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MR. SCARINCI: Present.
CHAIR URAM: Jeanne Stevens-Sollman?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Present.
CHAIR URAM: Dennis Tucker on the phone?
MR. TUCKER: Present.
CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Dennis. I am Tom Uram, the chairman of the CCAC, and I welcome everyone. We'll review today's agenda first.

First we'll have the discussion of the letters and the minutes from the June 18, 2019 meeting and from our telephone meeting. We'll move on and review discussions of the obverse candidate designs for the Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Program and the design competition. A review and discussion of the reverse candidate designs for the Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Program will follow that.

Before we begin our proceedings, are there members of the press in attendance and on the phone, or on the phone? Anyone in attendance from the press?

MR. GILKES: Paul Gilkes, Coin World.
CHAIR URAM: On the phone. Thank you, Paul.
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Any journalists in the room or any journalists other than Paul? Thank you. I'd finally also like to record and acknowledge the following Mint staff that are participating in today's meeting. First of all, April Stafford, the Chief Office of Design Management. And Program Managers from that office are Vanessa Franck, Megan Sullivan, Pam Borer, Roger Vasquez. Where is Roger? There you guys are. Okay. All right. Ron Harrigal, manager of Design and Engraving is with us. Betty Birdsong, our liaison to -MS. BIRDSONG: Yeah.

CHAIR URAM: -- Citizens Advisory Committee. Our counsel, Mr. Greg Weinman. So I'd like to begin with the Mint -- or are there any other issues that need to be addressed before we begin? Okay. Acceptance of Minutes and Letters from Previous Meeting

CHAIR URAM: Then first is the approval of the minutes, Secretary, and from our last meeting. Have any comments on the documents you all received? Hearing none, is there a motion to approve the minutes and letters?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: So moved.
CHAIR URAM: Second?

MR. JANSEN: Second.
CHAIR URAM: Second by Erik. All those in favor say aye.

GROUP: Aye.
CHAIR URAM: Opposed? Thank you. We now turn to April. And April is our, as mentioned, Chief Mint Design and Management to present the designs and portfolio for the Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Program Design Competition. April?

MR. WEINMAN: Beginning with the obverse.

CHAIR URAM: Beginning with the obverse. Review and Discussion of Candidate Designs for the 2020 Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coins

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you so much. We are very fortunate to have with us today representatives of the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame who we will introduce in a moment. And, yes, we are pleased to provide the following background on this commemorative coin program.

As Public Law 115-343, the Naismith Memorial
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Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act that requires the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue five dollar gold coins, one dollar silver coins, and half-dollar clad coins in recognition of the $60 t h$ Anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

Some background about this sport. It was on December 21, 1891 when a young physical education instructor named Dr. James Naismith introduced the game of basketball to his physical education class at Springfield College, formally the YMCA International Training School in Springfield, Massachusetts.

In the next two years the YMCA missionaries who were trained at Springfield College were dispatched on their missions around the world with a peach basket and a soccer ball, giving rise early on to the global reach of the game and explaining the roots of the game's worldwide participation.

Dr. Naismith's vision was to have basketball be a very inclusive game. We know exactly who, when, and where this game was invented unlike American football and baseball where the origins are a bit more
nebulas. Basketball has a clear inventor and purpose for the game. Dr. Naismith's purposes for inventing it were to engender team work, sportsmanship, fitness, leadership, integrity, respect, and preservation. These seven values he wanted the game to reenforce are known as the Naismith values.

In 1959 the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall
of Fame was founded and dedicated to the game's
creator in Springfield, Massachusetts known as the birthplace of basketball and became the first and only museum to honor the game at all levels around the world. The Hall's recognized throughout the world as the premier institution entrusted with recording and disseminating the history of the game of basketball and recognizing and honoring the achievements of its greatest players, coachers, and contributors.

The fact, the Naismith Memorial Basketball

Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act requires that all three coins be curved similar to the 2019 Apollo 11 50th anniversary commemorative coins. Additionally the act requires the convex side of the coins, the reverse, depict a basketball as a common design across
all three.

In accordance with the act, candidate designs for the obverse or the concave side of, of these coins, were solicited from artists through a national public design competition. Twenty artists' designs are being presented today. These designs are required by the act to be emblematic of the game of basketball. Required inscriptions include liberty, in God we trust, and 2020 .

I should note that some artists additionally opted to submit designs with other inscriptions such as Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, Basketball Hall of Fame, and Naismith core values, or the Hall of Fame's core values, which are preservation, inspiration, and celebration. Some artists also reference, as I mentioned, the Naismith values with, with inscriptions themselves or other devices.

In order to preserve the artistic vision of the competition submitted designs, but still ensure that the designs are fundamentally coinable, the Mint conducted one round of modifications for coinability
concerns. As the designs are presented, we will note necessary modifications to address technical and/or historical accuracy issues.

Representatives for this program are with us today and I'd like to invite the president and CEO of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, John Doleva, to make some comments to our committee and also introduce his team.

MR. DOLEVA: Sure. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I'd like to think the Committee first of all for your time, but also your expertise. We're very excited about this coin. It does commemorate the founding of basketball in Springfield, Massachusetts, and as was said, this is a sport, a major sport around the world. Sometimes we think soccer is first; sometimes we think basketball is first. We think basketball is first around the world and growing. But this was a game invented in Springfield that was meant to be very much inclusionary by Dr. Naismith. He invented this game in December of 1891 in Springfield College and just 30 days later he was at Smith College teaching women how to play
basketball, introducing the game to women. He thought that women were very well suited for this game. He thought this game matched them.

He worked with a gentleman called EB Henderson down here in Washington, DC in the early 1900s. EB Henderson learned about the game when he was at Harvard from Dr. Naismith being at Springfield College. And EB Henderson is called the father of black basketball and working with Dr. Naismith, introduced the game to young African-American men.

And I think EB Henderson probably has the, the most understated view of basketball or, or kind of the most obvious thing he said at that point, that $I$ think this game is well suited for African-American men. And I think as we look at, back on the history of the game, he was incredibly correct.

So Dr. Naismith wanted this game to be very much an inclusive game everyone could play. UC basketball, boys, girls, men, women, college, pro, collegiate, the high school game, the international game, all around the world this game really has become a language, kind of a universal language, and we
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celebrate that at the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

I'm joined here by Don Senecal, our CFO, for the Hall of Fame. Don was the one who shepherded this through congress for the past two-and-a-half years. So he might look a little tired today, but relieved. And also Robin Vidito, development director, and kind of a one-on-point really of the communication from day to day for us and has done a great job.

And I'd be remiss if $I$ didn't mention the Mint staff and what a joy it has been to work with the Mint staff. We have, I think, but $I$ know a very, you know, great relationship. We go back and forth. We, we're invited to stretch the boundaries a little bit. But with all due respect, they have a wonderful velvet hammer to keep us inside the box of the, of the various rules we have here.

But our goal is, as $I$ sat with the, in our first meeting with the Mint director, was I'd like this to be, unless I'm, I'm incorrect on this, I'd like this to be the first coin that sells out. This is a coin -- so, so think about it. I mean we have
all around the world, at any age, this coin is an opportunity to touch people.

So we're all looking for to engage young people about coin collecting. Through basketball you can do that. If you're looking at engaging international people about collecting coins, US minted coins, basketball can do that. So we see the bigger picture. It's not just a, a core market that we have. I think that this allows us both to stretch ourselves a little bit.

And then finally I'll say that $I$ know at 1:45 today we have a marketing meeting. The Hall of Fame has many platforms, constituencies where the coin, the message of the coin can be shared. We are actually building a brand with the approval, of course, of the, of the Mint folks. We are building a brand that is going to be utilized. We run collegiate games, a national high school event, golf tournaments. We're at the NBA All Star game. We're at the NCAA Final Four.

We are building a brand for this over, you know, the 16,17 months that it will be running once
it's introduced at our enshrinement ceremony, by the way, on September 6th in Springfield on stage at an enshrinement. We're building a brand to support that with all the elements of communication that we have. So we feel very confident that this coin will be very, very successful. I take the challenge of being the first sellout very seriously and I appreciate the team that the Mint has provided to us. I appreciate the internal team, and Donald, the hard work that you did. We're very excited about this opportunity today. So thank you.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. We've worked hand-and-glove with John and his team and they have offered up five obverse designs that are their preferences. One of them is their first preference. I will note that as we move through the portfolio. On all of the designs our liaisons with the Hall have offered commentary, as well as Ron's team from Philadelphia on coinability.

So each design may have minor modifications that are needed for coinability or historical and technical accuracy purposes. As we move through the
portfolio, I will only note those for the top five preferences from the Hall, but should any committee member wish to know that information about any of the designs that are otherwise discussed, I'd be happy to provide that as well.

I should note that John and his team gave some very important feedback about the designs. These are to be emblematic of the sport, and among some of the feedback was the importance of communicating the global reach of the sport, the inclusivity, and also noting that it is a modern, dynamic, energetic game. Those were among them.

So while it has a rich history that dates back pretty far, that was not necessarily the upmost priority for the Hall at that time for us to communicate in the designs. But I'd like to ask John if you'd like to add to that list of things that the Committee should be considering as we move through the designs?

MR. DOLEVA: No, I think that's absolutely right. We had a discussion early on about whether we're celebrating the invention of the game in 1891
basketball or are we celebrating today's basketball.

And $I$ think from our standpoint we certainly are respective of the history of the game, the inventor, our institution and 70,000 square feet is dedicated to Dr. Naismith and his invention, but that we want to celebrate where that invention has gone today.

So it's a much more modern design. We want to obviously appeal as we had discussions about target markets and constituencies and other elements that we want to reach out to. So we've determined that it was more appropriate to have a more modernistic celebration of basketball and that's where we kind of hoped the designs would go and I think we've got some wonderful designs here.

MS. STAFFORD: Wonderful. Thank you. Should we take any questions or go ahead and go through the portfolio?

CHAIR URAM: Let's do the portfolio and then we'll --

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. So we'll start with obverse -- sorry. The liaison preferences and we will call these out as we move through the designs. Among
the five are Obverse 1, 2, 9, 10, and 19, with Obverse 19 being the Hall's first preference. And again, I will stop as we move through the entire portfolio and note the Hall's preferences as we move through. But again, the Hall provided five preferences, among them Obverse 1, 2, 9, 10, and 19, with Obverse 19 being their first preference.

This is a starting point from our discussion and $I$ know the Hall and the representatives are very eager to hear the Committee's feedback about the entire portfolio. So we'll start with discussion of Obverse 1 , which again has been identified as one of the five top preferences by the Hall of Fame.

Obverse 1 shows two women and two men playing basketball with a globe in the background representing the sport's worldwide appeal. Below, three spectators animatedly react to a tense moment. These seven figures are a reference to the seven Naismith values, which include teamwork, fitness, leadership, and perseverance.

The positioning of the spectators makes it clear that they're close to the action, a unique
characteristic of this sport. And the artist chose to represent both players and spectators in the composition so that everyone can see themselves in the design.

The Hall of Fame likes the inclusivity, the inclusion of players and fans and representation of both male and, and female members and figures. They also like the representation of the globe as a reference to the reach of the sport. They noted that the ball might have to be made a tad larger to be accurate.

As far as coinability and anesthetic notes from our team in Philadelphia, they would have to adjust the net because it will not be able to touch the outer rim of the coin. We'll have to add a little more space between the characters of the inscription Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, and it would require a consistent inner border around the frame so that it's not broken up as you see here at the bottom of the composition.

Moving on -- and if $I$ could ask for participants who are joining us by teleconference to
mute your phones, please. If you could mute your phones, we would appreciate it.

Moving on to Obverse 2, this also is a top preference of the five of the Hall of Fame. This design depicts a slam-dunk, one of the most exciting plays in the game. The perspective of the design accentuates the concavity of the athlete's body as his legs come forward through the momentum of the dunk.

The 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial

Basketball Hall of Fame is referenced with the number on the player's jersey. The American roots of the gave are indicated by the 13 strips on the soles of each of the shoes.

The Hall of Fame commented that they really appreciate the artistic style of this design and the reference to the $60 t h$ anniversary and the way that the year 2020 is stacked. They might suggest that the underline in the letter O in the inscription in God we trust be removed, and that the basketball text be moved to the side with the Hall of Fame text. Commentary from our coinability team, as well as aesthetic notes from the Mint staff in

Philadelphia, include that we'd have to have some adjustments in the word Naismith. The A and the I are a bit too close together. And would have to add space on some of the other inscriptions. They would like to look at the stacking and the placement of the year 2020 and make sure that that's optimally supporting the design.

They agree that we might have to revisit the underline under the letter $O$, and a note to the Committee, we might need to fade the rim near the border a bit more.

Again, I'll move on to Obverse 3. I will not again be reading the Hall of Fame's feedback or the Mint staff's feedback on any design that at present isn't identified as a top preference, but can offer those at the Committee's request.

Obverse 3 shows a basketball hoop with the word liberty incoproated in the netting, a way to reference that basketball was invented in the United States. The artist selected this primary device element to complement the curvature of the coin, as well as the reverse, which must depict a basketball.

In the background is a regulation basketball court.

Obverse 4 depicts an aerial view of a rim and net utilizing the concave shape of the coin. The design is offered as a complement to the reverse, which will feature the other iconic element of the sport, the basketball itself.

Obverse 5 depicts two outstretched hands close to a basketball. Whether the moment is a last second shot, a jump ball, or a blocked shot, the image captures the energy and excitement inherent in the game. Depicting only the hands underscores the inclusivity of the sport and recognizes all levels of the game, professional, collegiate, high school, recreational, and international.

Obverse 6 focuses on the net and the intense action that takes place near it. This could be a rebound shot or a shot in progress. The depiction of hands reflects the universality of the game. Just behind the hands, a semicircle, an arc present on many basketball courts under the net is shown. The artist's placement of these elements was driven by the concave shape of the coin which reflects the shape of
the net when viewed from above.

Obverse 7 depicts a jump ball capturing a powerful image of action with two arms extended to their upmost dynamically reaching for the basketball. The inscription for the design is the universal draw of basketball that brings people together through the love of the sport.

Obverse 8 features a stylized basketball hoop and a basketball. Inscriptions encircle the design around the border including basketball Hall of Fame delineated by two basketballs on either side.

Obverse 9 portrays a stylized compilation of arms shooting different shoots, a dunk, a layup, a hook, and a jump shot to convey the feel of a fastpaced, fun game. The artist elected to show a variety of shots to highlight the fundamental essence of the game - putting the ball in the basket.

This again is one of the Hall's five top preferences. They noted the design and applauded the modern and artistic elements. They appreciated the inclusion of the inscription 1959 for when the Hall was founded.

And some coinability and aesthetic notes. We have to look at the space between the characters and in the inscription in God we trust. The RT in the inscription liberty should not intersect the lines of the arms. Some of the border text is a tad t0o small and would need to be upsized, the inscription in God we trust by as much as $200 \%$ perhaps, and the inscription Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame both width and height by as much as 25\%.

The interior pattern you see here would not be rendered as such. In sculpt we would have to drop the dots. If you have questions about that, Ron Harrigal can further explain. And there would not be proof polish immediately behind the nets.

Moving on to Obverse 10 , which is another of the top five preferences of the Hall, this design centrally depicts two figures near a basket. The six stars arcing across the bottom of the design represent the six decades of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame's existence. The Hall of Fame likes the classic look of this design, the inclusion of the backboard, and the treatment of the 2020 inscription.

However, they feel that the depiction of only men playing is a bit limiting and would request that a female player be featured as well. Or in, in replacement of one of the male players.

Coinability and aesthetic notes from our team in Philadelphia. The spacing in the, on the inscriptions, the text, is a bit too tight. We'd need more space between the characters. It would include upsizing in God we trust and very minorly the splayed fingers in one of the player's hands would have to be closed up.

Obverse 22 showcases a spontaneous game of hoops perhaps during recess. No special gear needed, just the ball and a few kids, and a game can begin immediately. The artist intended for this design to show how one can develop a love of basketball at a young age.

Obverse 12 displays a hand that launches a basketball out of this world into deep space, a cosmic ring replaces the traditional basket to create its own planet of basketball. The design features the outline of the city of Springfield, Massachusetts where the
game was invented and where the Naismith Memorial Hall of Fame is located, and include the words Springfield and 1891, the year Dr. Naismith invented the game.

Obverse 13 features three basketball players in action, a physical representation of Dr. Naismith's inspiration values. Four of the seven Naismith values are listed around the design, teamwork, respect, fitness, and integrity. His creation of a game that all can play joyously at any skill level, age, or gender is represented in the different figures.

Obverse 14 features a rim and net with a court in the background with the additional inscriptions Basketball Hall of Fame and preservation, inspiration, celebration.

Obverse 15 leverages the concavity of the obverse by featuring a net which in combination with the basketball required on the reverse makes a powerful portrait of the game. The net's opening provides a central location for the required inscriptions.

Obverse 16 features major elements of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame building
including a large sphere that symbolizes the global reach of the game. Accenting the sphere is an arrowlike vector which depicts the momentum of the ball. In the foreground is a basketball player on a fence, offense moving so fast his individual features are blurred. The ball flowing from his hand is about to go through the hoop in the foreground.

Obverse 18 heralds the energy and excitement of basketball by depicting the high energy and upclose action of the game. The star represents a basketball team. Five points for five players. The star also signifies the stars of the sport acknowledged by the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

Obverse 19 portrays the intense, hands-on action of the game of basketball, the constant struggle for possession of the ball, and the skill required to overcome the opponent and put the ball through the hoop. The design features three different figures all reaching for the ball in unison, suggesting how the sport has brought together millions of diverse people from around the world through a
simple universal and unifying athletic experience.
Their arms are intentionally elongated just slightly to emphasize the full exertion of physical and mental effort required to excel in the game. The rim and net are presented as subtle background elements to compliment the primary figures.

As noted, this is the first preferred design from the Hall of Fame of their five that they have identified. They noted they appreciated this design very much for the inclusive nature including genders and abilities. They also appreciated the use of the rim as the edge of the coin and felt that the net did not get lost in the design.

Worth noting, the uniforms are depicted accurately. They would like to hear about potentially applying a different treatment for the inscription 2020 and incorporating Basketball Hall of Fame as an inscription perhaps.

Feedback from our Mint team in Philadelphia regarding coinability and aesthetic comments. The basketball cannot intersect with the outer rim. Legs running over the border, may need to shift them to
make the border cleaner due to the concave shape of the, the coin. Border elements cannot extend out to the border in the same way that we do with other coins. And the black channels, the black in the channels of the basketball would need to be lighter, more within a tonal range.

And finally, Obverse 20 centrally features a basketball. I apologize. There are two more. Obverse 20 centrally features a ball with an image of a globe to symbolize the global outreach of the sport. The ball has passed through the hoop and net representing the path from the past to the present to the future of the sport. The netting is detached and broken in particular areas.

Following clockwise along the circular shape of the net on the outer most layer the word Naismith can be seen. Memorial is depicted in the second layer and basketball in the inner most layer. Hall of Fame is inscribed between the central basketball and the net using a similar pattern inspired by the net.

And finally, Obverse 21 depicts an aerial view of a basketball hoop. Looking down, the viewer
sees the rim of the hoop through the inside of the net. This design in conjunction with the concave shape of the obverse is meant to convey a feeling of depth.

And that concludes the obverse designs. Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR URAM: Thank you very much, April. And before we move on just for attendance purposes, Robert Hoge, are you on the phone?

MR. HOGE: Yes.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HOGE: Yes.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Are there any technical questions from the committee before we move on to designs and discussion? Seeing none, Ron Harrigal, are there any technical questions on your side that we should be aware of?

MR. HARRIGAL: None at this point. I mean these designs are from external artists and we have addressed coinability to them. Not all the revisions have been incorporated in this design. It is their concepts. And so there will be slight changes of, of
the design based on what the Committee preferences are.

CHAIR URAM: Perfect. Thank you. When I introduced myself to John Robin and, and Robin, Robin, John, Don. There you go. I mentioned that I had gone to a small basketball school, the University of Kentucky, and I think they understood that. And so I'm going to start out with, I think with a boilermaker and why don't we start out with Mr. Mike Moran on the phone. And Mike, do you want to pick up on that or dribble, whatever you want to do? MR. MORAN: Yeah. CHAIR URAM: Take the shot. MR. MORAN: I've got season tickets. CHAIR URAM: I know. I traded him some points for basketball tickets. MR. MORAN: Yeah, (inaudible - off phone mic). Okay. I'm just going to talk about the ones that (inaudible) and the one of my favorite is No. 2. I think it's dynamic in nature. While basketball is certainly a team sport, when you look at the basketball players today, it's made up of a lot of
individuals. They play together. But you think of people like Anthony Davis, (inaudible) player, but there are others that are really good. You go back and we had one on our committee, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar. I saw him play. Saw him beat the tar out of Perdue. Michael Jordan.

To me this image is good. I think it is reasonably coinable. I think the idea of the feet coming at you. I've seen these kinds of dunks all the time, every game I go to watch. And I think the way it will show up on a concave surface will be excellent. I'm not a fan of No. 9. I, I get it. It's nice. It's modern, but that's not me. You can take me to water, but I'm not going to drink it.

Let's talk about 19, the Hall of Fame favorite. It's also one of mine. (Inaudible) talk about is bleeding into edges and I get that. They're asking the Mint to do something that the technology is not there to support with this design.

The other thing is when you look at the reverses, and $I$ know that we need to choose these things individually, I'm guessing the need for the

Naismith Hall of Fame to be in there in the inscriptions, and $I$ can't get it there as I look at this obverse without cluttering it and losing some of the design, design. I'll be voting for it, but I really have some issues and I think that it won't look as good as it is rendered here on the page.

No. 18, I'll vote for it simply because that guy's about to get called for palming the ball and he's going to turn it over. That's it, Tom.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Mike. Thank you. Move along. Dr. Dean Kotlowski?

DR. KOTLOWSKI: Okay. I am going to -- I applaud the artists for what they have, what they've done in giving us a real diversity here of designs to look at. As I looked through these the first time, I was drawn to -- I really do like the classic design of No. 10. I know that, that is one of the favorites, so it's not the identified favorite. I, I do like in No. 1 the inclusion of the spectators. And I, I think No. 19 is, is, is very striking as well. And I think I have -- I know we're not supposed to talk about the reverses yet, but $I$ did have stronger preferences with
the, with the reverses than the obverses.

So I just want to raise one issue about No.

19 and $I$ don't want to, you know, invite any
controversy here, but we were looking at a coin during my first meeting and we were talking a little bit about how you picked, depict people of different abilities in a way that's respectful. And I don't have any issue here, but I'm, I'm just wondering if, if that's a concern.

It's not really a concern of mine, but I'm just kind of interested in if anybody has any insights 'cause $I$ think it is very striking that you have three very different people, you know, with these elongated arms stretching and striving. And the symbolism is very powerful.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Dean. Erik?

MR. JANSEN: Is this mic on? Is this mic on?

CHAIR URAM: Are the members still on the
phone?

MR. WEINMAN: I think we lost Paul.

MS. STAFFORD: Anyone on the call. Okay. We can pause, Mr. Chairman, if you like.

CHAIR URAM: Sure.
MS. STAFFORD: Okay. This is United States Mint. Do we still have folks on the line? Maybe we want to start with the CACC members to ensure that they're there?

CHAIR URAM: Yeah, and they said 17 are on the line. That's what we started with. Just to verify, Robert Hoge present? Robert? Dennis Tucker? MR. TUCKER: Present. Dennis Tucker. CHAIR URAM: Thank you. Michael Moran? MR. MORAN: Present. CHAIR URAM: Thank you. We'll follow back up. Robert probably takes a little bit longer to catch on, you know, to connect. Okay. We were moving to Erik. Erik, thank you. Sorry for the interruption.

MR. JANSEN: With all due respect to our Chair and the prior speaker from Kentucky, I'm 6'6" and I came from the real place of basketball, and that would be Indiana. That's right cross the river from Kentucky (crosstalk).
CHAIR URAM: He'd love to be --

MR. MORAN: He'd be throwing a chair.

MR. JANSEN: They throw things over the river at us all the time. All right. On to the task at hand here.

I have two comments directed to the Mint and this is real requests and recommendations. We obviously are charged to follow the mission as defined by Congess and the Hill on programs like this. However, to the extent that we have input back to them, I have two messages that I'd ask the Mint to consider carrying back up to the Hill.

One, programs where we have one design for all three sized coins create a real missed opportunity. What we can do on a large silver pallet, inch-and-a-half approximately in diameter, versus what we can do on a gold pallet are approximately the size of a nickel for totally different missions.

So to have one piece of art we necessarily fail on the silver and we have to accommodate the gold because it's such a small pallet. So I think the, I can't speak for the Committee, but in the experience of history here, to the extent we can recommend

Congress not pick one design fits all, we'll be able to do a better job.

The second point I'd like to make is I think we've missed the boat here on this legislation just like we did on the prior athletic concave, convex coin. And that is there's not a product for general circulation here. Let me paint a picture for you. If someone goes to a basketball game and they buy a drink or a slice of pizza or something that's concession, if there was a circulating version of this, let's just say a flat, non-concave, minimize costs, get a product out that could be given in change at the concession stand, we would go ten times further, faster, better towards attracting new collectors, and quite honestly, painting a picture that this program offers coinage for the general population.

We always struggle with price points to cover costs and surcharges, but if such a coin could have been put out there through the Fed at circulating face value, this program would have sold itself. As it is, and I'm going to recommend strongly to the Naismith executives here, you're going to have to market this
hard. It will not sell itself. Your primary money maker will probably be the silver dollar because of price point and popularity. The gold will not sell a lot. You'll be lucky if you sell 2 or 3,000 of these. It's the silver dollar that's your moneymaker here. Market it aggressively and you'll do much, much better. So thank you for indulging my comments there.

As $I$ went through this portfolio, first of all, a couple of comments. I found there were many many cases, and I think a public submission process is a wonderful way of injecting new spirit and ideas; however, I would encourage the artists to pay close attention to the ergonomics.

I am a ballplayer. I was played to dribble with my eyes closed through my legs and make a shot without even knowing where the basket is. The hands, the gestures in so many of these drawings are not, they're just not right. And so they're very, very distracting to me.

Second of all, $I$ found there were a number of trite symbols. It was very easy to accommodate a net, but this coin is not about a net. This coin needs to
be about energy. To that end $I$ very quickly winnowed this down to a few designs that in many cases were overlapping the preferences of the Naismith people. So I'll address the ones that $I$ think deserve consideration and let the others go.

A thinking man's coin here or a thinking woman's coin, a thinking player's coin, would be Design 1, Design 19, potentially Design 10. However, thinking designs will not sell this coin. Action designs will sell this coin and there's only one coin that truly, only one design that truly carries that forward here.

I was extremely pleased that Design No. 2 was a preference because to me this is no-brainer design for this coin. It, a coin has to convey feeling and it will be a sculpture's challenge to convey the feeling on the player's face. Mouth open with teeth, Heidi Wastweet, an ex-member of this committee, would have said to us be careful. It's going to look like a rabbit. We saw that in the Ronald Reagan dollar. We've seen that in many coins where it's an open mouth with teeth. This is a sculptor's challenge.

The second challenge will be the eyes are closed. That's a very, very small feature on, with the gold, an extremely small coin. With the silver dollar it'll be a little bit easier to see. But this is a coin of energy. To me it's the only coin that, that, that, that answers the charge to make this a coin which will satisfy the buyer that wants to replicate the feeling, the energy, the spark, the moment of scoring which is what basketball is about. Thank you very much.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Erik. And I agree, we had the similar issue with six coins with the Apollo not having different designs --

MS. STAFFORD: Yes.
CHAIR URAM: -- when --
MR. JANSEN: It's been a lesson that we seem to fail to learn. I mean lawyers that want to be artists, how about artists that want to be lawyers?

CHAIR URAM: Okay.
MR. MORAN: It's an either or.
CHAIR URAM: Okay. Ron, do you have any
comments on the (inaudible) sizes as it relates to any
of these designs that you'd like to get out before we continue on with our discussion?

MR. HARRIGAL: I think Erik hit it on the head when he said that, you know, the designs have to accommodate both, the silver dollar size as well as the gold, which is a . 850, size of a nickel. So, yeah, we have to -- a lot of these comments are more geared towards on the smallest size when we talk about having to respace text and upsize the text.

CHAIR URAM: So you'll focus on what --
MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah, and we do, we do have, you know, successful programs that have the same designs, but we also have unsuccessful. We have the, you know, the gold bullion and, and the, and the buffalo, American Buffalo series and that. But again, those are collected for different reasons.

You know, we had breast cancer; it had the same designs. And we have had the Apollo and that. But, yes, there are pros and cons definitely there. But yeah, accommodating the smallest size is really what we look at when we talk about spacing of text and the size of the text and what we can actually do from
an engraving standpoint.
CHAIR URAM: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.
Robert, excuse me one second. Don?
MR. SCARINCI: I'm sorry. Can I ask a question to Greg?

MS. WEINMAN: Yes.
MR. SCARINCI: Are you sure there's no workaround? Are we stuck with one design for all three? There's no --

MR. WEINMAN: I'll let my colleague, April Whitaker, comment, but it's in the legislation.

MS. STAFFORD: Right. The legislature requires one design.

MR. WEINMAN: No way to --
CHAIR URAM: Those are common, but it specifically says common obverse, common reverse.

MS. STAFFORD: That's too bad.
MR. JANSEN: That's a shame. It's a tragedy.
CHAIR URAM: And I, and I think that gets back to the, the education side of on this. Great ideas, but when it comes down to the specific, and I think that we're doing a better job getting the
message out to congress people that, you know, to, to be a little bit more, look beyond just the topic and just beyond what they're trying to accomplish.

So I think that Betty's doing, you know, getting that word out there much more now than it had been before. So Robert, are you on the phone?

MS. STAFFORD: Did we lose everybody again? CHAIR URAM: Hello. Michael? MR. MORAN: I'm, I'm here. CHAIR URAM: Okay. Robert, we'll come back. I don't think --

MR. WEINMAN: I e-mailed Robert.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Mary.
MS. LANNIN: These were challenges for me mostly because I'm like under 5'6". But anyway, I too liked No. 2. I agree with what Erik said. And I also did like the favorite, which is No. 19. When we look at our large scale drawings and see them representative of the actual size that they'll be, I think, you know, Ron is this right? I think that 19 will work for coinability.

MR. HARRIGAL: Absolutely. I mean we, you
have to look at the rim depicted there is going to be inside the border. So the artwork would have to, you know. It would, it would be coined as shown there. As you get close to the border, we just have to fade the artwork down. So there's not a lot of detail there. I think, I think we'll be okay.

And we also have to keep in mind that this has to be a proof coin and an uncirculated coin. So that when we look at the field on here, we have the net structure that's on the field. Now typically on a proof coin, that would be polished. We'd have to look at some way to depict the net maybe with like a laser texture or something like that that would show the net on, on the, on the polished field for the proof coin. And also allow it to be like a burnished finish for, for the uncirculated.

MS. LANNIN: Well, I liked this one very much be, because of the inclusion. All three people are equally going for the same basketball. You know, so there's, there's really not a barrier whether it's ability, disability, or gender. And so they're all going for the same thing. So that was what was really
important to me in this.
In terms of just something that $I$ found was
interesting that we haven't talked about is No. 4. I
just thought that that was a really, it was a
beautiful design. It was simple and $I$ thought that
the shading on it was very interesting and that it
would certainly go along with any reverse that we
would pick.

So my choices would be No. 2 possibly with
his eyes open. I don't know why his eyes are closed.
MR. JANSEN: That's actually what happens to
the human mind when you --
MS. LANNIN: But it's weird to look at, Erik.
MR. JANSEN: It's, it's, it's reality.
MS. LANNIN: I know. It's just weird to look
at. I'm sorry. So, and No. 19. And that's all.
CHAIR URAM: Thank you. 2 and 19?
MS. LANNIN: 2 and 19.
CHAIR URAM: Mm-hm. Thank you. Robin?
MS. SALMON: Well, I, $I$ went kind of in the
opposite direction. I really like the net, and the
thinking of, of that imagery as being more artistic, I
guess. And also how some words were woven into the net. So No. 3, No. 4, No. 15, and No. 20 intrigued me. No. 20 in particular. I, I couldn't find all the letters in it, but $I$ would think that that would be enough of a challenge to people who collect coins such as this that it would develop more interest in people wanting to get it so that they could find the letters.

I could be totally wrong on that, but $I$ thought it was very interesting. The idea of this being a universal symbol of the game along with the basketball I think was important to me. And just how it was depicted was, was different than most of the other designs.

I also liked No. 19 if, a design with people in it for all of the reasons that have been already addressed. And of course making sure that the design works with the final coin itself. So those, I like those five choices, 3, 4, 15, 19, and 20.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you. Robert? Not on yet.

I thought I heard him on. Sam. We'll go to Sam.

MR. GILL: Well, first I commend the, the artists. They're all very interesting to me. I'll
just go through my top two or three here. I like No. 2. I think to Erik's points, it's certainly marketable, No. 2 is. And I like No. 19. I like the inclusiveness about it and I like the competition. I went with activity. I looked at the coins that had activity on them.

And I focused my preference on No. 10 for this, for these reasons. It shows a competition, competition between two players. That's kind of how I think of basketball. And then I like the fact that it mentions the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame. And $I$ just think that this would -- and it's got the, the rim up there and the net. And I think it would, it would just make a very beautiful coin.

CHAIR URAM: Okay, Sam. Thank you. Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: First thing, the first thing I want to say is, you know, a compliment to everyone -is there a mic? A compliment to everyone who submitted these designs. And I think, I think they did a fabulous job with the designs and everyone who submitted a design, we should absolutely send them an application for the artist infusion program next year
and be sure they, be sure they apply.
They did a great job and they were very, these are very creative designs and, and, and you all know particularly which one $I$ like the most, right? So No. 1. No. 2, I want to, I want to, I really think we all need to focus on the fact that this is a concave coin, right? So, you know, while some of the designs like this one might look great if the coin were flat, you know, when, you know, have to, you really have to, your mind have has to really bend it and ask, and ask how's it going to look at a concave. And then you're kind of stuck with it in all three coins.

So whatever we pick, it's got to work with all three of the sizes, right? So the two things we have to think of. One, we have to use our mind for, which is the concaveness, right? And the other, we have the advantage of using this little board to see, which is the, which is the size of the pallet. And we always have difficulty with the size of the pallet. And unfortunately you have to look at the smallest size that we're given, which is the gold. So it can't
be too cluttered and crowded because of the gold.
So that's the real tragedy of one design for all three coins, unfortunately, but that's what it is. We don't decide that. Our boss decides that and our boss is Congress. So all of that being said, you know, I, I, I look at these designs and of course, you know, you, you all know, you all know the designs. You, I probably don't even have to say which one that I like. You all know $I$ think No. 9 is great, right? I think it's, I think it's a great basketball coin. I think there's a lot -- it has so much going for it as a coin, as a design.

I could see the, I could see why you liked No. 2. I think, I think it's going to be a -- that would -- that's really going to be challenge to the, to the sculpt, to, to sculpt it, but $I$ mean we absolutely have the talent, you know, to, to sculpt this. So there's no question we have the talent to do it, but it will be a challenge. And, and, and probably in, in a concave, in a concave coin, this might be cool, you know.

So, so while they may say -- oh, somebody
just --
CHAIR URAM: I'm passing it down so --
MR. SCARINCI: Oh.
CHAIR URAM: -- it gets down to John and
everybody so they can see -- now that's the half
dollar coin.
MR. SCARINCI: This is the half dollar coin.
CHAIR URAM: You have it now? Okay.
MR. SCARINCI: So, so, so what 2 has going
for it, right, it's a simple, you know, it's
relatively simple. It's one, one element. So for the
smaller designs, you know, it, it's more simple for
the smaller designs than for the larger designs.
What I'm concerned about for 19 , which, you
know, which, you know, I, I have to be the one to
articulate this because I'm the democrat on the
committee and I have to, and I'm the, I'm the, I'm
the, I'm the appointee of the democrat, right? So I
should be the one to say this, but I have to say this,
right? It's too politically correct.
MR. JANSEN: I agree.
MR. SCARINCI: And it's a 2020 coin, right,
which is like the wrong year to be, to have a politically correct coin. You know, so I really have to be the one to say this. Nobody else can say this. And I have to be the one to say it. All right. I just, $I$ just don't know about -- I just don't know -I just don't know that it's the right thing to do at that time.

So I would caution, you know, you to think about that 'cause you're going to be the one selling it in 2020. Because when you going to sell it, right? So that's my concern. And $I$ think if you, if you play with it, you know, it, it might be kind of cool in a concave way 'cause, you know, you'll, you'll play with it. You'll get it. You know, you'll smoosh it a little bit and it might be kind of cool.

Design wise on the gold, it's going to be kind of squishy on the gold. And it's going to even be a little squishy on the half dollar. So there's a lot going on there. Three, three figures, the basketball's going to be teeny-tiny on the gold. The basketball's going to be really teeny-tiny.

So even from a design point of view, there's
just a lot going on there for the gold one and maybe too much even for the, for the little half dollar.

So for that, for the, for the, for the silver dollar, you're fine. So, but anyway, my concern with that is what I said. So I think, you know. And as much as I like No. 1 'cause you all know I kind of like No. 1, I really like No. 1 for the dollar, but I've got the same concern with No. 1 for the gold and for the half dollar. There's a lot going on there.

Although, I think No. 1 is really, is really cool. I think No. 1 works. So, you know, so, so -and I, I also think -- you know, Rob, Robin made a really good comment about, about the baskets. I mean I do think, I do think the baskets would work fabulously. And if, and if in fact we have the ability to have separate designs, I would absolutely put the basket on the gold. On the little gold, it's perfect for the little gold.

MR. JANSEN: Unfortunately we don't have that flexibility.

MR. SCARINCI: I know. I know. Which is why I was hoping for Greg and his, and his battery of
legal interns who are here for the summer to -CHAIR URAM: To wave the magic wand. MR. SCARINCI: To maybe came up with some hook.

MR. JANSEN: We would, we would love to able to use the gold as the thematic area and the silver and the half as the action character carrier, but we don't have that flexibility.

MR. SCARINCI: I know. I mean because the basket, that basket one that Robin is talking about would be great for the gold. It would really make a great gold coin. So you know, with, with, you know, and I'm trying to stick with the four because I think, I think you all did a fabulous -- you know, you've just done, you've clearly done your homework and you've clearly done a lot of, a great job, you know. And, and you've put a lot of thought into it and, you know, you put a lot of time into this, you know. And, and I guess, you know, you know, in my, you know, and what I'm going to say to you really is, you know, you know, you know, you have all the makings of a winner here and you've got to top baseball
because, you know, baseball, just so you know, baseball, the baseball half dollar won a coin of the year award after a seven year dry spell for the United States Mint without winning an ward. The baseball won, won a, won a coin of the year award.

So, you know, now you can't always control how an award gets won, but you can control selling out. So.

CHAIR URAM: So you want to follow that hit up with a slam dunk.

MR. SCARINCI: Exactly.
MR. DOLEVA: Mr. Chairman, can I, can I respond?

CHAIR URAM: Sure. Go ahead.
MR. SCARINCI: I definitely want you to respond and $I$ want you to, and $I$ want to hear your opinion and $I$ would love also to call upon the Mint's marketing people, marketing director as well. I'd like to put you on the spot with, with a question about marketing this thing and what you, and what you think and what our marketing director thinks as well would, would sell the best.

MR. DOLEVA: So let me respond if I could first to the politically correct aspect of your comments. And I get what you're saying there. I will, $I$ will tell you, you know, we only have to rewind six days and think about the women's national soccer team and what --

MR. LANNIN: Thank you very much. MR. DOLEVA: -- impact of that was. And I will tell you that quietly, but soon I'm sure to, to bubble up will be the women's basketball side as well. We reviewed this with several hall of famers. You know we induct both men and women players, coaches, contributors.

In fact, we made up -- the first sample we made to go to congress and try to hype this thing up, we had none other than Jerry West, Bob Cousy. We had Kareem. We had Karl Malone. Did I say Cousy? Who was the fifth? Jerry West. So if we have five images on a coin to go to congress and say if we could do something like this, and we take it back to the Hall of Fame and we show a, a collection, you know, of our Hall of Famers, and the women go something's missing,
there's something missing here, it's a big part of the game, the women's game.

I think from a marketing standpoint and from a, and this is perhaps something that this committee doesn't, doesn't worry about, but from a, a commentary standpoint, from a newsworthy standpoint, I think not giving consideration to having a woman represented on this coin would be a risk.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, John.
MS. LANNIN: Thank you.
CHAIR URAM: Appreciate it.
MS. LANNIN: Yes.

CHAIR URAM: Don, anything further?
MS. SCARINCI: I'd like to hear from --
MR. DOLEVA: The marketing side?
MS. SCARINCI: -- the, the marketing, my marketing question for you and for, and for our marketing which design -- I'm going to put you on the spot and, you know, 'cause now you've heard a lot of commentary and you've heard a lot of what we all think. But, but I really want to sell out on this and I'm happy with --

CHAIR URAM: (Crosstalk) comment when we finish.

MS. SCARINCI: Okay.
CHAIR URAM: Let's do it that way.
MS. SCARINCI: I'll, I'll hold the question until the end.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Jeanne?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, you know, my, my initial response to this portfolio, which is $I$ think outstanding, and I have to agree with Robin. I loved the basket because, you know, it seemed to fit with our, our shape. But I must say to listen to the stakeholders, to listen to your passion about what we need to have represented and inclusion and everything about basketball, you have certainly inspired me to change my, my mind. So thank you very much.

And I was very happy to, once I changed my mind, to know that your preference is No. 19 'cause I do think that that's the most inclusive. But what concerns me about this is, as Donald said, you have such a lot of information on a small coin, the gold.

The other thing that concerns me is how are we going to get all of the, the Naismith Memorial on that coin? But --

MS. STAFFORD: Just, just a note. It's certainly not a requirement and $I$ know that our, our representatives from the Hall are, are open to the possibility of it not. It was just something that they said it would be, it would be preferable. But I don't know that it's a requirement, especially given the various sizes.

MR. DOLEVA: We've had discussion about the packaging that the coins would come in.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. So --
MR. DOLEVA: -- materials that would go with it in telling the Naismith story to, to a great extent. So our thought process was it's a very impactful coin. It represents the entire game on both sides of the coin, and provide those additional materials once a purchase is made, and during the marketing process of marketing to people that we kind of tell the whole story. But you can't, you know, tell the whole story with two sides of a coin. So it
gives us the opportunity to educate beyond that. MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. I, I, I truly like No. 19 because of its inclusion, and $I$ also like No. 1 because No. 1 is a little bit more contemporary and $I$ think it probably would strike -- convincingly we have, you know, the action of the spectators and the action of the players. And we have the inclusion of the, the various genders.

So, you know, I'm, I'm going, I'm going to
support 19, 1, and 2 and No. 2 because it is so dynamic. The only problem with No. 2 is we don't have a woman on there. So thank you.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Jeanne. Yes? MR. JANSEN: Just a thought here. Because the, I think the perspective went out to the public had the date, in God we trust, and liberty as the required elements, $I$ assume that once we harmonize the design here with the opposition side, we'll then address where we're going to drop potentially the values, the Naismith Memorial Basketball and so forth. So, so the text is not the issue here. It's really
artistic design.
The second thing is $I$ have a question on No. 20, Design No. 20. And I, I mentioned this to Robin. I think the artist misspelled Naismith if I'm not -the correct spelling is $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{I}$ ?

MS. STAFFORD: That, that's correct and it's something --

MR. JANSEN: And I think it says N-I-A.
MS. STAFFORD: It's, that's correct and we did notice that. It was something that we felt we could speak to and of course it would be remediated should it be --

MR. JANSEN: Okay. And I'm certainly not advancing this, but we're going to end up going into design by committee mode, which is almost always a mess.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Erik. Okay. Dennis?
MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can everyone hear me?

CHAIR URAM: Very good, Dennis. Thank you.
MR. TUCKER: Okay. Thanks. I want to add my voice to what Erik said. I think he spoke very
eloquently and, and summed up some of the issues that we face with the legislation coming out of congress. The, the limitation of having a single obverse and reverse pair of designs for three different coins, not only from a technical standpoint as we've discussed, having to design for the smallest template, the five dollar gold, we, there's that issue.

But we're also missing out on an opportunity to really broaden a program's scope and appeal and tell a story, as we sometimes say, of how six different emphases rather than just two. So I, I'm a little disappointed that we continue to see that, that kind of legislation coming out and I hope that they can change.

The, the idea of having a coin for circulation is interesting as well. I mean there's a wonderful circulating quarter now. But of course that, that gets into other congressional elements that is required.

So as I was going through these designs, I, I was struck by the fact that every commercial dye making firm in the United States has an inventory of
stock of basketball designs, right? You see them in school awards and metals for competitions. We see a lot of basketball swishing in nets, balls and nets, hands gripping basketball. So when $I$ was looking at these designs, I was onboard for anything that puts those parameters behind and, and leave those cliches behind.

I really liked No. 2, No. 13, and No. 19. No. 2 has energy that Erik was talking about that a lot of us noted. No. 19, I, I love the, the inclusive aspects of it. I don't think political correctness will really be an issue here. I think that would broaden the market and the appeal of, of the design. And it just kind of illustrates how if we had three obverse pairs to work with, we would be able to tell a lot more of the story of basketball. And (inaudible) and the inclusive one for design.
(Inaudible - off phone mic) the Mint's feedback on the design side and also our liaisons' feedback on, on designs that were not among their top five choices. I'm curious to hear what they thought of No. 13. For me that one stood out for its use of
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the, the Naismith focus on teamwork, respect, fitness, integrity. Those are things that we don't see in every design.

And, and here it is spelled out. I like the fact that it's spelled out here so it kind of elevates basketball to more than just a game or a past time and, and gets to some of the important, the other important aspects that Naismith was going for (inaudible). Any (inaudible) comments on 13?

MS. STAFFORD: Absolutely. From our colleagues at the Hall of Fame, they complimented this designation for depicting the diversity of figures and the inclusion of some of the Naismith principles. However, they noted that the basketballs in the background were reading to the, more like volleyballs in the way that the figures are interacting with them. And noted that the proportions of the ball to the figures would also have to be adjusted.

From the team in Philadelphia for coinability, as well as aesthetic commentary, the inscription in God we trust would have to be upsized, as well as the inscription liberty. And I'll ask Ron
to comment. We have a note that we cannot have the, the foot over the zero in 2020. So, in the lower area. I don't know, Ron, if you had anything you wanted to add?

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah. The, in addition to that, I would think that net creates a bit of the challenge to making a proof and uncirculated coin. And I think similar to No. 19 we'd have to look at some sort of maybe using a laser texture for the net feature in the background. I think outside of that, you have the single depicted circle for the border. We'd have to define whether that is truly a bead or a change in elevation. And then that would affect how that foot, how we'd have to sculpt that foot, yeah. In that perspective I think, I think I agree with all the other comments.

MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Ron and April. One, I'm kind of torn here. I, I really like No. 19. I think it's a, it's a great design from the perspective of being inclusive and welcoming many different kinds of players and participants and spectators. There's great appeal in that. From a marketing perspective, I
think No. 2 is the most exciting, the most energetic, and probably would be one that really resonates. But on the vitriol level with, with a big audience. So 2 and 19 are the strongest candidates in my opinion.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Thank you, Dennis. And is Robert -- Robert, are you available on the phone? MR. WEINMAN: Robert just informed me by email that he can hear everything we're saying, but we seem to be having trouble hearing him.

CHAIR URAM: Robert, if you would like to then document through e-mail since we can't hear you, and you could score and make your comments.

MR. WEINMAN: Is your phone muted, Robert? Can you check your mute on your phone?

CHAIR URAM: On mute?

MR. WEINMAN: Robert?
CHAIR URAM: Well, while they're checking on that, I'll just make a couple comments and then we'll ask him one more time. If not, we can do it via email through your -- you guys can communicate. I too first of all, everyone's mentioned the motion and what we have here and that's exciting. And I was
originally pretty much going with that and I like 19 as well. Those were my two picks, as well as like the net, you know, just too bad.

But on this one I also like the fact that you
kind of bring Special Olympics into this as well, you know, into the, into the fray of the entire marketing aspect of this as well. And I almost feel that the basketball shouldn't even be there. I think if you have the basketball on the reverse, it could be something where they are reaching for.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: That's a good idea. CHAIR URAM: And, so, I mean I think I'm going to lean now more towards 19 because it does, it does do what I think the stakeholders would like to see it do. And then at the end if you have your comments on my, on the basketball thought there once we look at the reverse designs, then we can make some comments from there. I will give you a marketing idea, though, when we do into the marketing side of this.

MR. WEINMAN: Robert, is that you?
MR. HOGE: Hey. Sorry.

CHAIR URAM: Okay, Robert, I'll, I'll -- I'm going to save my thoughts for the end on the marketing side, but if you have some comments you'd like to make regarding the designs? Okay.

MR. MORAN: Hey, Tom. This is Mike.

CHAIR URAM: Yes.

MR. MORAN: Is this a good time for me to break? I've got to get radiated.

CHAIR URAM: All right. Well --

MR. HARRIGAL: We've got his ballet already.

CHAIR URAM: We have it. Thank you very much. Catch up with you in a little while.

MR. WEINMAN: Robert, can you hear us?

CHAIR URAM: Well, what $I$ was going to say as it relates to marketing, if you could get -- now this is a stretch, but you know how all of these slab companies are doing, what they're doing with autographs and so forth, and you mentioned about the collateral materials that you're going to have that relates to this. What if you guys had 50 basketball players do 1,000 signatures and randomly place different signatures within the basketball coins
themselves. Just a thought.

MR. HARRIGAL: In partnership with
(inaudible) company and we are speaking with them about how best to market the, this opportunity.

CHAIR URAM: If you had autographs in there that were personalized, like the slabbing companies do and you're doing it in advance, $I$ think you'll have collectors really going after just seeing which one they would end up with. Just a thought.

MR. SENECAL: We also advised (crosstalk)
issue.

CHAIR URAM: Pardon me?

MR. SENECAL: That has to be a secondary offer, I mean market because it can't be packaged that way. That's what we've been advised.

MR. DOLEVA: From the Mint. We would then have to purchase those --

CHAIR URAM: Well, they can do what they want on that, can't they?

MR. JANSEN: (Crosstalk) that discussion probably doesn't belong (crosstalk). CHAIR URAM: You guys, you guys work that out
if it can ever be done, but the guys can help if it can be done, if it can be worked. But anyhow, is there any other discussion?

MR. SCARINCI: Your, your comment about removing the basketball from 19 , $I$ dare enter the caseum called designed by committee, but I'll say the following. I think there was a discussion a bit ago when we were dealing with designs for the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Or perhaps it was before that. Designs where there was a design with a young person reaching out to hold a dove and the question was is it a dove there, is the reach there. And we toyed with does the dove need to be there and then the comment was made then it won't be clear what they're reaching for. And I, I think the ball is of the essence for that because the game is not about -- honestly, the game is not about the score. The game is about the technique and the pursuit of scoring. And without the ball being there, you lost half of the story. So I just, I would question that.

And my next comment would be if, if we are to
go with what is a politically correct design here in No. 19, I think, one, we should be adding a young child to this one because most of the basketball players in this country didn't start in college. They started as young child. And I think much of the interest in this country as soccer's proven to us, has to start when the kids are there.

So if we're going to do truly political correctness, $I$ think we need a child added as a fourth player.

CHAIR URAM: Back to designed by committee. MR. SCARINCI: It's a total mistake. CHAIR URAM: Yeah. Okay. If everyone would please turn in your score sheets, we'll take a -MR. SCARINCI: I asked a question about the market.

CHAIR URAM: Sure.

MR. SCARINCI: I wanted to hear based on now you've heard everything that we've all had to say and I'd like to hear that the Mint's marketing and from you 'cause I'm going to put you on the spot. And quite frankly, I'm going to vote for the one you think
you can sell out, or that you, the one that -- if you both agree. If you both agree on a design that you think you can sell out, that's the one I'm voting for. So do you both agree on which of these designs you think you can sell out?

MR. DOLEVA: We certainly haven't talked about this before, so $I$ think it's a good question. From standpoint of running the Hall of Fame for 20 years and seeing the growth of the women's games specifically, and how important it is and how it's becoming the forefront of basketball and issues, I do feel strongly that, that we should have representation of, of all that play.

I'm not sure about a child. I think this can be aspirational. Children can, can look to play when they're in college or become a pro player, become a pro player or something like that.

I, I look at it from the standpoint of, of, you know, our, our vision is to introduce this at enshrinement and I'm, I'm thinking when we unveil to a vast audience of 2,500 people at enshrinement, made up of men and women, coaches across the whole
international space of basketball, my gut feeling is that if, if we unveil one that does not have a woman represented on either side of this, of this coin, we've, we've swung and missed.

So from the saleability standpoint, I think we take some percentage of that market opportunity away. I think that wheelchair basketball which, which goes beyond Special Olympics, goes to USA basketball, the Olympic team and Paralympics, and I think that group would be very pleasantly surprised that they are included in this. They often feel that they're, that they're not thought of and it's a, it's, we've had MBA players sit in wheelchairs and try to, they're to play basketball. Can't do it. So the skill level is beyond that of have all of us lucky enough to be mobile.

So I'm leaning towards the more inclusive. And understanding what James Naismith was all about when he designed this game. So it's kind of that message as well. So that, that's where I come from. It is the most sellable? I can certainly see salability for No. 2, but $I$ can see us starting with a
headwind if we had No. 2.
MR. HOLBEN: I don't have a vote. Let me be very clear. I'll be very clear that $I$ don't have a vote (crosstalk) that there are other opinions obviously that would go into your marketing decision as well. The secretary will obviously make a selection of this, of this design. And the Commission of Fine Arts will have an opinion on this tomorrow as well.

MR. HOLBEN: What I'm comfortable saying without clearing through legal first (crosstalk) is the reality of sales has nothing to do with my opinion of the design or its elements. My experience in selling products, both financial and physical and tangible and intangible products over 20 years, is if you can represent the voice of the customer adequately and you have the support of the customer properly aligned, the sells will happened.

And anyone of these designs whether it's inclusive or not will sell depending on the support and the collaboration and just our sheer will to be successful, which $I$ think is appropriate in a sports
theme. We've all if you've played sports have had that last second pep talk, the Bobby Knight experience, right?

MR. JANSEN: I think he coaches in Texas Tech.

MR. HOLBEN: He's a West Point guy. Yeah, see? So, a little bias. So my point to that is whatever John and Robin and John pick up, the US men's market team is going to be behind it and we'll make it successful and we'll sell a heck of a lot of product.

I will say as someone who I can't walk and dribble a basketball, so $I$ can't speak to the elements of the technique being displayed, but what $I$ can say if somebody's a member of USA disabled section of sports, the inclusiveness I think is something that's rarely achieved.

As someone who has a daughter in sports supporting women in sports and other minorities through sports speaks to what Naismith set out to do originally as described by April in the original reading. And I think that gives us a broader marketing opportunity if we choose to leverage it
properly. That I like.
As far as the design elements, there's some, there's some spectacular design. No. 9 and No. 1 are very unique and different and non-typical that $I$ think if we're chasing an award offers some opportunity. I think the other ones that are traditional also capture the essence of playing a competitive sport or overcoming a disability or being inclusive of, quite frankly, the entire US or the global reach.

You can play basketball in the desert. You can play basketball in Alaska. You can play it with any economic backing that you have. Unlike my sport of choice, that is, is largely biased to an income base. I, I like hockey and figure skating and those are expensive and there's economic disparity that profits people from joining.

Baseball, soccer, and basketball have the appeal because they hit all audiences. Our product offering as we spoke to the dynamics of the legislation, but the reality is these designs with John's support, we can tell any number of stories and they all give us the ability to tell a story from a
different perspective to each audience and still be true to the independent design. For me that's huge. I hope that adequately answers your question.

MR. SCARINCI: No, you did a good job fielding that difficult question and, and thank you. And I think --

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Matthew.
MR. SCARINCI: (Crosstalk) because we were coming back to my turn and just to sum up my view 'cause I want to be crystal clear, you know, and I, you know, I'm going to go with you on 19. But I just want to be crystal clear. You know, I, 'cause I'm, I want to go for the most -- I want to go for the best shot that you believe is, you're going to be able to sell out.

You know, but it's going to rely on the Mint to really do something special here because absent something special, probably my guess, 'cause I like to win awards, and my guess for the award winner would be 2 or 9. All right. So 2 or 9 are the award winners.

But, but I'm leaving it now in the Mint's hands for 19. And, and, and the more important thing

I, I believe is, you know, you've worked really hard on this and selling out's important. More important than the award in this case.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Don. Dr. Kotlowski? DR. KOTLOWSKI: Really quick point here. I'm sorry the marketing people left, but I'm sure the word will get to them. Market this aggressively in the Philippines. I taught in the Philippines on a Fulbright. I do Philippine history. It is the national sport of the Philippines. They are crazy about basketball. Absolutely crazy about it.

And so it just goes again to the global reach. It's often overlooked I think in terms of what countries we're thinking about. And again, relatively speaking, you know, it is a poor country. This is an easy sport to pick up among either things.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Dean. That's a good point.

MS. STAFFORD: Just for the record, we do have marketing representation from the mint still in the room. So that will indeed get back to all of, all of that team. And as well, we've been talking with

John Doleva and his team about the potential markets and outreach and ways to connect throughout the world and which countries might be among those. He's been sharing that kind of information --

MR. DOLEVA: Southeast Asia is a, is a key target for us. China, there's more people that play on registered teams, not just in their backyard. But more people that play on registered teams in China than there were citizens in the United States. So the marketplace --

MR. LANNIN: Can you say that again?
MR. DOLEVA: There are more people that play on registered teams, signed up for teams. It's not playing in your backyard or shooting with child or grandchild, than there are citizens in the US. So the marketplace is huge and awesome. And, you know, we'll take a look at the marketing materials and how we would market to a foreign audience in terms of what's the collateral.

MR. JANSEN: Would this carry a tariff? MR. DOLEVA: Sorry? MR. JANSEN: Would this coin sold into China

```
carry a tariff?
```

MS. STAFFORD: We, yeah, we, we'd be looking into that. I'd want to get our sales operations and marketing teams together before positing on that.

MR. WEINMAN: That's what I'm trying to say.

CHAIR URAM: Pam, were you going to say something? No? Okay. All right. Everyone, please turn into our counsel, Mr. Greg Weinman, the, your scoring sheets and we'll take a five minute break.

MR. WEINMAN: Let's make it, let's make it at least ten minutes.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Let's just say 11:30, 11:30. (SESSION BREAK.)

CHAIR URAM: I'd like to call on our counsel now, Greg Weinman, for the results of the selections.

MR. WEINMAN: Okay. The, the
recommendations, the voting is in. You know, as a reminder, especially to our guests, the voting is a tool that's used to gauge the interest of the, of the CCAC. It's not in and of itself a recommendation. And CCAC, although CCAC has generally had a rule that
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to gain the committee's recommendation outside of a separate motion, it should be at least $50 \%$ plus 1 of interests. And there are two designs that leaped out. I'll go through in order though, if you're ready. Obverse No. 1 received 8 votes and this is out of a maximum of 33. Obverse No. 2 received 18 votes, which would actually meet the threshold. Obverse No. 3 received 4. Obverse No. 4 received six. Obverse No. 5 received one. Six received one. Seven received one. Eight received one vote. Nine received two votes. Obverse 10 received eight votes.

Obverse 11 received two votes. Obverse 12 received one vote. Obverse 13 received five votes. Obverse 14 received two votes. Obverse 15 received three votes. Obverse 16 received two votes. Obverse 18 received three votes. Obverse 19 received 26 votes, making it the highest vote getter. Obverse 20 received three votes and Obverse 21 received 4 votes. Once again, the two designs that met your unofficial threshold would be the top vote getter, vote getter, Obverse 19 and then Obverse 2.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Greg. Are there any
motions from the committee? Okay. Seeing none, we will record accordingly.

MR. JANSEN: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR URAM: Yes, Erik.

MR. JANSEN: I assume we will revisit the text inclusions and coverages and so forth once we understand the opposite design as well?

CHAIR URAM: I think that's what we'll do and then we'll leave that up to Ron as well to get some insight on that. But $I$ think that would be the best way to handle that. Okay. We'll have discussion now on the -- I'll ask April to, our Chief Mint Office of Design Management to present the portfolio for the basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin program reverse.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. I should note that all of these designs were developed by Artistic Infusion Program Artists for our United States Mint sculptor, engravers. This was, these were not developed through a competition.

There are 23 reverse design sets being shown today. Each depict three designs showing the
variations required across the denominations. Other required inscriptions for the reverse include United States of America and E pluribus unum. Some artists submitted designs with additional inscriptions where you will see, which you would see.

Our representatives from the Basketball Hall of Fame identified four preferences. We will show them to you now. They are Reverse 5, Reverse 9, Reverse $12(\mathrm{a})$, and Reverse 17. I'd like to invite John Doleva to make any comments regarding the reverse portfolio and to clarify whether any of these four rose to the top in terms of your first preference. John?

MR. DOLEVA: It was actually we, we polled a number of people back at the Hall of Fame and it was, it, there was no clear favorite here. We think all of these designs are beautiful, representative designs, and would work. Of course we were waiting to see what the, if the, the obverse side was and what would work with that. And I guess that's part of your role here.

But we believe each one of these designs probably a little lesser on No. 5, at least from my
perspective, because of the scale and the scope of the basket versus the ball, but I think the other three work nicely. No. 9 for instance, you know, we talked about the global game and I'm often stopped and people say, you know, I was in the far reaches of Indonesia and I'm driving down this dirt road and then all of the sudden I see a rim. Maybe not a backboard, but I see a rim and I see three kids playing basketball.

So the iconic representation of the rim and the backboard are of interest to us because the legislation does call for it to be a predominantly basketball design. Don, Robin, am I missing anything on the Hall of Fame, our team's perspective that broader team's perspective?

MR. SENECAL: No.
MS. STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you. So we will start by sharing Reverse Design 1. These designs depict a three-quarter profile view of a basketball and we are only showing the designs for the $\$ 5$ coin; is that correct? Okay. So we'll go through them. So I'll highlight the $\$ 5 \mathrm{~s}$ and then move through. Okay. Reverse 2, the designs portray a basketball
with the inscriptions placed upon it in a threedimensional manner. The pebbling on the design is a range to mimic the three-dimensional effect of an actual basketball.

Designs for Reverse 33 show a straight-on view of a basketball. Designs for Reverse 4 present a hand holding a basketball aloft to symbolize the importance of basketball in the history of athletics. Designs for Reverse 5 depict a basketball in front of a hoop. This is one of the top four designs identified as preferences by the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame. There is a comment that we should note, that this design may have to be adjusted because the ball may read as if he's heading for a missed shot. Is that correct?

MR. SENECAL: Yes.
MS. STAFFORD: Okay. Designs for Reverse 6 centrally feature a basketball with the additional inscription of one of Mr. James Naismith's purposes for inventing the sport, teamwork.

Designs for 7 and 7 (a) show two hands posed to shoot a basketball. The hands on the ball itself
represent that. The Basketball Hall of Fame honors people involved in the sport, as well as the sport itself.

Designs for Reverse 8 and $8(a)$ portray a close-up of the intense action of basketball. The inscription E pluribus unum, Latin for out of many one, is placed at the center of the composition to extend this idea beyond its original meaning, suggesting how the sport of basketball has brought together millions of diverse people through a universal athletic experience.

Designs for Reverse 9 centrally feature a backboard and hoop on a background of a basketball. Again, this is one of the top four designs identified by representatives as a preference.

Designs for Reverse 10 depict a basketball coming towards the viewer by way of a swish through the net. The ball has already passed through the net; hence, the discrepancy in proportions between it and the rim.

Designs for 11 and $11(a)$ reverse designs showcase a basketball that has just gone through the
hoop and is ricocheting in the net before falling, before falling by capturing the resulting movement and action of the ball's energy. The stretched net amplifies these two characteristics of the sport.

Designs for Reverse 12 show a view from directly under the basket with the ball in motion capturing one of the more celebrated moments in the game, the moments just after a slam dunk. While designs for Reverse $12(a)$ portrays a view with the basketball closer to the viewer and fewer connection points between the net and rim, again, this is one of the top four preferences identified by the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

Designs for Reverse 13 and $13(a)$ depict a basketball just after it passes through the hoop for the game winning shot. This point of view from ground level looking up at the basket conveys basketball's energy, intensity, and the shear joy of the game. Design set $13(a)$ features the additional inscription, Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, across two panels of the ball. The same inscription is contained within one panel in Design Set 13.

Designs for Reverse 14 and 15 portray the viewpoint of someone under the hoop wondering if the shot will score a basket. Design set 15 features the additional inscription of one of seven Naismith values, teamwork, infused in the centerpiece of the ball underscoring the similarity of the inscription, $E$ pluribus unum, which translates to out of many, one. Designs for Reverse 16 capture a last second shot that could score the winning points and feature the additional inscription, teamwork, in the center of the ball.

Designs for Reverse 17 depict a basketball about to pass through the net. Again, this is a top four preference from the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame. They commented that it is a clean design. They very much like the text not being on the basketball itself and the angle of the ball reads as most likely to be making a shot.

We noted coinability comments. The channels in the basketball, the lines are not as dynamic as other designs and they would like it to be more of a 3D feel which could be, of course, addressed in
sculpt.
Designs for Reverse 18 portray two players against that background of a basketball. That concludes the reverse portfolio.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, April, very much. Are there any technical questions before we move on that you have for Ron?

MR. JANSEN: I have a question. Inasmuch as the proof versions of these coins usually outsell the uncirculated versions, and inasmuch as, and perhaps this, this, this is merely me projecting, I know what a basketball feels like and in some many of these drawings because the ball was the dominant feature, my concern is the texture on the ball is a critical feature to anybody that knows anything about basketball. And the proof version is going to totally blast that texture apart and turn into a giant blob.

Is there any alternative in the proof version, Ron, to retaining more of the intrinsic texture when we go to a proof version?

MR. HARRIGAL: I think it's something we're going to definitely have to explore. I think you can
put the dimpled effect on it, on both designs. Clearly on, on proof we do have with our laser the capability of dialing the frost down so it's not as robust. And what we would do would be to look at maybe two or three different levels of, of contrast with our frosting.

So we could do a, a light frosting on elements that need to show the subtle texture. So I think, $I$ think we can dial it in properly. MR. JANSEN: A ball that, that's variances on the street is pretty doggone smooth and it doesn't have much, much real shading in the light. But a new ball with really healthy leather is going to have the reflection that you see typically on 17 there. Would it be possible on the, on the proof version to actually do a continuous gradient of variable shading?

I mean we, we get drawings that have shading on them and translating shading to sculpting is, of course, the nightmare we all deal with. But in this case could it be done without it looking really cheesy?

MR. HARRIGAL: Our experience thus far is
that from the beginning coins off the dye to the last coins, you get too much variability to do a gradient like that. You would definitely have to curtail your dye light with that and $I$ don't think with the volumes we have (crosstalk). Yeah.

MR. JANSEN: So not really an option you're saying?

CHAIR URAM: Boy, we're getting a lot of noise in the background.

MR. WEINMAN: Whoever's on the phone, could you mute your phone again, please? Please mute your phone.

CHAIR URAM: Anything else?
MR. JANSEN: No, that was my big concern because we, we've, we've inherited this, this design that says give me a picture of a ball and we'll end up frosting the whole thing and it's just, it's just a, it's just a train wreck waiting to happen.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. With that considerations, we'll begin our consideration for the reverse designs. Let's begin with Mary Lannin.

MS. LANNIN: Because of my expertise in
basketball.

CHAIR URAM: Exactly.

MS. LANNIN: Ron --

CHAIR URAM: It'll be a slam-dunk.

MS. LANNIN: Yeah, exactly. I have a
question. The highlights on No. 1, how would you accomplish that at least on my...

MR. HARRIGAL: I think on that you're getting more of a visual on the design itself.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MR. HARRIGAL: It's not going to really show on a coin that way.

DR. KOTLOWSKI: It'd be like the baseball. Where you had the baseball.

MR. HARRIGAL: I think, you know, you may want to do a heavier frost on the, on the, the lines and a very light frost on the texture. And that way you get a little bit of that pearlescence look to it.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. Okay.

MR. HARRIGAL: And $I$ think that's, and I think that's about the best we can do with that kind of design.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. Thank you. All right. I actually happen to like No. 1 because looking at what we've picked with the three people reaching, this is the ball spinning in the same direction that they're reaching. So that to me sort of completes it. I prefer the design to be totally the basketball without the hoop.

I think this is our chance to really shine and make something look very, very cool. It's big. So like let's go with it and not add any other extraneous detail that, because we've got, we've got all the stuff going on on the other side.

So the simpler the better for me. I like, I like No. 1. I would be equally happy with whatever texture Ron and company can do on 2 or 3.17 is fine with me, but $I$ just, $I$ just think that this is the direction they were all reaching. This is the way the ball was spinning. So those are my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Mary. Dr. Dean?

DR. KOTLOWSKI: Okay. Actually Mary and I did not discuss this before, but $I$ completely agree
with her. I think that there's -- I think that there is something very, very elegant. I thought No. 1 and No. 2 were breathtakingly beautiful. I really did. And I thought there's something just, you know, amazing elegant and as you said, cool, where the circular nature of the coin and the circular nature of the basketball are one and the same. And I really don't think the hoops or the hands get you anything beyond that.

And what this reminds me of, and again, this is my relative newness and freshness to the group, is a coin that we looked at where the coin was a tire and it was the same thing. We all thought that was a different category. And going back a few meetings and a lot of us really, really liked that coin.

So I like, I like 1. I like 2. I like 3 a little bit less. And then we just kind of move on here, $I$ really, you know, if you have to include something, I like No. 9. And I would have been willing to consider the very last one, which was 18. But I think, I, I, I believe I, I, I think and I hope, you know, that No. 19, the, the obverse finished first
is going to handle, you know, the players and the diversity.

And Mary, I do think that this is what $I$ was thinking of. The, the obverse where they're reaching for the ball. It's almost like you flip it over and the actual ball is (inaudible).

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Dean. Erik?
MR. JANSEN: When you said 19 there, did you really mean 18?

DR. KOTLOWSKI: No, I, I, I, I was talking about (crosstalk). But $I$ did say that No. 18, you know, under certain circumstance if we pick a different obverse, that would have been acceptable.

MR. JANSEN: Right, right. In general I was extremely disappointed by this set of drawings and it's hardly the fault of the artists because the box we're put in on this by the lawyers wanting to be the artist on this legislation is so constraining as to really just give us such an inability to deliver a quality product.

Having said that, my hands, hands together clapping to the artists that managed it to be stuck
with a ball and do something creative with it. I'm going to start at the back on No. 18 and go forward.

I wish we had been able to consider this design before we considered the, the politically correct opt-out that we chose for the other side because we could have achieved the political correctness in that dimension of the marketing and sales goal for the Naismith folks by going with this design here and then putting some energy and some salability on the other side. But that's kind of sour grapes at this point.

I think Design No. 18 is practically taken out of consideration based on a recommendation on the former unless we want to revisit that recommendation.

17 was actually of the entire set here the one that I thought about then, then it inspired my question to Ron saying how do we deal with the texture because this drawing is not about a ball. This drawing is about what a ball feels like when you're, when you're holding on to it. The, the, the texture is the essence of this drawing and so I'm going to eliminate it because there was, it's a disaster in
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proof and it's a sculpting challenge that $I$ think we would fail on.

Walking backwards in this, I just found no inspiration in, in the designs. When we get to No. 12 because $I$ know this is a preference, I want to highlight something. Proof is the big seller and proof, this is going to be a blob that looks like it has one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven point star around it and it's not going to make any sense. So it loses its impact in the proof version.

Walking further backwards, I just find no inspiration. When we get to No. 9, I was really, really -- it was a big wakeup moment for me when we heard the representative of the Naismith group say as I travel internationally, what $I$ see is a rim and a backboard and whether the kids or the adults are there playing, I still see the game. And that is such a powerful reality and I'm, so I'm going to turn a little bit from the creative value to the marketing value.

And although we're, we're, we're required to
feature a ball here, this is really the backboard, which this is what you see around the world. And that was such a powerful point in the story you completely changed my view of this drawing to the point that $I$ will advocate No. 9 because $I$ think it carries just that heartfelt put a board up, put a rim up, we got a ballgame. And that applies everywhere.

Boy, No. 8 is just a handful of a train
wreck. I don't know what to make of that. And No. 7 is the only design that actually has hands on a ball that, that reflect reality.

No. 6, that's how a coach holds the ball when he's talking to you about how to make a play better. It has nothing to do with the game.

No. 4, that's how you hold a ball if you're trying to do a drawing of it. It has nothing to do with the game whatsoever.

No. 5, I was intrigued by the, the, the, design by committee edit of lowering the rim so it doesn't look like this is a missed shot. Looks like the ball actually is going to float down in. I like action in designs. I actually might advocate for this
if the rim was lowered to about one-third of the way up. If you could keep the, the relative dimensionality of the ball and the rim right and still do that edit, we'd certainly have a design by committee we could go with.

3, 2, and 1 , lovely pictures of balls. Creative? Not, not so much.

So that's how I'm going to vote on this. I think we were so constrained by the legislation as to take the very people that created this program, Congress, killed it.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Erik. Jeanne?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. I have to agree with what has been said. I really like No. 1 and its simplicity, but I'm not sure, I'm not sure about it. I like the fact that if we chose No. 1, it is the reverse of what we chose for the obverse and $I$ think that in that it would add dynamics.

And I look at No. 5, even if we redesigned that, I, I don't find that spectacular. I enjoyed looking at the net that we had and sort of like
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throwing the ball into a bowl of spaghetti. I'm not sure if that's what we want to really have on our coins. It's like plays.

No. 9, although I agree with Erik, I think that that was quite a nice tribute to seeing basketballs all over the world. I, I don't think as a coin and as design, and as a design element, I don't think that that's a very positive design.

No. 12, which is one of the preferences, I think it's not going to coin up beautifully. This is going to be, you know, the convex part of the coin and then we're going to have the, the drop back of the, the text. Again, $I$ don't think that that's a great design element. If it were flat, you know, we would be thinking of something else.

And the next one which is No. 17, again, 17 is a preference. As a design I really do not like, even though this is basketball, and I know what we're trying to accomplish, we're, you know, the net, the rim of the net just kind of cuts through that ball and I appreciate Erik's desire to have the stippled effect of the skin.

I'm going to go back to No. 1. I agree with Mary that No. 1 was the obverse that we have chosen and the fact that we are in a box by Congress. We can't make a beautiful story of this amazing game. I'm so sorry about that. My, my leaning is toward No. 1.

And 2, the basketball committee, I'm sorry that that's my choice. Thank you.

CHAIR URAM: Okay, Jeanne, thank you.

Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: Jeanne, I'm looking for the baseball coin --

MR. JANSEN: Is your mic on?

MR. SCARINCI: Oh, is it on? I'm sorry. No, I'm -- to me this is a no-brainer. I mean it's a concave coin, right?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: This is the convect --

MR. SCARINCI: This is the convect side. So why isn't 12 -- you're saying 12 is not, is not going to work and to me, and to me on the convect side of it, 12 is, is, is the right -- there's no other, there's no other choice. It's the right, it's the
right -- it's exactly the right --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMON: Right, but then we've the, we've got the text around it. If we didn't have the text round it, I'd be, I'd be for that. I'd be for that. We don't -- that's, that's --

MR. SCARINCI: So it's the other side of it.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: No. We're talking about this side.

MR. SCARINCI: So you, so you, you're doing this side of it. So the basket -- so the, so the ball is coming out of the net, the side of it.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Correct.

MR. SCARINCI: This is correct.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

MR. SCARINCI: This is what you want.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes, but I don't want -

MR. SCARINCI: This is good.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: But I don't like the
the text around, the text around --

MR. SCARINCI: Your objection is the text on this side?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: No, not on that side.

I can't see this. Sorry. I'm sorry, sorry. We're having this little side (crosstalk).

MR. SCARINCI: I think this is the right -- I think that is exactly the, this is exactly what this coin needs. This is exactly what makes the coin work. This, this reverse. Or obverse, whatever it is.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I agree. I agree. I agree with that, but I'm not (crosstalk).

CHAIR URAM: Which one is that? Is that the baseball?

MR. SCARINCI: It's the baseball.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: That's a baseball?

MR. SCARINCI: I'm, I'm sorry. This is the, this is the Apollo.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: This is how you deal with this packaging.

CHAIR URAM: Ron doesn't get that far. When he gets his from the minutes, it stays in the brown box.

MR. SCARINCI: It goes to (crosstalk). I rip
it out of the (crosstalk) and throw the box away.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: So this is not the
side. This is the side.

MR. SCARINCI: This is the side.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Right.

MR. SCARINCI: This is the side we're talking about.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Right.

MR. SCARINCI: So the ball is coming out of the side.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I understand that. I understand that. I just don't like, I just don't like design wise the text around --

CHAIR URAM: We're going to discuss the text, though (crosstalk).

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: If, if all we had is the ball and the net, I'm, I'm for it.

MR. SCARINCI: Oh, okay.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: That's --

MR. SCARINCI: Okay. So we agree.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yeah, we do.

MR. SCARINCI: No, when you say it, it makes me nervous.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Well, I'm going for simplicity with No. 1.

MR. SCARINCI: When, when Erik gratuitously attacks lawyers, that's, that's Erik.

MR. JANSEN: I don't take it personally.
CHAIR URAM: Let's keep moving 'cause --
MR. SCARINCI: Okay. So, no, I, I think this is a no-brainer. I think this -- I think it's cool.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: It is, no, it is a nobrainer --

MR. SCARINCI: And, and this is what they're -- and the, and this is one of their, this is one of the ones that they like, right?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Right (crosstalk).
MR. SCARINCI: Okay.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: But 1 is simpler.
MR. SCARINCI: Okay. I --
CHAIR URAM: Okay, Don.
MR. SCARINCI: No-brainer.
CHAIR URAM: Perfect. 12(a). Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just I
want to know about something that Erik mentioned. I
would note that we have not yet made a motion, made a recommendation for the obverse. So as far as I'm concerned, this is still the conversation stage and Reverse 18 should be under consideration. Until we (crosstalk) having said that, assuming that we will go with Obverse 19 , that, if we've got that (inaudible) accent the athletic part (inaudible), I don't see (inaudible) and (inaudible) on the reverse.

So my choices are, are for those that show a simple point of view of the basketball. Of the ones that our liaisons' preferences, I, I like -- I actually like No. 17. It's simple. It's clean. And you get, you do get a sense of action, hoop in the net. And $I$ (inaudible) about that ball, that No. 2 or No. 3.

So my preference is for No. 17 if we carry it with Obverse 19. And then again following up on this idea that we might, that we not not made a recommendation yet. If we go with Obverse 2, which was the single player in a very dynamic, energetic pose, I would recommend Obverse 2 and pair it with Reverse 18 and then we get, we get that sense of
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action and energy, but we also get it combined with some of the more inclusive element. You know, we have a male and a female player on the coin.

CHAIR URAM: Dennis, by the, by the point of clarification, Greg, with the -- I'm going to have Greg interject at this point.

MR. WEINMAN: Just, although the, you always have the option of placing a motion on the floor to make a recommendation. By default you're, the top vote getter would be your recommendation because we simply report the scores. In this case --

CHAIR URAM: And that's what we did.

MR. WEINMAN: You have a clear, you have a clear favorite from it. That doesn't mean you can't by motion make a recommendation of No. 2 be the recommendation of the CCAC. That just hasn't happened. So just to clarify you're, you have by default made a recommendation unless you act otherwise.

CHAIR URAM: I would actually pile in behind Dennis here and I'll take the blame for taking Reverse 18 off the table here. Honestly $I$ think Reverse 18
entertained with Obverse 2, if, if the committee believes in trying to serve up the best design for saleability, as well as important messaging to the customer, boy, we get inclusion and energy. And I can't think of a design pairing that would work better. So Dennis, thank you for bringing it back in. MS. STAFFORD: So, so because we now have two committee members that raised this, I, I do happen to believe that our representatives from the Hall of Fame would like to comment on this, about the idea of balancing the inclusivity with the energy.

MR. HARRIGAL: Yes. I made the mistake of asking if we could consider No. 2 for the reverse and the answer was no from a production standpoint and from a legal standpoint. So if we had No. 015 and 02 on a back and forth, I think that would be a slam dunk salability, getting to your point, sir.

I personally like the story -- there's,
there's a lot, a lot of story behind No. 19. But I do see the saleability element of having No. 2 as the obverse and No. 18 as the reverse. There's a little less representation there. I can't necessary -- maybe
this is a good thing -- tell race. Certainly gender we can tell.

Typically, and maybe I'm, I'll be shouted down for this, but men playing women at a tip off, $I$ don't see that a lot, but this is, this is --

MR. JENSEN: Ever.

MR. HARRIGAL: So that's an issue, but this is a representative coin of basketball. That has a little bit of a concern. But my heart still tilts towards 26 , but $I$ think from the standpoint $I$ want to point out to you too as well, we're, we're kind of a team here, Don. What's your thoughts on this being the, the reverse and change to No. 2?

MS. VIDITO: It did get a couple of votes. I think the feedback that we got was kind a little bit too much of a vintage look. So --

MR. DOLEVA: Vintage, the uniforms?

MS. VIDITO: Yeah, the uniforms aren't
accurate. So we're looking at this. Also --

MR. JANSEN: That can, that can be addressed.

MS. VIDITO: Right.

MR. JANSEN: That's a minor feature. And,
and to your point, pictures on metal rarely makes a great coin. It's symbols that evoke feelings and, and, and in this case diversity. Yeah, I've never seen a coed game like that either. That doesn't make a lot of sense.

MR. DOLEVA: Yeah, thank you for backing me up.

MR. JANSEN: But symbology is more important than the literalism, as long as the literalism isn't toxic.

MR. WEINMAN: Once again, could somebody mute your phone, whoever is on the phone? We're still hearing static. Thank you.

CHAIR URAM: Dennis, anything else?

MR. TUCKER: No, that's all. Thank you.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Thank you. Sam?

MR. GILL: Well, I'm going to not continue that conversation.

CHAIR URAM: I figure we can come back to refresh it.

MR. GILL: Yes. I'd like, I like No. 1. I thought it was clean and interesting and just captures
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everything. I liked No. 5 and if it had some adjustments that I think either Erik or somebody had mentioned it, that would be fine. I liked No. 7 just from the hands holding the ball. And then, and then lastly I liked No. 17. And I don't have strong preferences for any of them. I think any of them would be very good.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Thank you. Robin?
MS. SALMON: I also like No. 1 for the reasons everyone has already given. I also like No. 9, No. 7, 7(a) actually, No. 13(a), and No. 17. But my strongest preference would be for No. 1

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Thank you. Robert, are you on the phone? I know Mark Moran is not. Is Robert there? Okay. My thoughts on it are that depending which way the Mint goes with some different ideas regarding this, and if we stick with the chosen design that we had on the obverse, I like 17 the best because of the fact that, you know, that's what you want to see happen.

You want to see, you know, if you're playing basketball, you want it to go into the, into the hoop,
in the rim and make the score, right? So, and $I$ don't mind the -- I think that's simple. I think the Mint can make the proof the way it needs to be textured.

What I'm worried about No. 1 -- and it's not that $I$ don't like No. 1 and No. 2 -- what $I$ don't like is the fact that it is closer to the Canadian design that came out about three years ago. It's very similar in nature and it's extremely similar to baseball. It's extremely, extremely the same. So I really don't want to put -- I'd rather basketball stand on its own and I'd rather see it being probably 17.

I also like that Don had mentioned, I believe
it was No. 6, Don? Is that the --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: 12 .

CHAIR URAM: 12? Yeah. I think that that has some potential as well in relation to exactly what you're saying based on the nature of the curve, that that would really stand out. And then we could leave it to the Mint to decide how you want to have the wording and how you want to have with the stakeholders the, the proper recognitions and so forth.

Before we go into voting, I'd like April to make a couple more comments from the Mint side, please.

MS. STAFFORD: Yes. I'd be remiss if I did not share that the United States Mint is considering the, the use of colorization on this commemorative coin program. I stress the word considering because, of course, if it were done, it would be the first time. So the application of it, the execution of it really would, would depend on the decision for a final go or no-go. And the designs would be a large part in driving that.

So we would not be colorizing -- if this were to be done, we would not be colorizing certainly all of the coins in the commemorative coin program. It would be a subset of each of the offerings for silver and clad.

So that would be something that we would look
into based on the designs that ultimately are recommended and selected by the Secretary, as well as an intense research and development effort that the Mint would have to engage in to ensure that the
quality of the coins would, would absolutely be of the highest, highest regard.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, April. One of the things that Don and I had the chance to be with Fred from the CFA, Lindstrom, from there, and they are in favor of subtle textured color. They've come a long way in that curve process in recognizing some of the things that are done.

We certainly don't want to have the bright, vibrant cars (ph) or different things like that. But for instance on No. 17, if we, if the Mint does go that direction and you had the rim and just the net, it would be very subtle. And the CFA has agreed that, in principle, that any subtle exposure to that type of texturing would be favorable from their eyes. And that's a strong buy-in too.

So, and he said this in his presentation too, the artist. So the artists are very aware of this. So when you vote, consider that is a possibility. And once again, I, if we chose No. 1, I, there's not much room to do anything in regards to that. But my bigger concern, my bigger concern is that it's just too much
like the baseball; though, $I$ do like it. But vote and we'll see how it comes out. And then the Mint can take it from there.

So everyone please vote and turn in your sheets to counsel.

MR. WEINMAN: You want to take a quick five minute recess?

CHAIR URAM: Sure.
MR. WEINMAN: Let's take a, a five minute recess.
(RECESS.)
CHAIR URAM: Okay. I'd like to have our general counsel, Greg Weinmann, report the findings on the considerations.

MR. WEINMAN: Can we come back to order?

MS. FRANK: I think they're having a
conversation that's relevant to what (crosstalk).

MR. WEINMAN: Do we --
MS. FRANK: Just give them a moment.
MR. WEINMAN: Okay. The results of the tally are as follows.

CHAIR URAM: No, maximum's different because

MR. WEINMAN: No, actually Michael Moran did submit his vote before he went off the call.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. But Robert --
MR. WEINMAN: Yeah, and Robert, yes.
CHAIR URAM: Oh, Robert --
MR. WEINMAN: So we're still --

CHAIR URAM: Okay. So we're still 33.
MR. WEINMAN: It is still a 33, which means the default would be 17. With that in mind, just one reverse obtained that but one came very close, just so you know. So the votes are as follows: Reverse 1 received 20 votes, which is the highest vote getter. Reverse 2 received 6. Reverse 3 received 4. Reverse 4 received one. Reverse 5 received two. Reverse 6 received one.

Reverse 7 received three. 7(a) received five. 8 received, received one vote. Reverse $8(a)$ received one vote. Reverse 9 received nine. Reverse 10 received one. Reverse 11 received one. Reverse $11(a)$ received one. Reverse 12 received seven votes. 12(a) received six votes. 13 received one vote.

13(a) received two votes. 14 received one vote. 15 received one vote. 16 received one vote. 17 received 16 votes. So just shy of your default position. And 18 received five votes.

So with all of that information, now you can move forward with motions or otherwise.

CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Greg. At this time are there many motions -- keep in mind that if you would like, you can submit two designs. You know, if you want to make a motion to move, move forward or if anyone wants to do that, you can --

MR. WEINMAN: Two pairings.
CHAIR URAM: Two pairings. You can do, you can do otherwise as well. So with that I'll open the floor up for discussion.

MR. JANSEN: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIR URAM: Yes.
MR. JANSEN: With all due respect to the way the votes went, I think holistically we have to look at the combination of public input. There's a variety it gives us and I respect that. I think we have to look at the issues that we've surfaced here today. I
think we have -- of energy, of inclusion of, of design requirements. And $I$ think we have to include in this case the, the preferences of the group involved.

And I want to revisit a point that Dennis made by feeling out everyone's feeling if we were to actually consider going with Reverse 18 and the second the best and strong vote getter, Obverse 2, to give -and I want to make sure that the constituents here weigh in on this. To give both the key point of diversity and inclusion, as well as the energy on the coin, plus complying with the ball being featured on the reverse per the legislation.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Now keep in mind that it was No. 2 and No. 19 that had the highest votes for the obverse and it was No. 1 and it was 18, I believe.

MR. JANSEN: I understand that, but I -CHAIR URAM: I'm just saying for the group, not you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can you turn your, your microphone on?

MR. JANSEN: Yeah, I guess you -- I'm, I'm just trying to do the best art here by considering all
of the options and not some options in a vacuum.

MR. SCARINCI: Could you repeat --

CHAIR URAM: So, so recalling our obverse vote, there were two standouts. There was the standout No. 2, which is kind of everybody claimed the high energy thing, which $I$ think will relate to kids and all kinds of people around the world that want to feel the yeah of basketball. And the other big vote getter was No., No. 19. Okay.

And if I'm not mistaken, the appeal on No. 19 was the ability to include all the constituencies that would make up the players, men, women, the, the, the, the disadvantaged. And $I$ would argue youth are lacking. But that was the impotence of that design. And between those two, I think we, we saw the Committee's challenge as well as preference.

Now when we actually go to merge that with the reverse considerations, and Dennis raised this, does 18 , in fact, on the reverse give the opportunity -- and granted we might want to address the, the uniforms and potentially even the, the ages, or if you even want to change ethnicity on the players there,
but you take that for the, for the, for the inclusion concept here to, to serve that piece of the marketing ultimatum, which I think the Naismith people have, and then pair it with the action on the other side.

MR. SCARINCI: So Dennis, Dennis, Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: Yes, I'm here.

MR. SCARINCI: So are you -- so what I'm hearing if $I, I, i f \quad I$ may paraphrase, Mr. Chairman. What I'm hearing is you, you and Erik are suggesting as a possible alternative a motion as an alternative recommendation from the CCAC that we support, that we support reverse, Reverse 2 (crosstalk).

MR. JANSEN: 18 .

MR. SCARINCI: Reverse 18. Reverse 18 with some, with some variation of the art on Reverse 13, the man/woman. Some, some modification to it.

MR. JANSEN: Reverse 18.

MR. SCARINCI: Reverse 18 and Obverse 2. And that we support that as an alternate recommendation to consider.

CHAIR URAM: It's a motion to (crosstalk).

MR. SCARINCI: Does that, does that correctly
state what you, what you think as well, Dennis?
MR. TUCKER: I think that -- yes.

MR. SCARINCI: Okay.
MR. TUCKER: Yes. And I, I agree with what Erik said, that we have, we have three different levels or facets that we're looking at. We're looking at energy in action, inclusion, and legislation, right? For the, for the reverse we're constrained by the legislation. The reverse simply has to do -- the only thing that we have to do is obey the law that Congress has written, which says we need to show a basketball. If we can get either energy or inclusion and add that to the reverse, and for beyond, then I think that's great.

When it comes to inclusion, I think that, I think that Obverse 19 definitely does it better and more artistically than Reverse 18. Okay. I think, I'll repeat that. I think Obverse 19 does inclusion better than Reverse 18. So, but because of what we are given in terms of the obverse and reverse portfolios, yes, I think that having Obverse 2 coupled with Reverse 18 would give us a good combination of
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all three of those elements. We've got the energy and action, the inclusion, and the legislation is covered.

MR. JANSEN: And so, so why don't we make -if, if, if, if we may, Mr. Chairman, why don't, -- I could, I absolutely can support that and I think it's a great idea to create flexibility (crosstalk).

CHAIR URAM: One thing (crosstalk). One thing before -- just so the committee knows, the chosen by vote was Obverse 19 with Reverse 1. That was the, the sentiment of the vote. Okay? The majority. So now we can either take that and/or add Obverse 2 with Reverse 18 , is what's being suggested. MR. SCARINCI: As an alternative. CHAIR URAM: As an alternative. MR. SCARINCI: To make an alternative recommendation. CHAIR URAM: Exactly. MR. SCARINCI: To, to do that with some variation of the, on the art. MR. JANSEN: Yeah. MR. SCARINCI: Of 18. And, and simply kick it back and let them decide --

CHAIR URAM: And they can decide the wording

MR. SCARINCI: And let them decide what -CHAIR URAM: -- Ron's side of the house -MR. SCARINCI: -- give them flexibility, and give them flexibility.

CHAIR URAM: So you're making that as a motion?

MR. SCARINCI: Yeah, I'll -- I'm going to support --

MR. JANSEN: I'll make a motion.
MR. SCARINCI: -- Erik's motion and Dennis is second. And I'll support it, absolutely.

MR. JANSEN: I'd like to know how the folks at Naismith feel about this 'cause you're, you're going to live with this decision.

MR. DOLEVA: Right. So from our perspective I think Reverse 18 solves the, the big issues that we think we would face if we did not include women as part of this. Wheelchair basketball is important, but in times of segmentation, men's basketball, women's basketball is, is the primary. So I think with
updating and getting these out of vintage uniform into something more contemporary and maybe a little more definition on, on who these people might be, along with -- and I liked No. 2, myself. I think that is a very excellent secondary recommendation.

MS. LANNIN: I'd like to say something. I think we need to remember the total number of votes that have already been voted. To me it was sort of extraordinary that we really liked No. 19 for the obverse, for the inclusivity, and for me it was the cleanness and the implied motion of No. 1 for the reverse. So 20,20 votes and 26 is pretty substantial.

MR. SCARINCI: If I --

MS. TUCKER: Can I ask a question? This is Dennis.

MR. WEINMAN: Yes.

MR. TUCKER: I think $I$ was off line for a minute. Were the ranking of votes for the reverse designs given?

MR. WEINMAN: Yes.
MS. LANNIN: Yes.

MR. TUCKER: Sorry. I didn't hear that. The system was not turned on. And I apologize. So I, I don't know what the No. 1 was.

MS. LANNIN: 20.

CHAIR URAM: 20 for No. 1 and No. --
MR. TUCKER: (Crosstalk) please just give me the top three votes.

MR. WEINMAN: The top votes were No. 1 got 20 votes. No. 17 got 16 votes. No. 12 -- yeah, No. 9 got nine votes.

MS. TUCKER: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SCARINCI: Can, can $I$ just respond to
Mary, Mr. Chairman? You know, my, my, my feeling would be tomorrow's the CFA. So they have, they have tonight. They have this afternoon and tonight to really give more thought to -- 'cause they just heard a lot of stuff and we can be very daunting to anybody who comes and listens to us. And they just heard a lot of stuff.

So my thinking about supporting this resolution is to give them the maximum flexibility between this afternoon and tomorrow when they have to
go to the CFA so that they -- and they may decide later today after they talk to all the people they have to talk to -- 'cause they're going to have to work the phones and do what they have to do, I don't want to be them today.

You know, they have to work the phone and do a lot of work, but they may decide like, look, we like what was, what, you know, you know. And they're done. In which case they walk into the CFA and they say, you know, of the two things that were done yesterday, this is what we prefer. Because you know that's what, that's what they're going to ask. And at the CFA, it's going to happen really fast. It's not going to be like --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes, five minute.
MR. SCARINCI: So they got five minutes to make their case. So by having a resolution that says we would consider this as an alterative, we arm them with something that if they choose --

CHAIR URAM: They're not handcuffed otherwise

MR. SCARINCI: -- if they approve --

CHAIR URAM: -- design.
MR. SCARINCI: Correct. And that's how the CFA is going to look at them tomorrow.

CHAIR URAM: Right. And they're going to look -- and the other thought is that if we do that, there's a possibility that in that design you could possibly working with Ron even turn this into a rim on the outside of this. So there's options for them to do. So Erik --

MS. STAFFORD: Which design is that, Tom, just for reference?

CHAIR URAM: 19.

MS. STAFFORD: 19.
CHAIR URAM: On the obverse.

MS. STAFFORD: Obverse 19.

CHAIR URAM: Obverse 19. So I think your motion would be then, Erik, it would be to honor the vote of 19 and 1 and then couple it with the optional suggestion and alternative as 2 and 18, correct?

MR. JANSEN: I would, I'd be willing to modify the motion to make, put forth two sets of recommendations on equal weighting here because what,
what troubles me here, and quite finally it is
actually quite troubling, because if, if our mission is the best art, then we should be considering all of the art when we consider any of the art.

And to have had the, the obverse discussion without any discussion relative to reverse, I think is, is putting, is putting the consumers of this product, the customers of the Mint, at, at a disadvantage. And $I$ think we always need to keep the customer in mind and produce the best obverse and reverse together. And so respecting the votes individually and the opportunity collectively, I would modify the motion to, to put forth two recommendations so the CFA can see that and the constituent organization can have their say as well.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Thank you, Erik. Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: The, the reverse, the
legislation requires that the reverse depict a basketball. Would it be possible for us -- and this is a crazy idea, but I'll put it out there. What if we use Obverse 2 for the obverse and Obverse 19 for the reverse? There, I said it.

The legislation is that we modify, but as Erik is saying, you know, if we look at all of these individuals, striping them of their obverse or reverse status, what is the best art? What is telling the story we want the way we want tell it? And again, you know, what's, what's giving us the energy, inclusion, and satisfies the legislation? Can we use Obverse 2 for the obverse and Obverse 19 for the reverse, modify to --

CHAIR URAM: Dennis, I think I'd like to have April define that because of the legislation.

MS. STAFFORD: Yes. And actually in break there were lots of side conversations exploring the latitude that the Mint would have with regard to legislation. Are, looking at our assigned counsel, April Whitaker, is it, is it fair to say, April, that as long the reverse has a prominent depiction of a basketball, we are within bounds so to speak of meeting our legislative requirement?

MS. WHITAKER: Right. If one of the obverse designs primarily or centrally features a basketball, it'd be chosen for the reverse it would qualify to
depict a basketball. So if any designs as they are, or as modified with primary or centrally feature a basketball, that would be appropriate.

MS. STAFFORD: So Dennis is positing
utilizing potentially Obverse 19 as a reverse. I think this is where Mr. Uram was going saying if there could be a modification to Obverse 19 where perhaps instead of the net a feature were added into the background depicting a --

MR. WEINMAN: A basketball.
MS. STAFFORD: A basketball in a very prominent way, that it would meet the requirements of the legislation and still, of course, be embraced for its inclusivity. But one concern would be how something that has been designed for the concavity of the obverse might translate as a reverse with its convex nature. So I'll like to throw it to Ron and he could talk us through what the potential here is for that particular scenario.

MR. SCARINCI: We could say either or and then just --

CHAIR URAM: We can put the designs all out
there and give them all four.

MS. STAFFORD: No. We could say either or -CHAIR URAM: Right.

MR. SCARINCI: -- for the obverse and then give them even more --

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Let Ron --

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah, yeah. I mean, you know, I'm, I'm clearly speaking with a little bit of a design hat here as well. So I'm speaking a little bit for the chief engraver, that we talked about these. These obverse designs were, were designed to be concave. So it's going to be more of a wide angle look to it. This design could be sculpted that way. It'd change this into more of a fish eyed kind of look.

You're going to have to modify the artwork to make it look more like a fish eye if you put it on the other side. That may be a little more difficult from an artistic perspective based on it shown there as it's designed as pretty much a flat design. That's, that really doesn't have -- where if you go back to the Obverse No. 2, that design where his feet are like
right there in your face, that type of thing, that is really designed appropriately for, for concave look on it.

So you have to think of those aspects on it. That design would not translate very well if you put it on the other side as a fish eye. You would have to really distort the artwork in a different way.

MR. JANSEN: Mr. Chairman, so if we go back to the prior image on the screen here, which $I$ think was obverse --

MR. WEINMAN: 18. No, sorry. 19.

MR. JANSEN: Okay. So Obverse 19 we would be potentially looking at using this for the convex side and did $I$ hear the thought of replacing the backdrop of the net here with, with the, the, the, linear portions of a ball?

MS. STAFFORD: I believe that would be required in order to meet the --

MR. JANSEN: I would argue the reaching for the ball, the, there are two central elements of this. That is the effort and the object. I think this, this -- and Dennis, congratulations for maybe cracking this
nut for us. This as a convect side I think could work wonderfully against Obverse 2 as the concave side. And the beautiful thing is, quite honestly, we get two public designs on one coin. I think that's just a wonderful outcome. And I'd be willing to withdraw my motion in favor of that one.

CHAIR URAM: I think the option for alteratives and options for the Mint to go before the committee is still really important. I think we should honor the vote that was taken, you know, for everyone picking the designs. And then not try to modify or do anything because $I$ think they understand our side.

When we were talking about customers, today our customer is the stakeholders here. That's who we're focusing on.

MR. WEINMAN: And I'll mention one more thing if it's okay, Mr. Chairman, that those of you that've been with CCAC for some time that know this, everything that we've discussed, that you've discussed today is on the public record. And so if, in other words -- and the, the stakeholders are literally in
the room right now hearing everything you say.

So whether you do this by formal motion or, or not, the discussion is clearly out there when the, when there's an ultimate recommendation. So I don't think you have to worry too much about --

MR. JANSEN: With all due respect to that, the memo that carriers our recommendation forward administratively, I'd like to see --

MR. WEINMAN: The more you put into --

MR. JANSEN: -- the two parallel mentions in
that would be --

MR. WEINMAN: That would be helpful.

MR. JANSEN: -- would be my, would be my desire here.

MR. WEINMAN: Then the motion's on the floor.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. So we have a motion that you made and, Dennis, did you -- excuse me --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I would like to just add to -- I would like to add to this conversation that we as the CCAC have been charged with helping to choose good designs for our coins. And I think when we have a vote like we've just had where we have as a
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committee chosen certain designs, then $I$ think we need to honor that before we start to alter some of these designs.

Our, our, our charge is not to design the coin. It's to be advisors and make the best coin out of what we've been given. And I love Dennis's idea. Dennis, congratulations, but $I$ also think we are, you know, we need to pay attention to other factors.

MR. JANSEN: But, but with all due respect, the vote on the obverse was done in a vacuum.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Indeed it was and that's unfortunate.

MR. JANSEN: It is.
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: But I, I --

MR. JANSEN: And I, my motion is not to overwhelm or dismiss the, the standard default process. It's actually to make a recommendation in parallel. So let the constituencies to CFA and ultimately the mint officers and the treasury officials know our best thoughts.

CHAIR URAM: With that being said, why don't -- your motion originally is to put four alternatives
on the table for the Mint to take and move forward with. And work with our stakeholders accordingly. It was 19 and No. 1. 19 obverse, No. 1 reverse, that garnered the most votes. So by default, that automatically should be considered because that's the committee's choice.

MR. JANSEN: Short of a motion to, to augment or change that.

CHAIR URAM: Yeah. And then the option or the alternative for Obverse No. 2 with Reverse 18 is an option for them to consider as well, which is what you --

MR. JANSEN: That's the, that's the motion on the floor. I, I'd like to discuss with my second, would you be willing to modify that motion, Dennis, as the second?

CHAIR URAM: One second, Erik. Don't you think it'd be better to do that and then let the Mint decide any other pairings that might, you know, still giving them the opportunity for pairings?

MR. JANSEN: I actually don't.

CHAIR URAM: Okay.

MR. JANSEN: I, I think it needs to rise to the level of official communique as opposed to fall into the morass of did you listen to the transcription.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. Is, is -- okay. We have a second. We have your motion and right now Dennis has seconded. We should call for the question on this motion first.

MR. JANSEN: I think there's discussion that isn't completed yet.

CHAIR URAM: Go ahead. Finish up.
MR. JANSEN: And, and, and that discussion, Dennis, would you consider altering the motion to essentially go to the idea you did, which is we adapt two obverse deigns for the coin? We adopt Obverse 19 for the convex portion, which $I$ think is normally called the reverse. And Obverse 2 for the concave portion, which is intended as the obverse. Did I get that correct, April?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes.
MR. JANSEN: I want to be crisp here. You would be willing to modify our motion to that, Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: I would and, and I think I would word the motion so that we make recommendation -either make further recommendations for the wording of the legends and inscriptions, or simply note that that would need to be figured out at some point?

MR. JANSEN: It, it, if we could put that off for the moment and just stick with the principle art images.

CHAIR URAM: So what you're saying is 19 and No. 1 as default. Then we're going to go to what next?

MR. JANSEN: Well, we, we have let the recommendation stand as the default vote pair and then so that stands. But on equal standing in the recommendations would be Obverse 2 as the intended concave obverse and what is Obverse 19, a second public design, to be adopted as the convex reverse of the coin.

MR. TUCKER: Yes.
MR. JANSEN: Okay. I would amend my motion
to that. And you would still second it, Dennis?
MR. TUCKER: Yeah. Second it.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR URAM: Okay. And it's recorded accordingly.

MR. WEINMAN: No discussion --

CHAIR URAM: So end of the discussion. Let's take a vote. All those in favor on the motion to rearrange the obverses and the reverses as discussed in the motion? All those in favor of that motion say aye. Opposed? Well, one, two, three, four, five, six, six. The motion's defeated.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR URAM: So, but another motion then to move forward with options for the Mint. I would entertain a motion if anyone wants to do that back to keeping it as Obverse 2 and 18 or do you want to just move forward with the recommended voted designs?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I move with --

MR. TUCKER: Well, do, do you mean obverse?

CHAIR URAM: Back to the, versus, versus shuffling the designs we would go back to the alterative that Don brought up of having Obverse No. 2 and Reverse 18 as another selection, part of the
selection process.

MR. WEINMAN: Of the selection.

CHAIR URAM: In conjunction with the one that was voted with the highest votes of No. 19 for the obverse and No. 1 for the reverse.

MR. JANSEN: I'd, I'd support that motion.

CHAIR URAM: Erik makes that motion. We need a second.

MR. SCARINCI: I'll second it.

CHAIR URAM: Don seconds it. And, and thank you, Dennis. All those in favor of giving the Mint the option to include the second pairing along with those that were voted and the majority, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? Four opposed. Motions carries. Okay. Thank you. That was good.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you for indulging me.

CHAIR URAM: No, that's fine.

MR. JANSEN: I appreciate it.

CHAIR URAM: No, that's fine. Is there anything else to come before our committee meeting today? I would just like to say that once again based on Mr. Moran's and myself as far as House Bill 3757,
which is for the 2021 Morgan and Peace Dollar, we're going to be getting a whole lot of information out to you so that you can help support. And for those of you that are able to, officially be able to make sure that we get as many signatures as possible for that legislation. You heard from Mike earlier today and we'll keep you posted on that. So any other business to come before -- our next meeting is scheduled for September 18, 2019. Is there a motion to adjourn? MR. JANSEN: So moved. CHAIR URAM: Erik. Second? MR. GILL: Second. CHAIR URAM: Sam. All those in favor say aye? Thank you. MR. TUCKER: Aye. CHAIR URAM: Thank you, Dennis, we're adjourned. MR. DOLEVA: Thank you all on behalf of the Hall of Fame.
(Whereupon, at 1:03 p.m., the meeting concluded.)
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