 5 is a fine design. Again, it's the memory I have of camping on the rocks and seeing more rocks and the trees. Design No. 5 is the conservative go- to coin there; it's going to be a great proof. It's just got, it's a very pleasant design.

Design 6 is a fake-out here, guys; either that or we're looking forward to a four to one dollar with the Canadian dollar and this is our loon.

That's a math joke. I apologize.

I think we get faked out by the contrast here. The loon really pops to our eye in this. But that contrast is really hard to translate into metal. So I think it's a fake-out, guys.

I'm going to vote, probably my strong vote goes to No. 3, and put it on Don to deliver it, which is a good bet.

MR. EVERHART: Do my best.

MR. JANSEN: I know you will. Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: I want to give credit to the Design No. 3 and the attempt to see this unique perspective.

I have a few problems with it. I can't imagine how this is going to read on the coin as far as the geography. I'm just not sure. It might and might not.

The other issue I have is the fish. Because it's going to be so -- I understand why the fish is there. But because it's going to be so small it may just diffuse what is bird and what is feet.

And also a bird flying, an eagle flying at that height I don't think would be carrying a fish.

It would be fishing and he'd grab the fish out of the water and he's going to take it up to the nearest perch. He's not going to travel long distance with it like that.

If we go with this, I'm going to suggest taking out the fish.

Design No. 5, I'm just going to come out and say it. This is boring. It's really boring.

Design No. 6. Like Erik says, this is

really deceiving in the extreme shading; nonetheless, I like it. I think it can be done if it's sculptured well and that's on the art department. If they put too much emphasis on the texture behind the bird it's going to get lost.

If Don drives this and makes sure that that texture doesn't interfere, I think it would be very successful.

MR. EVERHART: I think if you do a very fine texture on the dark areas of the loon, it'll kind of catch some darkness and you can contrast that against the water and then play the background back, you know. Play it soft.

MS. WASTWEET: And you can really have fun with the reflection in the wave. It's a beautiful design down there at the bottom. Especially when we see this on the larger piece that we affectionately call the hockey puck it can be very beautiful. And Canada does not have a monopoly on loons. We can have loons.

CHAIR LANNIN: It's not their national bird.

PANEL: We have many loons in this country.

MR. JANSEN: Birds of a feather.

CHAIR LANNIN: Herman, save me from this.

MR. VIOLA: I'll try to rescue you.

I have to say that the eagle flying high like that would need an oxygen mask. It seems that, you know, he's as high as an airplane. You see the landscape on the bottom. And certainly at that height he wouldn't be holding that large fish; there's no way. But it's a nice concept, a nice drawing.

And I agree with my colleagues. I think overall all the drawings in this group are very nice. But I have to say the loon does pop out at you and we can make it work. And Canadians may feel we've just stolen their idea, but that's fine.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Michael?

MR. MORAN: I have to put my glasses on for this one.

I'm going to agree with everybody. I think No. 5 has plenty of negative space, but I think it's boring.

I agree with Herman on No. 3. You're not going to see an eagle like that. And you won't have

to worry about whether it has a fish on the quarter.

It would just look like a lump of something or

another. We don't want to do that.

To me, it comes down to No. 1 and No. 6.

And both of them are difficult sculpts. Let's go to

No. 1 first. It's a unique composition. I compliment
the designer that did it. He certainly broke out of
the box and tried to portray --

CHAIR LANNIN: Or she.

MR. MORAN: He or she. Sorry.

I would question maybe the pine trees on the right get in the way of the northern lights. I don't think they're particularly needed. If they do, you could make them even smaller.

I would also say the Canadians on their silver dollar portray the northern lights a little bit differently from this. And maybe some more raise in there it would look better. It's a consideration for me.

Let's go to No. 6. We've seen this before. Whoever he or she is that did this has a very good pencil. I mean, it's great as a drawing. I love the

wavy water. I think that's done well.

The problem is the background. The sheer rock cliff there against the head of the bird is a real problem. If you play with the rock pile by the cliff and get rid of -- and the trees are all okay. I think it's that sheer rock cliff that really causes me real hesitation to vote for this design.

If it weren't there and it had a clean head I wouldn't worry about the sculpt. I know it would happen and it would be good.

I don't know what I'm going to do with this.

CHAIR LANNIN: Michael? I'm sorry, Steve?

MR. ROACH: Thank you. I feel pretty confident about which one I'd pick. I love Design No. 6. Collectors love animals on coins. Collectors love a specific animal on a coin. The loon looks really cool. I think of a loon and I think of Minnesota.

I love the eagle in No. 3. I'd love to see that on other coins going forward. I mean, it's an interesting perspective that isn't unique to Minnesota. Again, I still have issues with the concept of the fish, like everyone else.

For No. 5, I hope that's not in consideration as it was before because I think those trees are just going to look sad and lumpy on a quarter dollar.

I love No. 6. I just think the loon is really cool. Thanks.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm going to address the flying eagle. I just simply have to say something about this eagle.

It's beautiful. I love the fact that we're looking at the islands from above.

But please, when an eagle is flying with a fish, the fish has to be aerodynamic and can't slow that eagle down. So with everybody saying the eagle can't carry a fish that high, I believe that's so. And it also can't carry it with the fish bent in that direction.

 $\label{eq:chair_chair} \mbox{CHAIR LANNIN: The world's most startled} \\ \mbox{walleye.}$

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: The other thing, it's not going to be noticed when it's struck in coin size.

So the fish really has to go. The face has to go. The fish has to go in the same direction as the eagle. If anybody has ever seen an eagle lift off from a creek or a pond, that's not the way they take it. So turn it around. Thank you. That's that piece.

I like, I like Don's concept about polishing the flames on No. 1. I think we're stepping out of the box a whole lot by doing the Aurora Borealis and the flames. I didn't like this one at first. But my colleagues have spiked my interest in it very much.

And I do like the site preferences on No. 5. It is boring, but it is what being in Minnesota and canoeing on the lakes and also in Canada is. This is what we see when we're up there: these little islands, the wonderful rocks, so I like this concept very much and I think it would strike up quite nicely.

No. 6, we're talking about the loon. I have to agree with everyone about the cliff behind it. The loon, is this about Voyagers Island, or is this about

the loon? I like the loon on a coin, but I'm not sure we're talking about Voyagers or if we're talking about loons.

So my vote is going to be probably for No. 5 or No. 1.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thanks, Jeanne.

Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: I hope we don't risk getting
No. 5. So I'm going to support No. 6 because I think,
I think not only is Canada having a bad year in 2016 -

MR. EVERHART: Everyone's having a bad year.

MR. SCARINCI: -- you know, and the designs haven't been the greatest this year. But by 2018 we'll get it back together I'm sure.

In any event, I think collectors like this. This is a good collector coin, a pretty coin. I think we haven't really done that before like that. So I'm inclined, I'm going to go with No. 6.

That being said, I'm a sucker for No. 1. I would normally be the big proponent for No. 1. Thank you for letting me give the artist a like for No. 1,

right, because I'd like to see that artist come back.

This is the kind of bold, this is the kind of bold design that I think we're looking for; something that's, you know, a depiction of something but, you know, a mood, a feeling expressed on a coin. I think it's great. I think we should definitely see this again.

As far as No. 3 goes, I'm not going to talk about the fish. But I'll say what I like, you know. I mean, what's really cool about this is the way the feathers, you know, really go to the rim. I like, you know, I like, this artist is also going to get a like because we can now do that, but not a vote.

And it's a pretty coin. I think we're up a little too high. The fish takes it off the table for me, and we'd be redesigning this coin to get it right. Plus I don't think the land mass is a really obvious to anyone unless you're one of the people from the park.

So I'm going to go with No. 6 just to prevent No. 5.

MR. EVERHART: Could I make a comment?

CHAIR LANNIN: Sure, Don.

MR. EVERHART: On No. 6, if the Committee does decide to go with that, my suggestion would be to play down the detail in the cliff behind the bird's head a lot and make that head stand out.

That's all.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Don.

Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

As a collector of Canadian coins
extensively, I gravitated to No. 6 because I thought,
That's great. It's going to be a good representation
for us.

However, when we looked at the other two designs that we just picked, in the two coming forward we have a lot of birds and animals on the next two designs. And I think we'll achieve the goal with the collectors as it relates to animals. I agree this is a great design maybe not for this one, but just because it's certainly going to get part of my vote.

No. 3, maybe we can change it to the bird and get that bird out of No. 1, and we'd have it all

covered. But I'm going away from No. 3. I'm just going to pass. I think it's a great concept there but it's just out of it.

I'll tell you what. No. 1 is intriguing because when you put it together with the entire set, it would really pop in relation to all the other four quarters in the parks. It is totally different. Like I said, looking forward we have plenty of birds and animals that will be part of this set in this series.

So therefore, even though it goes against totally what my first impression was in really liking No. 6, I just think when it relates to the whole set - and the only thing with No. 1 I would have liked to see would've been more northern skylights than that.

Polished reverse looking No. 1 I think would really really make you look at this entire series in a little bit different way.

So I'm going to change my mind and go with No. 1 with the concept of the reverse proof, and still give some to No. 6. But I'm going to switch gears on that and go from that point of view.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thanks, Tom.

I too find No. 1 intriguing, but I wonder if it's a little incongruous. If you're sitting in a campfire and the northern lights are in the distance beyond, aren't you going to be missing the whole middle part in the northern lights because of a lighted campfire?

To me it looks like it was pasted together, two separate scenes pasted together that wouldn't logically be something that you would look at.

I have to confess that I do love the loon, especially after Don said that he could tone the cliffs down. The eagle in No. 3 is beautiful. The walleye is -- I don't know where the eagle's flying. That could be Quebec, could be Alberta, could be anywhere. I like the perspective but doesn't say the park to me.

I wouldn't be interested in seeing No. 5 on there because, again, the land of 10,000 lakes is actually the land of 20,000 plus lakes, and they all look like that. And No. 4 is from an eagle's eye view but it just doesn't say much to me.

I think that I will tend heavily toward No. 6 because I just, it looks like a combination of two designs for me in No. 1.

MR. HOGE: Where is the smoke?

CHAIR LANNIN: And where's the smoke, exactly. Up in the northern light.

That does it for my native state. Thank you.

MR. SCARINCI: After hearing Tom, I'm not going to wimp out. And if Tom can go with No. 1, I'm going to go with No. 1.

MR. JANSEN: There's no bird in it.

MR. SCARINCI: We're going to do birds in the other two. We are going to do birds in the other two.

So when you look at the set as a set of five, I mean, listen. Jeanne likes No. 1. Listen to this. I mean, look at us. We're being bold.

I think it's going to be a real challenge because I think it has the real potential to be another volcano. I think you can do it. I think you can do it.

CHAIR LANNIN: Talk to us about the northern lights.

PANEL: Don, what if we colorize the northern lights?

MR. URAM: But maybe on the northern lights you can have more raise or distinguish them a little. Can that be done?

MR. EVERHART: Sure.

MR. URAM: I think that's the way --

CHAIR LANNIN: Can the top part of the flames be eliminated or lowered or something so there's not -- or do you think that's integral?

MR. URAM: I think it would be great if they were larger.

MR. SCARINCI: I think we can --

MS. WASTWEET: I'd like to remind everyone that the reverse polish will only work on the proof and on the circulating it won't show.

And also the northern lights, to me it looks like a curtain. And I can't tell which one is -- and the gradation, I don't know how I would handle it as a sculptor.

CHAIR LANNIN: This should be a colorized coin.

MS. WASTWEET: I like the subject matter. I can't get past the curtain look.

What you said about the eagle changed my mind about that, because land is not as specific as it needs to be, and eagles are all over the entire country, not just Minnesota, where loon says Minnesota.

I think even though the cliff is a challenge, if the cliff wasn't there then it would just be about the loon. So the cliff is necessary. I'm going with the loon.

CHAIR LANNIN: Cumberland Island, Georgia.
Okay, Dennis, you're up.

MR. TUCKER: For me, No. 1 really captures the essence of the Georgia shore and the beach, and really immerses you into that scenario.

If you've ever visited this area, you'll immediately recognize this. I love the family scene of a mother and child as a human element, and it's very distinctive flora. That is a very strong design

in my opinion.

No. 3, who doesn't love tortoises and turtles? It's an interesting design.

CHAIR LANNIN: Treasury department.

MR. TUCKER: It's not, it's not busy as many of the designs we've seen are. It has an element it's cute. I think it would be very popular outside of the hobby community, and would have some fans in the mainstream audience.

I voted, I feel very strong. I want to mention that I was the person who said yes to consider No. 10 and I think that I have some disagreements with certain parts of the design. I'm not a big fan of the way the sun has been depicted. It's symbolic.

But I love the way the pallet has been used here. It's something that we haven't seen in a lot of these designs. You've got the shapes, you've got elements that are again breaking out of that central tonneau and it's different, and for that reason I think it deserves some consideration.

Those are my comments.

CHAIR LANNIN: Robert?

MR. HOGE: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

No. 1 I think is so busy that on the small size of a quarter, many of the details would just be completely absent. Look at the details in the back feet of the people, the heel. These are not going to be there, or if they are on the coin they'll be so microscopic a detail it would be ridiculous.

This is so busy. It's a nice representation even in the drawing of this size. But on the size of a quarter I think it's almost preposterous.

We've seen so many birds similar to these, pelicans, egrets, they look a lot like the other quarters. I can't go for them.

I have to say I think the turtle is one of the best designs I've seen on No. 3. I think this would be a real winner.

I have to disagree with Dennis with No. 10. Yes, it's different, but what is the water area?

Looks like a strange band, like a sort of optical illusion between the two people and the mythological sun.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Robert.

Erik, what do you think?

MR. JANSEN: I agree with Robert. No. 1 is just too much detail, just overwhelming. So I let it go.

No. 2 is the safe choice. I was talking with some folks over dinner and so forth, and this was one of their favorites. What was highlighted was how you can literally look at this and feel the wind. The birds are frolicking in the wind. They're not on the same wind gust. The grass is all showing us the wind.

Having said that, it's kind of boring. So I'll pick up on Heidi's boring there.

The turtle is really fun. I love the layout, I love the bubbles, I love the frolicking kind of surf of a thing. The turtle is really fun. I'll probably throw some support there.

Actually, the design that I liked best is No. 5 especially if the sculptor lightens that grass up and really puts a strong proof technique in those ripples.

I think that the fish is in the right

profile against the beak. And if the attention and the energy here, the top of the sculpt was on that egret and the grass kind of faded away, and those ripples became a top sculpt too you could almost feel that fish getting caught.

No. 5 gets some support from me. No. 6, this bird looks like a dinosaur to me.

CHAIR LANNIN: They are dinosaurs.

MR. EVERHART: They are.

MR. JANSEN: It's a loony dinosaur because the head makes no sense to me. That bird just isn't right. It feels very stiff. And if that's supposed to be a heron --

CHAIR LANNIN: It's not.

MR. JANSEN: What's it supposed to be?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Snowy egret.

MR. JANSEN: I can't go for the head. I've spent summers on the Florida coast, and I've never seen a bird that looks like that.

I like the symbols in No. 10. I'm not sure they work harmoniously. I'm definitely going to give the artist a thumbs up for trying, working. I'm not

sure I like the way the water kind of leaves and the shell kind of leaves me confused just sorting it out.

When you go into the quarter pallet, I think you're asking too much unfortunately of the observer.

And so whereas I really would like to support No. 10 with the selection vote, I don't think I can.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Erik.

Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: This packet for me was a real love/hate relationship. There's some really great designs here and there's some designs I really don't like.

No. 1 I think is a hot mess. It's busy.

It's going to look worse on the coin. The characters are very small. I don't like it at all.

Design 10, I don't think I've ever said this about a design in my six years, I hate this design.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

MS. WASTWEET: I think it's saccharine, I think it's confusing, I think it's busy, and I don't think it says anything about Cumberland Island that can't be said about any beach anywhere.

To go back to No. 2, I like design No. 2. I don't think it's the best design, but I think it's very nice.

Design No. 3 I love. This is fantastic. It's the right amount of bold, the right amount of detail, the right amount of contrast.

I'd like to see the bubbles polished. It's going to be really fun. The kids are going to love it. I love Design No. 3.

And if we can go to Design 5, this deserves a closer look. So Erik, what you said about Design No. 5 I'm actually going to flip that around.

So instead of softening the brass behind the bird, I would suggest we use the texture of the grass as the contrast so that becomes a pattern, and then sculpt the bird feathers soft, a soft bird, and that gives you the contrast.

Then the ripples, instead of drawing the ripples literally, this artist has taken our advice and has made it a bold, graphic design that's really beautiful. I like Design No. 5 a lot.

MR. JANSEN: Would you go incuse with those

ripples?

MS. WASTWEET: No. Because if you raise them, it's going to be the frost, and then have lots of nice shiny polish behind it on the proof version.

MR. EVERHART: I concur with what Heidi said on that. I would raise the ripples, frost them, and then have them set against the polished background and really set them off.

MS. WASTWEET: That's it.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

Herman?

MR. VIOLA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Again, these are some very interesting designs. I would also agree there are some that I can't believe they suggested.

No. 1 I agree would look like a mess on a coin. I don't know how you'd do it.

I do love the turtle. I haven't seen anything like that before. Collectors, kids, they'd buy it for their kids or grandkids. It's a neat coin.

So I would say my primary vote will be for No. 3. But I also would support No. 5. But I

certainly don't have much to say for 10 or the other ones.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Michael?

MR. MORAN: Let's look at No. 2. Two years ago, we'd have been happy with it. We'd have praised it. We'd see the wind was blowing and the birds show action and there's plenty of negative space, and it's a good quarter design.

We've come a long way in the last two years. This is a good design, but there are far better ones. The turtle got my vote.

But I do agree with Erik on No. 5. It's a nice design, and I'll give it a 2. But that turtle is one of the better ones I've seen.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

Steve, have you vacationed here?

MR. ROACH: So I'll start off by admitting I have a strong bias because I love turtles. I think a ton of collectors also really love turtles. I think young people, who will potentially be getting these coins as gifts, also love turtles.

I love Design No. 3. It's fun. It's going to look great as a proof. It's going to look good large, it's going to look great small. It's going to be the kind of coin that, when someone looks at it in pocket change, they're going to stop and look at it.

I won't say much on 1 and 2 that hasn't already been said. But No. 3, one of my other fields is European and American paintings. And there's nothing that kills the value of a still life more than a dead fish.

I will leave that at that.

(Applause.)

MR. ROACH: I want to give some kudos to whoever designed No. 8. It's not right, but I love the fact that someone was able to put personality in an animal. That turtle looks like a Disney villain that has a heart of gold. It's fantastic.

I don't think it's right. I think 3 is definitely the right choice. But I applaud whoever designed No. 8 for putting some character into the turtle.

No. 10 I like that it's in a shell, but it

feels like an ad for an online dating company. I hope we don't go that way.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Interesting, Steve.

Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Steve, you're a hard act to follow. You need your own show.

Preferred design, which is the preferred stakeholder Design No. 1 is truly too much information on a small planchet. I'm not going to even discuss that any more.

No. 2 gave me a sense of the wind, as everyone spoke about, and I agree with Michael Moran about the fact that two years ago this would have been a great design.

But we've moved so far from that. And I like Erik's interpretation of No. 5. To make the texture behind that heron would be interesting, and also it would, you know, the ripples become extremely contemporary. That's great.

However, I'm going to go with everyone else's choice about the turtle, which is so amazing. It fills the coin. And No. 3 wasn't my choice in the beginning, but the more I look at it, the more I see that it's going to really pop out like the loon in the past packet pops out.

I think we have something pretty spectacular for young collectors to maybe follow the field a little closer. It gives them something exciting to have as a foundation. I'm going to go strongly with that.

I know the CFA likes these very conservative pieces and No. 6, where we have the egret, which to me gives an amazing sense of space. The bird is sitting on that branch and flapping its wings kind of airing them out, I really like this one a whole lot.

I think the turtle is going to overcome my votes. I just wanted to speak about that a little bit.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Jeanne.

Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: We've definitely come a long way. This is a very -- in two ways. I mean, No. 1, this is a very strong group of designs. And, you know, it's really, in any other, two years ago, you know there's a couple of these designs we would just have been going crazy about.

The second thing we've come a long way about is the way we all seem to reach consensus with each other. You know, yeah, No. 3, the turtle, is a nobrainer. I think we all know exactly the way Steve feels and expressed. It's a great design.

I mean, it's not really something, I mean, we should probably, I think we're all just marveling at the fact that this is a great group of designs, No. 1. And No. 2, we all seem to be on the same page, not only with this design but some of the others we've talked about. So it's great.

It should have taken us five minutes to come up and basically say, Yes, No. 3. And we'll get there; it's not quite what the CFA does, but we'll get there.

No. 3 is a no-brainer.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thomas?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Now you see why I decided to go against the loon because the turtle was the outstanding design.

When you have them both in the case I think you're competing against each other, so I'm all in on No. 3.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR LANNIN: I'd like to give a thumbs up to No. 2 because I think the Cumberland Islands are actually barrier islands and the sea oats or the wild oats that are there actually hold the islands in place. I like the sense of movement.

I don't think I've ever seen sea oats actually be still. I think they're always kind of waving a little bit. It is, however, a very safe choice.

I'm in Steve's camp. I'm going to be a turtle person. I think it's great. But I also, Erik made me look at the ripples in No. 5. And I do think that that is a wonderful design, especially with what Don said he could do with this.

Those are my thoughts. We are now going to

go to our last park, and then we'll have a break.

Okay, so we are now at Block Island National Wildlife Refuge in Rhode Island.

Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: This was an interesting set in that so many of the designs are very similar. And I think we've eliminated quite a few of them to get around that.

For me, No. 8 was the strongest. And it really expresses a sense of joyful movement and exuberance that is really lacking in a lot of the other ones. So that has my strong support.

It also has you get a view of the natural surroundings and you get the lighthouse, so you've got the man-made architecture and the natural park environment.

And No. 2 I think, which I think was preferred by the CFA was it, we have a sense of movement, there's good negative space, we've got the water, the seashore, we have the lighthouse.

I think all are very important elements, but for me No. 8 was the strongest.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

Next is Robert.

MR. HOGE: I have to go with No. 7. This was the third preference for the site. I think the mother bird and two little chicks set out well against the sand, compete with them in the background. See the lighthouse.

I think there might be a few too many birds in No. 7. You see the what are they, oystercatchers flying above. There isn't enough detail to be distinguishable on those to be representative, enough negative space.

But for Block Island, it is a bird sanctuary and every one of these features the birds. I think that's appropriate. Maybe it's a good idea to include two species on No. 7 for this reason.

I kind of like all of them. I thought they were all appealing.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Robert.

Erik, what do you think of the birds?

MR. JANSEN: Steve, if a dead fish kills a painting, how about a bird in the hand?

Put me out of my misery on this set, guys.

I'm going to go with No. 2 because I think it will be the strongest contrast. I think the bird would make a very interesting coin with its wing stroke, which kind of grabs me.

No. 8, these look like orioles or robins or some terrestrial bird; they don't strike me as a beach bird. The physicality is wrong. The lineary body is wrong. It's just not working for me in No. 8.

So I'm just going to leave it at that and go with No. 2 and call it a day.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thanks, Erik.

Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: There are several here that I could get behind. I think that Design No. 1 is very pleasant. Because the background is soft the birds stand out. The lighthouse is big enough the sculptors can simplify it enough it could work. I think Design 1 is fine. Not a lot of polish, but it works nice.

Design No. 2 is nice. Design 8 also has a nice negative space, good movement. The local bird speaks to the sanctuary nature. The building is

simplified, lots of polish area.

Also nice Design 10. The bird is bold.

It's a unique bird to that area. It's not a gull that you see everywhere. The piping plover is a nice representation. Those are all nice.

I will speak to Design 4, 4-A and 5 all together because they're variations. You can plug in any one of those.

So we've seen throughout these pages we've seen a few that break that barrier of the coin. And as Don describes, in order to make that work, the sculpture has to go very shallow and there has to incuse a little bit into the rim.

When you put a bird wing out into the edge, that's fine because you can do that. But when you have a bird head break that line, you've got a problem because that's not going to go into that rim as well as just having the bird tip.

So the version 4 and 4-A would be technically difficult, which then brings us to 5, which we don't have that problem.

CHAIR LANNIN: No. 5 we culled.

MS. WASTWEET: And No. 5 we culled.

I applaud the attempt at some interesting perspective. It's too much layering, too much detail for the size of the coin.

I'm not going to support any of those.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

Herman?

MR. VIOLA: As a bird lover, I loved all of these. These are quite beautiful designs.

But again, to be repetitious, I did like No.

2. I think that's a very effective drawing or design.

But I say my favorite would be No. 10.

The piping plover is so dominant it's like our loon: You can't misjudge it. So I think it's a very effective design and I think it will be an effective coin.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Herman.

Michael?

MR. MORAN: I love to photograph birds. And I try my skills at getting them in flight. Sometimes I do okay, sometimes I don't. And sometimes the bird

doesn't cooperate and its wings are all down like on No. 2, and I hit the delete button. I just don't like birds in that position. I know they get there, but to me it's not picturesque; it's not art, it's function. I'm not going to be supporting that.

No. 8 is good, makes good use of negative space. You have the iconic lighthouse in the background. But the birds, when you get to a quarter, are not strong enough to really identify as shorebirds to me; they could be any kind of birds flushed out.

That gets me back to No. 1. I had completely missed No. 1. Sorry about that. No. 1 has potential. I think, though, that the footprints in the path there are too heavy, too distracting, and if we do choose that we need to soften those footprints in a beach path. I think that's backlight.

Anyway, let's go to No. 10. That's the one that I really like. As Herman says, it's distinctive. You have that iconic structure in the background, it's not overpowering. You've got great negative space around that bird. It's what we want. It's well executed, and I think it easily identifies with the

101

park, both the bird and the lighthouse.

And that's my personal favorite.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Michael.

Steve?

MR. ROACH: I agree with the site preference in the CFA recommendation for Design No. 2.

Something I would make a comment on about Design No. 8, which seems to have some support, I don't get any sense of it being an island. I get no sense of water. The birds don't give me a sense of being shorebirds. And the house feels like a sad, lonely, Edward Hopper style house.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay, a reference to Edward Hopper. That's cool.

All right, Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you very much.

Rhode Island is my home town so I have a great opinion of this particular quarter.

You can't walk on Rhode Island beaches or Massachusetts beaches without seeing plovers; that's what's there. So the artist portrayed the piping

plovers in No. 3, that's kind of the way they are, flitting around. They're great fun and very beautiful.

I think I can't back 4-A and 5 because, as Heidi said, there's too much layering there. I don't think it's going to be very clear, although 5 is terribly interesting because you get the lift over that lighthouse and the lighthouse really is important.

I applaud the artist for giving a sense of sand dunes and the fact that, you know, you can wander between them and see behind them. This is a very beautiful beautiful drawing. I think it would strike up as a lovely metal. But as a quarter I think so much would be lost, so I can't put my vote behind that.

I'm going to have to go with the third choice, No. 10, because that is Block Island. We have the island, we have the sand dunes, we have the sand, we have the rocks. You can't mistake that plover. I think it's going to be quite beautiful. I like the fact that there's space, negative space around it,

103

negative space around the lighthouse. This has my vote totally.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: I've vacationed on Block
Island. I like No. 1. And I think this does come down
to 1 and 8, honestly. Personally I think, Mike, you
said it exactly right: It's function, No. 2 is
function. I don't know what's particularly attractive
about No. 2. And the lighthouse is really kind of
small. You do get the sense of it being an island.

I get a good feeling about No. 1. And I hope it's not just from the picture, you know. I hope it's not just from the picture. I think No. 2 again is a more conservative play. The bird doesn't really do much for me, the lighthouse is too small.

What you do get in No. 2 is you do get a sense of beach. Again, the beach that you're getting is going to be really too small. So again, No. 2 does a lot of things, but it does too many things. So I just don't, I just don't care for it.

I think it's really between No. 1 and No.

10. I can see why people like No. 10. We keep asking for focus, and on a small pallet you want to see one thing. And here you definitely see the birds, but I think you see the lighthouse is just too far in the distance. I agree with Steve. You don't see the beach or get a sense of beach from No. 10.

I like No. 1. I'll definitely give No. 10 a like, and I'll give No. 5 a like too by the way.

CHAIR LANNIN: It's been culled.

MR. SCARINCI: Anyway, thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I'm just going to go right to No. 10. With all the complaints that have been said on the other ones I would tend to agree.

As much as I do like No. 1 and No. 2, No. 10 maybe you could add a little bit more to the foreground there to create that beachy atmosphere. It reminds me when you look at it, it reminds me if you've been on the beach late in the day, the solitude looking effect, a calming effect with the bird the way

it is you can almost hear the bird chirping with the way it has its mouth and so forth.

That's going into a whole lot more than you would with a quarter when you're looking at the designs here. And I think it also complements every other one of the ones that we've considered as designs.

So I just like the calming, solitude effect of the design. And if we could make it a little bit more looking sandy somehow in roughing that up a little bit I think that would set it off nicely.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I think those little,
I first thought those were little stones. They're
not; it's sea foam. So when the beach, when the waves
are coming up, the bird is running along the top of
that sea foam of the waves. We're sort of sitting in
the water looking up on to the beach, so it's sea
foam.

Is there some way, Don, you can depict that, some way we can make that not polish glossy, but that would have to be textured because it's foamy.

106

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay, Jeanne. Thank you.

I too like No. 10. That little bird means business. And I like the fact that we can see the lighthouse in the back. It's got some nice perspective.

I thought the CFA choice was a CFA choice.

And I do like No. 1 because the lighthouse is a little bit more prominent.

No. 4 and 4-A, even though we culled 5, how many saw The Birds with Tippie Hedron and saw the schoolhouse, which is in Bodega Bay, California.

That's all I could think of when I looked at it.

MR. EVERHART: I have a question for you.

Why, when the birds attacked in the movie, did they take the kids outside?

CHAIR LANNIN: Bad parenting? I don't know.

MR. EVERHART: Just wandering.

CHAIR LANNIN: Is there any more discussion

on any of the state quarters?

MR. SCARINCI: Note that didn't happen on Block Island.

107

CHAIR LANNIN: I would like to ask the Committee to give their thumbs up or thumbs down in Heidi and Erik and Michael's new system to do our vote, hand them in. Tom will read out scores. We'll take a much needed break, and get back here at about in ten minutes at 8:20.

MR. JANSEN: Madam Chair, are we doing audience comments?

CHAIR LANNIN: At the end.

MR. SCARINCI: For the people, the end is near. All we got to do is tally the votes on this. That's done on the break. And we've got two Obama coins, two Obama medals. And we've got to do about the palladium, going to be hearing about the palladium, which shouldn't take that long.

(Short break.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call the meeting back to order, please. We're all out of order.

Megan, how are you doing? Need more time?

MS. SULLIVAN: Give me another three

minutes.

108

MR. WEINMAN: Let's go on to the next item.

MS. SULLIVAN: All right.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. We'd now like to turn the discussion of designs for the President Obama presidential medal.

April, would you discuss them, please?

MS. STAFFORD: The United States

presidential medals have their origin in the earliest

days of our nation when medals were presented to

American Indian chiefs and other important leaders.

These medals, known as Indian peace medals, featured an image of the president on the obverse with symbols of friendship and peace on the reverse.

The medals ultimately became the presidential medals featuring a portrait of the president on the obverse with elements such as inaugural dates, terms of office, presidential symbols and seals and excerpts from speeches on the reverse.

Presidents who serve more than one term are often honored with two medals, one highlighting each of their terms. Since the 1960s, with the exception of Ronald Reagan, all presidents who served more than

one term have been honored with two medals.

The United States Mint worked closely with the office of the whitehouse chief of staff in development of these designs. We initially presented them with a robust portfolio of a wide variety of designs. After review, our liaison indicated that the following designs were preferred for the medal.

For the term 1 obverse and the term 2 reverse, the liaison requests comments from the CFA and CCAC before identifying a preferred variation. So we will show term 1 obverses first. There are two.

Both obverse one and two feature a youthful portrait of President Obama with the inscription

Barack Obama. This is Design 1, which is closer up, and 2, pulled back a bit.

And there is one design to be considered for the term 1 reverse. Reverse 1 features a quote from President Obama beneath the presidential seal. The quote reads, Our destiny is not written for us, it is written by us. The additional inscription is January 20, 2009, the date of President Obama's inauguration. Beneath the date is the president's signature. The

design is bordered by 50 stars.

Moving on to term 2 obverse, we have one for consideration. Obverse 1 for term 2 features a traditional profile of President Obama with the inscription, Barack Obama.

And for the term 2 reverses, there are two.

Reverse 1 and reverse 2 for term 2 feature a quote

from President Obama beneath an image of the

whitehouse. The quote is, the single most powerful

word in our democracy (sic) is the word "we." We the

people. We shall overcome. Yes we can.

An additional inscription beneath the whitehouse reads January 20, 2013, the date of President Obama's second inauguration. The designs also feature President Obama's signature, and 50 stars around the border.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, April.

I'd like to begin the discussion with Mr. Scarinci.

MR. SCARINCI: I think what they're asking us to do is very simple. If I can perhaps suggest, if we all agree, maybe we can just do this on a motion or

111

a simple show of hands, whatever you want to do. I think it's very simple.

We have the luxury, the beauty of really seeing his first term medal together with his second term medal. So when you put your hand in the middle and eliminate the second obverse and eliminate the first reverse, you have a pair of presidential medals that go perfectly together.

You have the larger head in both obverse in the first term medal and the second term medal, and you have the simpler, cleaner reverse in the first term medal as well as the second term medal.

If it's acceptable to everybody, I'd like to make a motion that we go with obverse 1 for the first term inaugural medal, and I'd like to make a motion that we also go with reverse 2 for the second inaugural medal.

MR. MORAN: Second.

CHAIR LANNIN: All in favor? Opposed?

(Vote.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Motion carries.

MR. SCARINCI: Okay.

CHAIR LANNIN: All right. So now we will quickly go back to the scoring for the America the Beautiful.

MR. URAM: Madam Chairman, here are the results from the America the Beautiful. Pictured Rocks, No. 1 had two votes, No. 2 one vote, No. 3 had 11 votes, No. 4 had three votes, No. 5 had three votes. No. 6 and 7 zero, No. 8 had eight, No. 9 had 12, No. 10 had zero, No. 11, zero, and No. 12 had 25. No. 13, zero.

You want to give the total possible votes?

CHAIR LANNIN: This would be 25 votes out of a possible perfect total of 33.

MR. URAM: Correct.

Moving along, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Wisconsin, No. 1 had six votes, No. 2 had seven votes, No. 4 had 14 votes, No. 4-A had nine votes, No. 5 had zero, 5-A had zero, No. 9 had 12, No. 10 and No. 11 had zero.

American the Beautiful Voyagers National
Park, No. 1 had 19 votes, No. 3 had eight votes, No. 4
had zero votes, No. 5 had eight votes, and No. 6 had

113

20 votes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Yay loons.

MR. URAM: Okay. Cumberland Island National Seashore, Georgia, No. 1 had two votes, No. 2 had five votes, No. 3 had 30 votes, No. 4 had zero, No. 5 had 14, No. 6 had one, No. 8 had one, No. 9 had zero, and all the way through 14 was zero.

Block Island National Wildlife Refuge, Rhode Island, No. 1 had eight votes, No. 2 had 11 votes, No. 3, 4, and 4-A, zero votes, No. 5 had one vote, No. 6 had zero, No. 7 had seven, No. 8 had eight, No. 9 had zero, No. 10 had 26, No. 11 had zero.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ JANSEN: Will the merit votes also be reported? And how?

MS. SULLIVAN: I didn't have time.

MR. JANSEN: I don't mean today. Will they

be in the minutes for feedback to the artists?

CHAIR LANNIN: They'll be recorded in the minutes.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

114

CHAIR LANNIN: So the winners and still standing, actually --

MR. WEINMAN: Pictured Rocks.

CHAIR LANNIN: Pictured Rocks, the winner is No. 12 with 25 votes. Apostle Island winner, No. 1 with 16 votes.

MR. JANSEN: I don't think that's sufficient to get a selection.

MR. SCARINCI: Can I suggest? I mean, I think somebody, I think Mike, somebody had suggested that 4 and 4-A, or maybe it was you Jeanne, somebody suggested that we consider 4 and 4-A together.

MR. JANSEN: You can't just add their scores together.

MR. SCARINCI: You can't just add their scores together. But if you do, it wins.

MR. JANSEN: That's not what the vote represents.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I think that, in order for that to work -- Heidi made the suggestion - in order for it to work that way we would've had to pair them before the voting.

115

MS. WASTWEET: We didn't do that.

 $\label{eq:msssollman:} \text{Ms. STEVENS-SOLLMAN:} \quad \text{We didn't do that.}$ That's kind of too bad .

MS. WASTWEET: At first I thought that they were qualified as variations of each other. But having the vote there or not there, that's a pretty fair way to go, voting them separately.

And yeah, 16 is not a strong enough vote to make it a formal recommendation.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: So can we make a motion? Shall I make a motion?

Okay, I move that we should reconsider No. 1 as a recommendation.

CHAIR LANNIN: You want to reconsider it?
You're not happy with it. Is that what you mean?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Well, we didn't have enough votes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. I'm sorry.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Sort of reconsider, you know. Those of us who did not vote for it, do we reconsider this as being one to move that? Or do you think we should reconsider voting 4 or 4-A?

116

MR. MORAN: Make a motion to consider No. 1 as a choice.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you. Second?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I move that we

consider No. 1 as our recommendation.

CHAIR LANNIN: Is there a second?

MR. VIOLA: Second.

CHAIR LANNIN: Herman seconds.

All in favor.

MR. JANSEN: Could we have discussion first?

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay.

MR. JANSEN: I think you actually could simulate a vote here by looking at the ballots and seeing if essentially, by scoring as the higher of the two you can get a simulated 4-4-A as a single unit. I think that vote is reconstruction. It's not as simple as adding 14 and nine.

CHAIR LANNIN: We just said that we were voting on these individually.

MR. JANSEN: We didn't during the vote. I voted on them collectively. So I would have given -- I voted on 4 and 4-A collectively.

117

MS. WASTWEET: Can I suggest even if we raised the score to 16 it's still not a strong vote.

Can I ask April, do we have the capacity to revisit this with some fresh designs based on our feedback? Or are we --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: There's a motion on the table.

MR. JANSEN: We're discussing it.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: And we're discussing it. But we're discussing not that motion, we're discussing something else.

We need to discuss whether we're going to accept that and if we're not, then we can reconsider No. 4.

MS. WASTWEET: I'm not talking about 4, I'm talking about your motion.

CHAIR LANNIN: What we're talking about is Jeanne's original motion where we would consider choice No. 1 with 16 votes to be the Committee's choice, their recommendation.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Right.

CHAIR LANNIN: Their recommendation, and

Herman seconded that motion.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: And now we vote on it.

MR. JANSEN: The regular vote is the problem. I don't think we have a well understood vote here is the problem.

I don't know how 16 stacks up against other numbers.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: What is the motion?

MR. JANSEN: We're in discussion. I think we have a right to have discussion.

MR. SCARINCI: I think I'm just going to vote against the motion so that we can just toss it to the secretary.

At this point, you know, we've done our job and the CFA has done their job and, you know, we should toss it to the secretary and let them decide.

MS. WASTWEET: I agree.

There is a motion on the floor. We're voting on Jeanne's motion.

All in favor of having the first choice, 16 votes, be our choice. All in favor?

(Vote.)

119

CHAIR LANNIN: Motion fails.

MR. JANSEN: You might have an abstain.

CHAIR LANNIN: Is there anyone who would

abstain from this?

MR. MORAN: I did want to ask, somebody started to ask April, do we have time to go back and try again?

MS. STAFFORD: Sorry?

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ MORAN}:$$ These all were so good. This one was just not on --

MR. JANSEN: It is 2018.

MS. STAFFORD: What I would say is, I think the Committee should make their recommendation that the Committee feels is appropriate for this portfolio.

If there isn't a recommendation, and that would be your collective consensus, that the artists need to come back with further designs, that's what we would take away.

MR. MORAN: That's what I'm going to move.

MR. JANSEN: I'll second that. The vote

failed.

CHAIR LANNIN: The vote failed.

120

All in favor of Mike's motion to have the artists reconsider the entire Apostle Island portfolio

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}$. WASTWEET: We should discuss it before we vote.

CHAIR LANNIN: Want to discuss?

MS. WASTWEET: Jeanne, you wanted to say something?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes. I don't think we need to send this back. I think that's too much to ask to have the artists -- I think they did a wonderful job of trying to execute our desires, and I think they've done it.

The only question that I have, following the discussion that we had, was No. 4, No. 4 and 4-A.

Here's another thought, and someone -- I will carry this through. Since this was not understood whether we were going to vote for it as a pair or whether we were going to vote for it individually, I think we need to reconsider not anything else but the vote and how we voted on this particular pair.

It's true they are very different but they're very close. There was a misunderstanding during the voting, as Erik had a misunderstanding, and I think it's only fair to the artists and to the Committee to follow through and just have us reconsider our own votes for 4 and 4-A.

If we get 17 or 18 on this one or whatever or not, then we can reconsider or revisit the motion that was turned down.

MR. WEINMAN: Make the motion to make them collectively is your recommendation.

MR. MORAN: We have a motion on the floor.

I'm willing to cede the floor to Jeanne and do it this way, and then we'll get back to kicking it back if we don't get something.

CHAIR LANNIN: There's an intervening motion.

MR. WEINMAN: To consider --

CHAIR LANNIN: To consider 4 and 4-A.

MR. WEINMAN: Collectively as your

recommendation.

CHAIR LANNIN: Collectively.

122

MR. WEINMAN: As the Committee's recommendation.

CHAIR LANNIN: Who would like to second that?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I'll second that.

MR. WEINMAN: You made the motion.

CHAIR LANNIN: Would anyone else like to second it?

MR. URAM: I will. In other words, are we going to vote for 1 and 4 and 4-A?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ WEINMAN: No. 4 and 4-A is the recommendation.

MR. URAM: What were vote totals for 4 and 4-A?

CHAIR LANNIN: They were 14 and nine.

MR. URAM: That's fine. I'll second it.

CHAIR LANNIN: Any discussion about that?

All in favor of making No. 4 with 14 votes and 4-A

with nine votes collectively the single recommendation
as -- Erik?

MR. JANSEN: We're kind of dealing with an experiment here. And the thought behind the

experiment was, in a situation where you have, as this is, two very similar designs essentially collapse them into a single voting entity. And if that collapsed entity was selected, we then do a discriminating motion.

So I just want to put it out there that I don't think we should send two very similar designs up. I think as a committee, if we converge on the 4-4-A combined, I would encourage the Committee to consider then deciding between the two, so a two-step process, Madam Chair.

CHAIR LANNIN: So would that require a double motion?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ WEINMAN: Needs an explanation. The motion is still on the table.

MR. JANSEN: I think what we'd be doing here

-- and Heidi, isn't that in the mind that we talked

about in collapsing the vote for common designs, then

come back and articulate which version of that common

design --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: That's good.
CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you for the

124

explanation.

Any further discussion or explanation? All in favor?

(Vote.)

CHAIR LANNIN: It fails.

MR. WEINMAN: Motion fails.

CHAIR LANNIN: Michael?

MR. MORAN: I move we send it back.

MR. JANSEN: I'll stand by my second.

CHAIR LANNIN: All in favor of sending the

designs back?

(Vote.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Motion passes. Okay.

Voyagers, the loon, the loon made it with 20 votes out of a possible 33 for Voyagers National Park.

And Cumberland was our outstanding vote of the night has 30 votes for the turtle.

And Block Island, Jeanne's little piping plover made it with 26, design No. 10.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. We've done

presidential medals.

We're going to move on and we're going to introduce Ron Harrigal, who will be talking to the Committee about the future of the palladium program.

MS. STAFFORD: Actually, Madam Chair, I'm going to be doing a little bit of an introduction before Mr. Harrigal speaks.

On December 4, 2015, the president signed into law the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, which is public law 114-94, hereinafter referred to as the Fast Act.

The Fast Act amended palladium coin legislation requiring the secretary of the treasury to mint and issue bullion coins weighing one troy ounce and containing .9995 fine palladium with face value of \$25. Also authorized are proof and uncirculated numismatic versions of the palladium coin.

Legislation requires the obverse design of the palladium coin to bear a high relief likeness of the winged Liberty obverse on the Mercury dime. This design was created by famed American sculptor and medalic artist Adolph A. Weinman in 1916.

The legislation additionally specified the

reverse design of the palladium coin is to bear a high relief version of the 1907 American Institute of Architects, AIA, gold medal reverse design. This work featuring an eagle was also created by Adolph A. Weinman, and commissioned in late 1906 by the AIA specifically for their gold medal award.

The gold medal is the AIA's highest honor given annually in recognition of the work of individuals who have had a lasting influence on architecture.

Earlier this year, the United States Mint contacted the AIA regarding the design of their gold medal. The AIA generously permitted the Mint to scan their original 14-inch plaster of the 1907 gold medal reverse, allowing the Mint to digitally capture the three dimensional information.

Currently, the Mint is conducting research and development to execute the palladium coin in high relief. Required descriptions for the reverse of the coin include United States of America, the denomination, the weight of the coin, the fineness of the metal, and e pluribus unum.

We have with us today Ron Harrigal, senior advisor and the Mint's manufacturing director to talk about the research and development phase of this important annual program.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, April. Welcome, Ron.

MR. HARRIGAL: Thank you. That was a wonderful introduction. Thank you, April.

Yes, this is interesting legislation. It came out in I believe originally 2012. And it was subject to a marketing study. And of course the study was not positive to go on with the program.

And later another law came through and took the marketing study out, so everything else is there that we have to work with.

Some few notable provisions in the law that April didn't mention, and one is the bullion version is not to be made at West Point. That's a pretty significant provision. That's stated in the law; we have no choice on that.

Another is if we do make a proof version that the proof version is made at West Point, so

there's clearly some language there that we have to follow.

Also, to the greatest extent possible, the surface treatment on the proof coin should change in a material way every year.

MR. JANSEN: Is it a multi year series?

MR. HARRIGAL: Well, okay. Let's go back and see, this is what's in the legislation.

The bullion coin is stated by law as a requirement. The proof coin we are authorized to make, which makes it an optional product. So our initial study that we're going through is to source palladium blanks that can make a bullion coin. That would be our traditional wire-brush type finish that we use on the bullion products, so we would make it in a similar fashion.

There are a couple of other items here that are not in the law. The law does not specify diameter of the coin, nor does it specify the date of introduction.

So what we've seen on previous programs that we've developed, developing a new alloy can be a bit

cumbersome, especially when you have an item like palladium that there's only, right now, one active mint making palladium coins. That's the Canadian mint.

So we reached out to the Canadian mint, talked to them. We also have suppliers that we're talking to. We've been engaging in discussions with our procurement department with multiple suppliers and at this point in time, we are in the process of -- if we have not ordered yet we will be ordering shortly -- it's been requisitioned working with some of the suppliers.

There's developmental work that the suppliers have to do. And to have any kind of sustainable program, you're going to definitely need reliable suppliers, and we're looking to more than one supplier here. We learned our lesson on platinum, you know. There are market issues that make a sometimes defective supply chain, and we're hoping that we can avoid that with this program by working with multiple suppliers.

So key to the success for us was to develop

a robust supply chain; at least one obviously, but more than one supplier. We've been working with the vendors for quite some time; had discussions at the world money fair with some of the vendors that were there, and have been going from that point on.

I can say one thing that we did back in 2005. We did do a test with palladium. We had some quarter size planchets that we got from GoldCorp at that point in time, and we struck some Martha Washington nonsense designs on them. The observations back then was it looked promising. Developmental work is needed.

So we had enough planchets left over from that program that we could look at. And we analyzed the planchets and found that they really didn't meet the specs that we believe we need for the palladium program.

We're looking to spec a planchet that is very similar to our platinum program: very fine grain structure, a certain hardness, certain surface roughness finish on it. And one of the keys to making a good coin here is the upset profile, working with

that.

So a lot of developmental work we have to work with on our suppliers, and it's going to take multiple iterations working with them to get the blanks. We're just starting the process. We expect there will be, you know, a minimum of two, maybe four, who knows how many iterations we're going to need to work with the suppliers.

But this takes time. They have to figure out their operating parameters, how to do the reduction, how to get the right grain size. This is not a walk in the park and it's going to take some time.

So, you know, the fortunate thing is that there is no stated start date for the program; however, I can say that we are working diligently to try to get this thing out as quickly as we can.

I think that's pretty much all that I can provide for you right now. What I'd like to do is open it up and talk about any kind of questions, roundtable discussions, anything that you may have at this point.

MR. JANSEN: So Ron, it's not like, in other words, we're not talking about a 2016 dated coin?

We're trying to get through a lot of development in 2016. The issue you have, once you develop the parameters and you come up with the specifications you need for the planchets, the suppliers have to make the planchets.

MR. HARRIGAL: Most likely not.

And, you know, obviously we're looking to satisfy demand. That's a big question: What is the demand of this product? There's some experience that the Canadians have, but we have no experience with it.

So, you know, we're working for it.

Obviously the No. 1 priority is to get the bullion

coin out on the market. At some point in time, if we

get the right specification -- and we are trying to

develop the planchets for a proof coin.

If we don't make that mark initially, we may introduce the coin as a bullion only the first year and then follow up with a proof once we get the planchet more refined.

So that's, you know, there's a lot of

133

uncertainty at this point on the program but the supply chain is obviously the key.

CHAIR LANNIN: Ron, isn't it brittle metal?

MR. HARRIGAL: Actually, it's not.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay, no.

MR. HARRIGAL: You know, we suspect that it's going to coin similar to platinum but our experience tells us that maybe it's not quite as bad.

If you look at the metallurgical characteristics on it, you know, if you get the planchet developed right with the right upset profile, this may be a fairly robust program for us, a fairly efficient program.

I can say that palladium is a metal that is used in catalytic converters. It's very reactive. It picks up debris a lot. So once we get it into production, there's going to be an experience there. And we're talking about benchmarking with a Canadian mint to find out what their experience is.

CHAIR LANNIN: Are they being cooperative?

MR. HARRIGAL: Oh, yes, very.

CHAIR LANNIN: Great. Does anybody have any

134

idea how many they sell in a year?

MR. URAM: I thought it was significant, but I don't know who told me that or where that came from.

CHAIR LANNIN: How much?

MR. URAM: More than we expected.

MR. HARRIGAL: There were a couple of years I believe they were upwards of 50,000 in that timeframe for a couple of years, and then it dropped off and they didn't sell them all.

So it seemed like there was initially a lot of interest. And now they've, I believe the past two years they've also reintroduced it, but they still haven't sold everything.

I think there's interest out there, but whether it's more of a novelty interest or for what I don't know. It's not your usual format for an investment of precious metals.

MR. URAM: Half the cost of platinum .

MR. JANSEN: So this would logically be an ongoing multi year program. But the reverse changes every year?

MR. HARRIGAL: No, the design doesn't change

every year.

But if we introduce a proof version of the coin, then they would look to see some sort of change, and that we would go from like a proof maybe to a reverse proof to a selectively polished proof.

MR. JANSEN: Oh, okay. So that option kind of moves around.

MR. HARRIGAL: And obviously you're going to get to a point where you're going to end up repeating.

MR. JANSEN: So is there any work to be done on the artwork of this coin? Or is it pretty much prescribed and bolted down?

MR. HARRIGAL: Well, there's --

MR. JANSEN: Does it say it shall be or it shall be like?

MR. HARRIGAL: It's a likeness. I think really where all the work is going to be is placing the inscriptions so that they fit and flow with the design. You know, I mean, there's some work involved there and we'll be looking at that.

I mean, the obverse artwork, the Winged Liberty we already have. We did a lot of work on the

Mercury dime, the gold Mercury dime version so we have good artwork there.

We're restoring the artwork on the reverse from the scanned plaster. The plaster appeared to be worn. The metal showed more detail than the plaster had. So we're filling in the gaps so to speak.

We'll have that, you know, we'll have that in time to do some testing and that. But we want to definitely make sure that, you know, we get the design correct so that we can push the high relief on it.

One thing that you-all didn't ask, which I thought maybe you would is, what size are we going to make the coin?

One thing we have to watch is, we've got a lot of different metals that we're working with here. And so to mistake proof our operations, we're going to probably be between the American Eagle gold coin size and our commemorative dollar size. But it will be between 32.7 and 38.1, somewhere in that range.

That will allow us to give it more thickness to be able to pull the high relief up.

MR. JANSEN: What diameter is the Canadian

137

version? Why wouldn't the procurement committee say just pile in and do their diameter? The market would be happier.

MR. HARRIGAL: They're not high relief.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

MR. MORAN: High relief using the same definition you did with the \$100 gold coin?

MR. HARRIGAL: Well, we're going to have, I mean, the high relief, really we work off the ratio from the thickness to the diameter. So anything that we come up with high relief, it's got to be, the thickness has to be thicker in relation to the diameter than any of our standard product, and that allows us to make it in high relief.

MR. MORAN: I think you said the minimum .025 inches? I might have missed a zero.

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah, I'm not exactly sure how that, you know, translates on this coin. It's going to be part due to how much we can push the, how much thickness we can get and how much we can push the metal down to pop that up.

Now, you realize that both the obverse and

reverse have a lot of real estate in them. The Mercury dime is a large obverse.

MR. MORAN: Yes, it is.

MR. HARRIGAL: And the eagle is very much like the standing or the walking Liberty reverse except the eagle has the head down. That's a very large volume as well, so it's going to be a real challenge to get high relief on this coin.

MR. MORAN: I would agree with you.

Did you all ever consider the privy mark instead of the fineness and weight designation? That eats up space.

MR. HARRIGAL: I'm not sure what's in the legislation. The legislation may tie our hands there. That's something that our legal department would have to take a look at.

MR. MORAN: If it's legal, you sure ought to consider it. There's nothing more -- everybody knows what I think.

MR. WEINMAN: The coin shall bear such other descriptions, including, Liberty, in God we trust,
United States of America, the denomination and weight

139

of the coin, the fineness of the metal as the secretary determines to be appropriate in keeping with the original design.

So there's some flexibility.

MR. MORAN: My question is moot.

MR. TUCKER: Can I comment on that?

I actually thought about that since our conversation. And when I was studying the American Arts gold medallions, part of the failure of that program was that there was no indication of fineness or even of the metal content, the weight or anything. There were other problems. The medals didn't have the name of United States of America for one thing.

But I wonder if there are certain things that bullion buyers like to see that might not be artistic but at least it tells them what they're buying. So that might be an issue.

 $\label{eq:chair_constraints} \mbox{CHAIR LANNIN: Any other questions for Ron?}$ Thank you.

MR. HARRIGAL: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR LANNIN: We'll look forward to asking

you further questions.

The final item will be April up again talking to us about with an update about the 2017 American Liberty high relief 24 carat gold.

MS. STAFFORD: Yes, ma'am. We just wanted to put onto the record an update to some information that was shared at the March 15, 2016 CCAC meeting.

There, candidate designs were presented for potential 2017 American Liberty high relief 24 carat gold coin and silver medal.

The Committee was advised that, if authorized, the gold coin would receive edge lettering to complement dual dates on the obverse celebrating the 225 anniversary of the United States Mint.

At that time, the Mint stated that it planned, if the program went forward, to use the inscription 225 years of American coinage. But after further consideration, again if the program moves forward and is authorized, the Mint will propose using the inscription, 225 anniversary in three evenly spaced positions along the edge of the gold coin.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you very much.

Okay, this is the end of our official meeting. And thank you all for staying up late.

Since we're in Colorado Springs and have some coin enthusiasts in the audience, I would like to open up to a public forum. It's almost 10 after 9:00. I think we can stay here till about 9:30. If anyone would like to ask any of the members any questions regarding the CCAC, and keep your remarks brief, Bob.

Please state your name for the record, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure. My name is Bob

Campbell. I'm past president of the ANA, and I have a

coin shop called All About Coins.

I feel like I'm on the front line of the coin industry. We deal with a lot of families and collectors, and sell over a million dollars a month in coins in my coin shop. So I'm dealing with young people all the time. They love the America quarter program, the America the Beautiful program.

One thing, if I could make just a comment, keeping the design simple is what everybody seems to comment on. They have a hard time really

understanding what's really going on, especially kids.

This is a strange world that you live in that you're looking at a three-quarter inch design, and you have to have this wonderful metal for the artistic design to really pop out.

I got to compliment the Mint. The designs from the first 50 state quarter program to this are completely different, much more quality, much more detail. And the designs need to be complimented. I think you've done a wonderful job.

The other thing I would like to comment, you know, the Canadian palladium maple leaf is exactly the same size as their other coins. They tried to do that.

I think you're in for a real firestorm with trying to educate the public for what palladium is. I mean, we honestly sell maybe 100 platinum pieces for every one palladium piece that we currently sell. The public just doesn't understand what the metal is, so you're going to need a lot of extra money to spend; you're going to have to create your own market. I think you can do it; I've seen you do it before.

143

It's interesting you're kind of on the ground level so you could actually probably -- I don't mean to say in a negative way -- steal a lot of Canada's market in this. I think it's great to give them some competition.

CHAIR LANNIN: We have a loon.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would congratulate you.

And I found this whole process -- first time I've ever attended -- really fascinating. I love to hear your opinions go back and forth.

Thank you for inviting me.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you for coming, Bob.

Is there any other members of the audience that would like to ask any of those questions about the CCAC or what you've seen tonight, or any comments?

MR. SCARINCI: Just hear what you think.

MR. ELWOOD: I'm Taylor Elwood.

I realized that there's quite a bit that goes into the designs of coins, but never before have I seen the entire process, and how much real effort and thought is put into these designs.

It really makes me appreciate even more --

I'm already a coin collector, but even more how much effort and time is put into these things. And it just, from seeing the designs evolve from the early American coins that I like to collect all the way up through today, it's just fascinating.

And it makes me want to collect the America the Beautiful series, in all honesty.

CHAIR LANNIN: We're here to help with that.

MR. ELWOOD: And also just the, with the turtle design. I think the numismatic hobby is not one that's particularly popular with young people in this day and age. And having coins with turtles or other animals of the sort could really help bring him them into the hobby and really help it just stay keeping, keep the hobby alive and well for the future generations.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Taylor. Recruit a bunch of your friends.

Anyone else have any comment about what they've seen tonight?

MR. CALLMAN: I have a question or a comment. I'm just wondering, when we're dealing with

the America the Beautiful series and state parks, what kind of weight do you give to the circulating quarter, and what kind of weight do you give to large silver 9995 ouncer?

There's a lot lower mintage obviously in the circulating quarter, but the pallets are two completely different sizes. What kind of weight do you give to the one or the other? Which one gets more importance for the design?

MR. WEINMAN: Could you state your name?

MR. CALLMAN: Seth Callman.

MR. URAM: I think personally myself, I look at it just as a quarter because that's what's circulating; that's what's out there. It would be too tough to differentiate.

But really, that's what we focus on is the circulating proof quarters.

MR. KALMAN: Certainly.

MS. WASTWEET: I try to make a balance of my consideration because it is both. And not only is it both a quarter and a larger piece, but we also have to consider that it's also a digital image.

A lot of people focus on the image; they see it on the computer and the amount of detail that they can see there, so we want to have designs that can span a whole range.

I think it can be done. I think the turtle is a good example. It will look good as a small piece, it will look good on the three inch, and when you blow it up on to your computer screen, you're going to see all the little details of the bubbles and the texture of the turtle.

That's a great example of a design that will balance all of the ways that people look at it.

MR. SCARINCI: I've never considered the design on the larger, on the larger pallet. I really think that I really consider the design as a quarter that's going to circulate, and that is the most commonly circulated coin in America.

MR. KALMAN: Sure.

MR. SCARINCI: The quarter is the quarter.

So if it doesn't work, if the design's not working on that quarter size, for me it's just not working at all.

MS. WASTWEET: That's a deal breaker.

SCARINCI: Now, having said that, I will share with you that, since I collect metals in one of my areas, I do collect the larger size, the larger size quarters.

I do think, just like the first spouse gold,

I think that's a sleeper series. I think one day

people are going to wake up and say, Oh, my God,

because you can, as David Ganz actually proved, you

can go take your silver quarter and spend it as a

quarter; it's a legal currency in the United States.

So I think it's a sleeper, you know. I think they are pretty as medals are pretty. And some of the designs do work better on the larger size.

I am a little surprised that, while some of the smaller quarters, some of the regular quarters have not won more awards and just won, two of them just won coin of the year award while the larger ones have never won an award.

I don't know why; probably because the national community doesn't take the large quarter seriously as a circulating coin.

148

CHAIR LANNIN: Anybody else have any comments to address?

MR. JANSEN: I would only say, that's really an astute question because I think part of our challenge is part of the materials we get, Show us the designs in real life size. And it is absolutely worth visiting. And I think we all visit them regularly going through this.

The point I want to add on top of that is, look at the congressional and presidential medals we do. Same three inch diameter, same as the silver five ouncers.

When we go through those, you'll find that there's typically more detail, because we are speaking to a three inch pallet. They're available in one and 5-16ths diameter at a cheaper price as well.

There's a lot of optimized art for that diameter. Those are really fun designs because they're so big and we can do so much fun stuff.

CHAIR LANNIN: Anyone else in the audience have any more comments? Kim?

MS. KIICK: I'm Kim Kiick, ANA executive

149

director. I just want to thank you all for being here.

I really enjoyed watching the process. And it was nice to reiterate, hear you all express, in your areas of expertise, your analysis of the design. And I learned stuff today just listening to all of you.

And it's very organized. Eleven people on a committee? I commend you for that, and thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Applaud this group. We don't exist without them.

(Applause.)

MS. KIICK: Thank you for coming to Colorado Springs.

CHAIR LANNIN: Appreciate it. Thank you for that.

I think there was another question. Yes, sir? Your name, please?

MR. PAONESSA: Joe Paonessa.

Actually, Kim almost said exactly what I was thinking.

As an amateur die cutter and wannabe

medalist, hearing your insights into the design element and how the layout fits on either size coin, the proof effects and how that works with the frosted areas very interesting and very helpful. Thank you for all your comments.

MR. SCARINCI: You know, there's something I'd like to say about this. I guess I've been on this committee the longest .

MS. WASTWEET: By far.

MR. SCARINCI: The last time we were here in Colorado Springs to do one of these meetings was 2010. And that was not as collegial of a meeting as you just witnessed today.

A lot of things changed since 2010 as you can hear, and what you saw, and as you observed. And what has dramatically changed is the United States
Mint is listening to us; they're listening to you.

And they want to do better and they want to produce coins that we're all going to be proud of.

And, you know, it's a democracy so there's no -- in some countries there's, you know, one or two people who pick the coin designs.

That's just not how anything in America could ever work, you know, as you've just witnessed in the coin designs. By keeping, you know, listening, and having a team of people that are working together and thinking actually along the same lines I think is producing some great results.

We just won awards for coins that US coins haven't received awards for the past six or eight years previous to this last year, so I think that makes a statement.

That's really all a result of these people right here and the Mint director and the previous acting director, who really gave this, you know, a thousand percent to get to this point.

And they really deserve a round of applause. (Applause.)

MR. JANSEN: I would add something there.

To your particular interests there are two extraordinary sculptors, deluxe players on this committee: this woman and Heidi down there. All that they say, the minutes of our meetings, there's dial-anumbers and listen and learn more, because that's what

they do and are really good at.

The second thing I would say is, we were in the Denver Mint today. We normally meet at the Mint headquarters in Washington DC; we're in the director's office all the time.

On their backup tables are Coin World, all of them, okay? So when you write in there and the letters to the editors get printed, it hits home. These guys here, they read it, they hear it, they see it, they feel it. So participate. It makes a big difference.

CHAIR LANNIN: I believe there was one more comment.

MR. JOHNSON: My name is Ross Johnson. I'm one of the frequent letters to the editor writers to Coin World.

CHAIR LANNIN: Have I answered you?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know.

I wanted to say a couple of things. One is that collectors really love the classic designs. We know that you guys are very strongly invested in bringing new art and new designs to coins and that's

wonderful, and you have a wonderful pallet with the quarter programs and are changing the reverses on the platinum coins.

Don't forget that some of us love those classic designs. And if you need proof, your Mercury dime that came out in gold sold out in 45 minutes, 120,000 coins.

One suggestion I would make, American eagle coins are now 30 years old. You've married a sort of cartoonish version with St. Gaudens' artwork with a politically correct reverse.

How wonderful would it have been to restore, and particularly since St. Gaudens was particularly sensitive about this, his artwork to the reverse and resculpt the front and make it look like those classic 20s that we all love.

How many people would like to see that? Come on, clap.

(Applause.)

MS. WASTWEET: Can you give some other examples of how you would like to see classic designs brought to new light?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I mean, I think it's difficult for, you know, to just keep reusing them. Pretty much the best ones you guys have reused.

I mean, the buffalo nickel that you've got on the pure gold bullion coin is a wonderful thing, and you're going to go use the Mercury obverse again on the palladium coin.

Oh, come on. You like the seated Liberty. Everybody's got their favorites. I mean, the fact that you're coming out with the gold versions of classic designs is kind a nice set.

The only objection I have to that is that there's a lot of collectors who can't afford gold coins; you should do it with silver as well so that, you know, the younger collectors have something they can collect and relate to the classic designs.

MS. WASTWEET: Why would you, as a collector, want to buy a new classic design instead of buying the original?

MR. JOHNSON: I think, well, it really depends. I just think that people like the idea of these designs not going away. And I think on some

level they could continue to extend their collecting.

For example, you have a gold program where you have fractions. You have one tenth ounce, you have one quarter ounce, one half ounce, and a one ounce. They all have the same design.

How cool would it be if you had the Mercury dime on the tenth ounce, like you just did, the standing Liberty quarter on the quarter ounce, and the walking Liberty on the half ounce, and resource the St. Gaudens on the one ounce.

And if this sounds familiar, it's because it's being published in one of my letters to the editors.

But what a beautiful set that would be. And it would be a coin that came out every year and it venerates history, it venerates the best of our artistic heritage, and everybody loves those designs.

You'll see a sellout on the standing Liberty quarter and on the walking Liberty. Don't take my word for it. Just look at the numbers. Look at how those phones light up.

MS. WASTWEET: So you're saying a new

156

combination, or excuse me, a new size or new material?

MR. JOHNSON: No, it wouldn't be. It would be exactly what you're doing now except using different dies.

You're already making the tenth ounce, quarter ounce, and half ounce, but you're using that same sad interpretation of the St. Gaudens obverse with the family of eagles on the reverse that we've looked at for 30 years. It's boring.

MR. JANSEN: Question for the Mint.

When we came out with the walking Liberty gold dime, the diameter on that didn't match the dime in silver.

MR. JOHNSON: Matched the tenth ounce.

MR. JANSEN: It matched the tenth ounce.

Was that the right decision?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. JANSEN: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: If you want to transition those to the new fractionals, that would be great. They've already done the work to do the die work.

MR. JANSEN: My question is, is the diameter

157

right to match the current bullion market?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe so.

MR. JANSEN: Or match the original issue?

MR. JOHNSON: No. I believe that it's the bullion issue because gold is a denser material than silver. And if you were to make it the exact size, the dime would actually have to be heavier than a tenth of an ounce.

But they did it successfully --

MR. JANSEN: Oh, the thinness can be moderated within certain boundaries.

MR. JOHNSON: Correct. It would have to be, if it was the same diameter, it would have to be thinner.

They did with the Kennedy coin a couple of years ago or last year. The Kennedy gold coin was actually three-quarters of an ounce. And the reason for that, I assume, is because they wanted to match the dimensions as close as they could.

But that required that they use threequarters of an ounce of gold as opposed to a half.

MR. JANSEN: My question was really a

158

marking question.

CHAIR LANNIN: Bob, did you have another question?

MR. CAMPBELL: I did. I was going to answer the question about those coin designs, why should we make the older ones.

It's hope. Those designs represent America better than any other designs in American history.

The hope of it.

When I got a chance to testify in front of the senate banking committee my talk was just about that. My mother was an immigrant from Finland. I remember her telling me that the first thing she saw of America was that walking Liberty half dollar. She saw hope in that coin.

I think that is the kind of thing you want to portray to the rest of the world. If you want to be the leaders of the world, show it in our coins.

MS. WASTWEET: I agree they're beautiful designs and they're inspired, and we all love them. So our mission of creating new modern designs is not because we dislike the old design. We love them.

My question is --

CHAIR LANNIN: We can't remain static.

MS. WASTWEET: Well, no. We'll continue to pursue the modern designs. And I'm not opposed to honoring and revisiting classic designs in parallel.

My question is, when you're choosing what to buy, for me I would buy an existing classic design, you know, in a classic year, rather than one that was struck this year.

So what, to you as a collector, what appeals to you having these designs restruck instead of --

MR. CAMPBELL: The same reason why I wanted to collect the classic designs. I thought they were beautiful.

MS. WASTWEET: But the older ones are still out there. So is it the price difference? Is it clarity? Do you think the quality is different?

MR. CAMPBELL: I think it's introducing it to a whole new generation, trying to see a child as they grow up and you say, Hey, the year you were born this was made. And they'll discover it and they'll collect it because of that interest in it.

160

We all have different reasons why we collect, and that would serve --

MS. WASTWEET: You're saying having the current year on that classic design is the appeal?

MR. CAMPBELL: Sure. It would be really popular among collectors. If we want to reenergize the whole collecting base, we have to figure out a way to get young people to start collecting more coins; that should be our first appeal. Whatever it takes to get the young people interested.

Your idea with the turtle, people in America are going to love that turtle just like the world loves the panda. That'll be a collector's thing for sure. You know, I can't wait for it to come out. That's what all the kids are going to want to have. What a great idea.

CHAIR LANNIN: One more question. Your name, please?

MR. PAONESSA: Joe Paonessa.

Just commenting on your question or your question on the marketing aspect.

I personally would have preferred the

Mercury dime to actually be on the full size dime blank regardless of the weight even if it raised the weight to a -- obviously it wouldn't be a quarter ounce anymore, tenth ounce.

But having it match the size to me would be a little more important than having it match the tenth ounce quarter, half ounce and up.

I think Heidi said something about she asked if there was anything we would like to see in the product. I would like to see high relief just in the commemoratives.

With a noncirculating piece it's not that important because you're not going to be producing huge numbers. If the original commemorative program with the higher relief than the current program is just it's a more attractive coin.

It's a personal opinion. I like the higher relief.

MS. WASTWEET: We all like the higher relief.

MR. JANSEN: Which of the higher reliefs would be your preference, gold or silver?

162

MR. PAONESSA: From all the products I see that are NCLT I think they all could use a little more depth to it.

MR. JANSEN: In an ultra high relief? I mean, in a knock your socks off, Oh, my goodness, look at that high relief coin, gold or silver?

MR. PAONESSA: The gold do look, I would say between the two, the gold do stand out more with that. The high relief smaller St. Gaudens -- I think was a 2009 -- a beautiful piece. The 911 anniversary medal was also a beautiful piece with the multiple laser frosting on it.

Across the board the effectiveness on like the 2009 dollar high relief, just adding that makes it stand out so much more than the issue, and even though they're higher relief than the current relief.

MR. URAM: Versus gold or silver, proof or business strike?

MR. PAONESSA: I prefer the business strikes myself.

MR. URAM: So like the current Liberty?

MR. PAONESSA: Pardon me?

MR. URAM: Like the current Liberty gold versus the 2009 high relief?

MR. PAONESSA: Business strikes in the latest, the proof on that ultra high relief, I don't think it can be beat. It's a great design, a great piece that they made.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Thank you. I think there's another comment. Taylor, you have something else?

MR. ELWOOD: I just, with kind of the older designs being redesigned into the newer coins I think could really inspire kids who don't know the old designs exist in the first place.

If they wouldn't have perhaps the resources or just the foresight to go get an older piece they can see the reincarnation of that design on a coin, and really be inspired to not only collect the new stuff but also go with the old.

CHAIR LANNIN: All right, thank you.

If there's no further business to come before the Committee I would like to suggest that we adjourn.

164

```
Any seconds?

PANEL: Second.

CHAIR LANNIN: All in favor?

(Vote.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Good night.

(Whereupon the within proceedings adjourned at 9:30 PM.)
```

165

CERTIFICATION

I, Martha Loomis, Certified Shorthand
Reporter, appointed to take the within proceedings
hereby certify that the proceedings was taken by me,
then reduced to typewritten form by means of computeraided transcription; that the foregoing is a true
transcript of the proceedings had subject to my
ability to hear and understand, and that I have no
interest in the proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand.

Martha Loomis

Certified Shorthand Reporter

Proofread by E. Williams