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PROCEEDINGS
WELCOME AND ROLL CALL
MS. LANNIN: Good morning. I'd like to call to order this meeting of the Citizens Advisory -Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee for Thursday, September 27, 2018.

And before we begin, I would like to introduce the members of the committee, and please respond with the word "present". I will start with our two members who are on the phone. Robert Hoge?

MR. HOGE: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Heidi Wastweet?
MS. WASTWEET: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Donald Scarinci?
MR. SCARINCI: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Erik Jansen?
MR. JANSEN: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Jeanne Stevens-Sollman?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Michael Moran?
MR. MORAN: Here.
MS. LANNIN: Dennis Tucker?

MR. TUCKER: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Thomas Uram?
MR. URAM: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Herman Viola?
MR. VIOLA: Present.
MS. LANNIN: I am the chair, Mary Lannin, and
I am obviously here. Okay. The first thing that we have today is the discussion of the letter to the secretary and the minutes to the previous meeting.

Then we are going to review the revised candidate design for the Weir Farm National Historic Site for 2019 for the America the Beautiful quarters program. There will be a review of candidate designs for the 2019 American Liberty High Relief 24K Gold Coin and Silver Medal, as well as a review of candidate designs for the 2018 American Innovation coin.

But before we start that, I would also like to welcome members of the Mint who are here. Ron Harrigal.

MR. HARRIGAL: Present.
MS. LANNIN: Roger, Pam, Vanessa, Megan,
Betty, April, Greg, welcome. Are there any people from
the press who are here?
MR. GILKES: Paul Gilkes, from Coin World.
MS. LANNIN: Okay. Morning, Paul. Any --
MR. GILKES: Good morning. I didn't make scallops.

MS. LANNIN: What?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: He didn't make scallops.
MS. LANNIN: Oh, I'm very sorry. Okay. Any other members from the press besides Paul? All right. Okay. For the -- and Betty has now walked in. Okay. Great.

For the Mint, is there anything that you would like to have on the record now, that you would like to talk about in any of the things that we're going to be speaking about today. Ron, anything?

MR. HARRIGAL: Nothing here.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
MS. LANNIN: Okay. All right. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes from our last public meeting. Any comments on the document? We have two sets of minutes. We've got those from June and we've got those from July. No comments? Is there

```
    a motion to approve the minutes?
    MR. JANSEN: Motion to approve.
        MS. LANNIN: Erik, thank you. Is there a
    second?
        MR. URAM: Second.
        MS. LANNIN: Tom, was that you? Thank you.
    All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.
        (Chorus of ayes.)
        MS. LANNIN: Those opposed?
        MR. HOGE: Aye.
        MS. LANNIN: All right. The letters and the
    minutes are approved. April, may I turn to you for the
    Weir Farm portfolio?
    2020-20201 AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL CANDIDATE DESIGN
    REVIEW
    WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
    MS. STAFFORD: Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair.
    We are going to be reviewing candidate designs for the
    Weir Farm National Historic Site, American the
    Beautiful quarter, which is a 2020 quarter. And this
    site is in Connecticut.
    Some background on this site, Weir Farm
```

National Historic Site is the finest remaining landscape of American Impressionism and provides a pristine setting where contemporary artists can connect to and paint in the same place that American masters painted at the turn of the 19 th century.

The park was home to Julien Alden Weir, a leading figure in American art and the development of American Impressionism. Designed and preserved by artists, the park is a singular crossroads of creativity, art and nature.

Thousands of artists travel to the park every year to be inspired by the rare quality of painter's light at Weir Farm and to paint and draw en plein air in the iconic and exquisite landscape.

After the initial portfolio of designs for Weir Farm was presented to the CCAC On June 12th, you requested that designs identified by this committee as well as the CFA and the liaison be revised. Based on this recommendation, we have developed a new portfolio with multiple designs.

Per the site liaison's request, all designs include the inscription "National Park for the Arts".

We're fortunate to have with us the superintendent of Weir Farm National Historic Site, Linda Cook. Linda, are you with us?

MS. COOK: Yes. Yes, I am, April. Good morning.

MS. STAFFORD: Good morning. Thank you so much for joining us. Before we review the candidate designs, would you like to say a few words to the committee?

MS. COOK: I'd love to. Thank you for the opportunity. Good morning, committee. It's great to be meeting with you again. And we truly appreciate the opportunity to have this second review and the opportunity to have worked with the artists and April and Vanessa to get us to this place.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you so much. And of course Linda is available if you have any questions. We'll start by looking at the liaison's preference. There's two. The first preference is 6a, you can see on the left. And I will note it as we move through the candidate designs. Our liaison's second preference is 14a, you can see on the right. I will
also note that as we move through.
We also took these candidate designs to the CFA this past Thursday and their recommendation was for design 6a, which is also our site liaison's first preference.

Okay. We'll start with design 1. This design features a stone wall in front of Weir House. In the foreground is a French easel with a canvas depicting Weir's studio. Design 4 features an easel with the beginnings of a painting of Julien Alden Weir's studio in front of the studio itself.

Design 6 and actually $6 a$ portray and artist painting outside Julien Alden Weir's studio at Weir Farm. It's inspired by various images of the studio and Weir's paintings created on the property, as well as descriptions of Weir and his fellow artists' creative inspiration from the rural environment. The design allows the viewer to feel as if he or she is standing where Weir stood.

So this is design 6. And design 6a, the figure is simply wearing a painter's smock. I'll note again that 6 a is the superintendent of Weir farm's
first preference, our liaison's first preference, and also the CFA's recommendation.

Designs 13, 14 and 14a depict a portable easel holding a canvas with the artist's painting of the scene overlaying the actual landscape at Weir Farm. This scene is of Weir House and Weir Studio. The canvas and easel are portrayed in greater detail than the rest of the design, underscoring the mission of the site, specifically to create a legacy of artistic expression.

This is design 13, 14, where the canvas is square, and 14a features a slightly upsized canvas. Again, 14a was our liaison's second preference. Madam chair, those are the designs.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you so much. I'd like to start with Robert Hoge, if you don't mind, Robert. What are your thoughts?

MR. HOGE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I think all of these are rather pretty designs and pleasing. It's very hard to decide. I do particularly like the house image in number one, but it might be perhaps a bit too busy. I think $I$ would be satisfied to go with
the preferences of the liaison and the CFA for 6 a.
MS. LANNIN: All right. Thank you so much. Heidi, would you like to chime in.

MS. WASTWEET: Yes, thanks. I do also like design 6a. It's a very straightforward, pleasant composition. But I'm going to lean my preference towards 14a because I think it'd be a shame to pass up such a creative design.

Even though 6a is a perfectly nice design, it's more pedestrian and $14 a$ really does something that we haven't seen done before in a coin. And I think that we should applaud that. And that's all.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. Thank you so much, Heidi. Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: I love the word pedestrian for 6a because that's just what it is. I mean, and it actually doesn't really work, given the size.

When you go look at the -- when you look at the picture of the coin on the full length page that we have that includes the size of the coin, the little tiny painter is like a little tiny painter. And it's just -- it's too busy. You know, the painter's too
small. The easel is -- you know, I hate to say it, but the size of a bug.

So the easel, you're not going to get the point of it in the quarter -- in the quarter coin. And to go with that one would then be a lost opportunity because certainly the more interesting and creative design and the artist who did it should be rewarded for their creativity and we should be sending out a message to the artists that this is the kind of thing we want to see.

And that's 14a. You know, 14a, you know, with a larger -- with a larger canvas, I think that's going to pop. You know, I know Ron's going to do an incredible job on it and it's going to look amazing in the proof. And I just think it'll make kind of a neat coin.

And on the three-inch size, it's even going to be -- it's even going to be better. It's going to be a really nice three-incher. But I think it's going to be fine as on the quarter-sized palette. Certainly it's the best one on the small palette of all of these. I think it's actually even better than 01 on
the small palette and 01 would work on the small
palette and 04 would work on the small palette. But I think $14 a$ is just a creative design. But that's the one I think we should -- that's the one I think we should go with and send the message to the artists.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Donald. Tom?
MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I agree with what's been said. However, I would -- in looking at this last time, I liked this whole concept from when we saw the originals of these.

But I kind of lean more towards 14 more than 14a because of the depth perception. It's just how I'm catching it. And maybe it should be left up to Ron and the team to see which, 14 or $14 a$, would strike up best.

As Don mentioned, on the five, the larger, certainly the 14 does. But if you look at your little size here down on the bottom right, you can see pretty much a difference between if you took both of them.

That canvas is taking up the majority of that space. And $I$ think we're losing a little bit of the depth perception and the value of -- you know, it's a great artistic design. And $I$ just think that it's
going to cover a little bit too much, based on that size. So I would leave it up to them about 14 or 14 a. But I like 14 because of that. Thank you, Madam Chair. MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Tom. Erik? MR. JANSEN: Thank you. When I look at this set, I really see three classes of designs. And the first class would be 1 and 4. I personally think buildings on coins are akin to a picture in metal. And I can't advocate for them. We've used some of them in the past. But $I$ think in general they yield kind of nonplussing designs.

So the second category would be 6 and 6 a. And I agree with Donald. These are safe, if not rather boring pictures on metal once again. And about the most creative part of those would be whether you incuse "The National Park for the Arts", which in my mind is a wonderful thing to have on a coin, national park for the arts. But $I$ don't think five pieces of text justify an artistic design.

So that leaves me with the third category that I'm going to advocate and that would be 13, 14 and 14a. And I guess I have a technical question here for Ron.

How would you -- and I think I'll just group them all together because the question applies to all equally. How would you frost up various parts of the design in a proof rendition? Have you given this any thought, Ron? I don't mean to hit you with a blind question.

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah. What you'd -- is this thing on? Okay. Yeah. What you can see there, typically what you would end up frosting is the field area on this design.

The area behind where it says "National Park for the Arts" is going to be the only opportunity to proof polish there. Everything else that has relief is a bit problematic when trying to proof polish. MR. JANSEN: Yeah, exactly. That's why I asked the question.

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah.
MR. JANSEN: Because, to me, not to do a reverse proof approach here, but if you were to leave in a polished format the entire background and frost only the perimeter of the canvas frame and the structural elements of the easel, that would really
make this symbolic of the easel being the pop element in proof. And to me, that's the essence of the strength of what Heidi used here was the creative -- or made here, the creative inclusion of the easel.

And obviously in the normal business strike, the relief of the background scene would be very light and the relief, I assume of the canvas frame would be kind of maximum depth on the relief, right?

MR. HARRIGAL: Yes, absolutely. You're correct there, Erik.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.
MR. HARRIGAL: You do have two levels of relief there.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.
MR. HARRIGAL: And then the field. The problem with proof polishing the artwork in the background is you do have very little relief there. MR. JANSEN: Yeah.

MR. HARRIGAL: And when you do polish, you lose detail.

MR. JANSEN: Right.
MR. HARRIGAL: So the concern there would be
losing those elements that you'd want to show the depth perception.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. Yeah. The challenge is managing that dynamic range.

MR. HARRIGAL: You will get the contrast if you do something like that. But you would lose detail, which would make it very challenging.

MR. JANSEN: I were to think if you were to frost the treetops at the 12 o'clock position and the building at the extreme 9 o'clock position and so forth in the proof, that would kind of destroy the popping of the easel and the canvas frame on the proof version.

That's just -- I want to put that out there because I would advocate for -- and we've got a -Madam Chair, we have to talk about this so we don't get a split vote problem here between 14 and 14 a and end up really dividing the real intentions of the committee. I'm going to advocate for $14 a$ on a specific design, merely to line up behind the liaison's preferences because $I$ really think the strength of this design is, quite frankly, in that decision of how and where to frost and, most importantly, not to frost in
the background and really lean on the symbolic of the easel and the artwork because I do believe "National Park for the Arts" carries the message here.

I wish I could pump up the font size a bit in $14 a$ of what is from $9 o^{\prime}$ clock to 12 o'clock. I don't think there's a way to do it without screwing up the layout of the coin. I thank the artist that spent the time to refine those designs a little further. That's my recommendation. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: Thanks so much, Erik. Herman?
MR. VIOLA: Thank you. I would have to say I agree that $I$ like $14 a$ also and $I$ think it'd be a very striking coin. And I'd let the experts figure out how to make it look better.

MS. LANNIN: All right, Herman. Jeanne? MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm a little -- I'm a little concerned, although I like 14a. I'm a little concerned about the detail when we get down to putting that canvas together, that that's not going to be too tiny.

Is that going to be difficult to reproduce or strike when we have such a small image in that painting

```
on 14a?
```

MR. HARRIGAL: Directed to me, Ron?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.
MR. HARRIGAL: It is a very difficult coin to pull that relief and to get that depth perception.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: My question is -- and I'm going to contradict Erik a little bit here -- is it -- if you have the painting smaller and the background larger, is that a little easier for you to strike or doesn't it matter once you get to this level?

MR. HARRIGAL: I'm not sure I understand your question.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Well, we have more background behind that painting on 14. So when we're talking about frosting, would that be easier? MR. HARRIGAL: Well -- well -MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Would that be any easier plan?

$$
\text { MR. HARRIGAL: I think } 14 \text { would probably }
$$ execute a little bit better than $14 a$, only from the perspective that you do have more room to work with for your perspective and your depth on the background

```
    elements.
```

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. That was --
MR. HARRIGAL: And it does carry through the
easel in the painting on both.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes, correct. Yeah.
For that reason, I would look at 14 more carefully because I think the painting, although I like the fact that the painting is popped on 14a, I think we're going to be maybe losing the background. So I'm going to put my vote toward 14. Sorry, Erik.

MR. JANSEN: I don't take it personally. But I will make a note, we've just been handed the voting scorecard.

MS. LANNIN: Yeah.
MR. JANSEN: And we've got to do a little --
MS. LANNIN: It's 14a, not 17.
MR. JANSEN: Well okay, so we're going to split out 14 and 14 a.

MS. LANNIN: Mm-hmm.
MR. JANSEN: And 6 a does not appear on the voting scoresheet.

MR. WEINMAN: Whoops. Yeah, just --

MS. LANNIN: We can write it in. MR. WEINMAN: Please write that in, yeah. MR. JANSEN: So -MR. WEINMAN: Please write that in. Our apology.

MR. JANSEN: I think I'm -- the candidate here is complaining about the write-in status of his vote. MS. WASTWEET: I'm sorry? I didn't hear that. Write-in what?

MR. JANSEN: The write-in penalty of his vote.
I don't understand what --
MS. LANNIN: Heidi, 6a was not -- was
eliminated from the scoresheet accidentally.
MS. WASTWEET: Oh, okay.
MS. LANNIN: And number 17 doesn't exist.
That's actually $14 a$.
MR. WEINMAN: 14a, yeah.
MS. WASTWEET: Okay, thanks.
MS. LANNIN: Yeah.
MR. WEINMAN: Please modify your scoresheet
accordingly.
MS. LANNIN: Yeah. So there's seven --
there's seven things to vote on.
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. That's all I had.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. Michael?
MR. MORAN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. LANNIN: Pick that up.
MR. MORAN: I had an opportunity --
MS. LANNIN: Pick that up.
MR. MORAN: I had an opportunity just recently to sit down with a national park superintendent who had gone through this quarter selection process.

And I really quizzed her in detail to get the viewpoint from the other side. And I got it in a very succinct phrase. She said, we were told you'd be amazed how much you can get on the back of a quarter. I about died.

And obviously we've not learned our lesson because 6 is in the mix. It will not show. When you pick that quarter up in change, you won't have a clue what it is. There's too much there.

And at the same time, we've got very viable designs at 14 and 14a. I'm going to give them both
three and then I'm going to let the committee deal with it.

MS. LANNIN: All right. Thank you, Michael. Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Something I want to point out, we've discussed this before publicly, but $I$ think it bears repeating is that the committee discourages dioramas, posed snapshots, montages. And we get away from that nicely with this portfolio, at least on montages.

Thirteen, 14 and $14 a$ all get my strongest preference. We were all drawn to the scene within a scene concept in our June 12, 2018 meeting and our artist has gone back to the drawing board and incorporated the revisions.

MS. LANNIN: Note unintended.
MR. TUCKER: That's right -- incorporated the revisions that we wanted to see and that our liaison thought that would improve the designs as well. These are all slightly staged. But to me, they benefit from a dramatic tension that comes with a scene of paused activity.

I'll explain that. We are not shown an artist at work. We don't have a snapshot of an artist painting en plein air. But we don't need to see that. He or she has stepped away out of our sight or has stepped backward to look at the painting in context. Ideally I think the person who's looking at this coin will look at the scene from 13, 14 and 14a and we become the painter.

When I look at this painting, or when I look at this coin, those are my paint tubes. That's my canvas. And I have painted this beautiful scene en plein air, as artists do at Weir Farm.

I think that's -- I think that's a strong element that these designs bring to this coin. I think that any of them would make a beautiful three inch silver coin.

Will they translate to the smaller one inch quarter dollar size? I know that our program managers would not bring them to us if they thought that our world class team at the Mint, our sculptors and our technical team weren't up to the task.

So as Herman said, I think we can leave that
challenge up to them because we know that they can do it. My strongest vote coming in was going to be for $14 a$.

But Ron, after your comments and some of the comments of the committee, I think I will -- maybe I'll do what Mike said and vote three points for both. But I think I'm leaning towards 14 after Ron's recommendation. So I think that concludes my comments.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Dennis. There's something -- I took like literally the portfolio that we're looking at with the painting within the painting. The one thing that stuck out for me was that number 13 is the only one that actually seems to mimic exactly the scene that's behind it. If you look at the trees at the top, they meet.

If you -- they've got the small house to the left. They've got the large house that the canvas is hiding. That's actually $I$ think the best trick of the eye that we have in these three.

If you look at 14, which again I appreciate Ron's input into this, that little house that's off at 9 o'clock, that appears nowhere in that canvas. And
that's sort of a disconnect to me. The trees are larger. I can live with 14. I just like the mimicry of number 13. The liaison prefers 14a. I would tend to go, I believe, with 14 because of what Ron said that could be accomplished for all of us. Erik?

MR. JANSEN: I had the same thought. I didn't mention it. I actually like 13 in a way that it's going to offer the most interesting use of negative space here because it fundamentally has almost no negative space and hence my question comes back to could we only frost up the easel and the frame. And despite the fearful loss of detail, the background, actually you want to lose that detail.

MS. LANNIN: Yeah. Yeah. MR. JANSEN: And so, I'm actually voting three points for both 13, 14 and $14 a$, if only to invite -MS. LANNIN: You're making our life difficult. MR. JANSEN: -- a refined discussion in the wake of staying -- having the group perhaps choose that class and we'll figure the rest out.

MS. LANNIN: The other -- the other thing that I liked about 13 is that, front and center, you see

```
"National Park for the Arts".
    MR. JANSEN: Yeah.
    MS. LANNIN: You don't have to read that --
    MR. JANSEN: Correct.
    MS. LANNIN: -- curved around. And I think
    that that would be important to the stakeholder.
    MR. JANSEN: And your comments brought that
subtlety forward to me just in a sudden moment of
clarity.
    MS. LANNIN: Yeah. So --
    MR. JANSEN: That --
    MS. LANNIN: It's just me looking at literally
an artist's snapshot of exactly what's behind. And if
    the trees are nice and soft and frosted, all the better
    in my book.
    MR. JANSEN: Yeah. No, so thank you for those
comments. I wish I had made them myself.
    MS. LANNIN: Well, you can borrow them. How's
    that?
        MR. JANSEN: There you go.
        MS. LANNIN: Okay. Any other discussion on
        this?
```

MS. WASTWEET: This is Heidi.
MS. LANNIN: Heidi? Yeah?

MS. WASTWEET: We've had a discussion in the past where we've come up with a situation where we have two designs that are very, very close and therefore we're in danger of diluting our vote because some of us are leaning one way, some the other, even though we like that set of designs the best. And it can work the against us.

So I like the idea -- I can't remember who put it forward -- of giving three points to each 14 and $14 a$ and then we can do a simple vote afterwards to pick which one of the two, something like that. But let's not dilute our vote and then lose it.

MS. LANNIN: All right. Anybody else have any comments? I see a lot of nodding heads. Don?

```
    MR. SCARINCI: I think -- I think -- I think
```

Heidi's exactly right. I think for those of us who
like 14 --

MS. LANNIN: Don, turn your mic on, please.
MR. SCARINCI: Oh, I'm sorry. For those of us who like either 14 or $14 a, ~ I ~ t h i n k ~ w e ~ s h o u l d ~ d o ~ t h r e e ~$
votes for each, three votes for 14 , three votes for $14 a$ and then --

MS. LANNIN: But you're not stacking the voting at all, okay?

MR. SCARINCI: What do you mean?
MR. JANSEN: And perhaps 13 in the same thought.

MR. SCARINCI: Oh, well whoever likes others can vote for others. But if you like -- if you like the 14 theme, it's either 14 or 14 a.

So rather than -- to avoid diluting your vote, you should just give each one three votes. And if you like another one, you like another one.

MS. LANNIN: All right. Any other comments?
MR. SCARINCI: I don't know what other one would be.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. So let's begin our voting.
MR. WEINMAN: And once again, please correct your scoresheets with the actual numbers. And Heidi and -- well, Heidi, respond to my text. Send me your scores either by text or by email. Robert, are you able to do the same?

MR. HOGE: Yeah, I just did.
MR. WEINMAN: You sent it -- how did you -- by what way? By what means did you send it?

MR. HOGE: Email.
MR. WEINMAN: Email? Okay. It should be coming in then.

MS. LANNIN: You're the delivery guy today?
MR. JANSEN: I'm the delivery guy today. I got a promotion.

MR. WEINMAN: I think that's the entire table. As soon as their scores come in, I'll give it to you. Do you want to take a quick recess or do you want to -MS. LANNIN: Do you -- what would you like to do?

MR. WEINMAN: We're a little ahead of schedule. So we can probably take a -MS. STAFFORD: I'd love to have Linda Cook, the superintendent of Weir Farm, available for further discussion.

It seems like there'll be further committee discussion perhaps about which ones. Maybe her input in the conversation might help drive a decision then.

MS. LANNIN: So we'd like to keep Linda -MS. STAFFORD: So maybe just keep going. MS. LANNIN: -- on the phone before we begin
talking about the High Relief Liberty.
MS. STAFFORD: Yes.
MS. LANNIN: Okay. Thanks. That is
important. Thank you. Okay. We're taking a recess? MS. LANNIN: Why don't we take five minutes while we're tallying up the scores and be back at 10: 40?
(Whereupon, the foregoing went off the record at 10:33 a.m., and went back on the record at 10:42 a.m.)

MS. LANNIN: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we are back in session. It is now 10:45 and Greg is going to read out the scores so far for Weir Farm. MR. WEINMAN: Okay. With respect to Weir Farm --

MS. LANNIN: Come on. Donald? Donald? MR. WEINMAN: Donald? MS. LANNIN: This is the vote.

MR. WEINMAN: With respect to Weir Farm, one received three votes. Four received one vote. Six received four votes. 6a received five votes.

Thirteen received 16 votes. Fourteen received
29 votes, which is the high, 14a just behind it with 28 votes. So the two highest scoring designs were 14 at 29 votes and 14a at 28 votes. MS. LANNIN: Okay. Erik, you wanted to say something?

MR. JANSEN: I was just going to --
FEMALE: So we don't have to discuss it.
MR. JANSEN: I was just going to offer a
thought to the committee inasmuch as 14 and 14a
technically show a difference, showing some respect to the liaison's preference of 14a, I would offer a motion to accept 14 a as our recommendation.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.
MR. WEINMAN: So moved.
MS. LANNIN: So moved. All in favor of -MR. JANSEN: Wait a minute, $I$ think we need a second --

MR. MORAN: Here's a second.

MR. JANSEN: -- and discussion --
MS. LANNIN: Second. It's the drugs.
MR. JANSEN: -- with all due respect.
MR. MORAN: Second.
MS. LANNIN: Thank you.
MR. WEINMAN: Any discussion?
MS. LANNIN: All right.
MR. WEINMAN: Any discussion?
MS. LANNIN: Any discussion about this at all?
MR. WEINMAN: It didn't call for any.
MS. LANNIN: Okay. All in favor of Erik's
motion to accept what the liaison would like, which is 14a, aye, say aye?
(Chorus of ayes.)

MR. JANSEN: Whoa, I think that was a positive.

MR. WEINMAN: Was that an aye?
MS. LANNIN: I think that was a positive.
MR. TUCKER: Velociraptor.
MS. LANNIN: Okay. Do we have any negative motion or votes against that? Two? Okay. So it's eight to two. The motion passes and we will be with

14a for Weir Farm. And Ms. Cook, would you like to say anything, add anything to this discussion before we sign off?

MS. COOK: Thank you. Yes. One, thank you for allowing me to participate in this. I really liked the idea that you spoke to a superintendent about this coin process because it is definitely not within the normal range of what we do every day.

But I want to really thank you for the conversation regarding around the three paintings, you know, the painting on the coins or the painting within a painting.

The gentleman who made the comment about the idea that the viewer or the holder of the coin is now the artist $I$ think really rang true with the universality of the park's mission.

And as I sat here and looked at this on my screen, I want to take out those paint tubes and put in a paint brush, you know, hanging over the edge of the easel and, you know --

MR. JANSEN: Brushes don't hang over edges. MS. COOK: -- the comments about bringing the
foreground into the -- bringing the background into the foreground and creating those kind of relationships between, you know, in and out and then the "National Park for the Arts", you know, what pops and what doesn't, all that rings true.

And I really appreciate the insight and attention you're giving to this. And we feel very lucky to have you being there to call the fate on how this will be debuted. And we're very excited. MS. LANNIN: Well, thank you for attending this session for a second time and we hope that you are pleased with what we have chosen for you.

MS. COOK: Yes, very pleased and thank you.
MS. LANNIN: You're welcome. Thank you.
April, on to you for the 2019 American Liberty High Relief 24 K Gold Coin and Silver Medal Program. AMERICAN LIBERTY HIGH RELIEF 24K GOLD COIN/SILVER MEDAL MS. STAFFORD: Yes. Absolutely, and thank you, Ms. Cook, if you're still there. Thank you, Linda, very much for joining us. We appreciate it.

All right. The 2019 American Liberty High Relief 24 K Gold coin and Silver Medal, for 2019,
basically building on the success of the programs that came before in 2015 and 2017, the Mint plans to produce in 2019 a high relief 24 k gold coin and the accompanying silver medal featuring a modern interpretation of Liberty paired with a modern depiction of an American bald eagle on the reverse.

The diameter of the one ounce gold coin will be 1.2 inches and the diameter of the now 2.5 ounce silver medal will be approximately two inches. This will be the first time in modern history that the U.S. Mint has produced a silver medal in this size. Based on recommendations from this committee, the design portfolio for this program is comprised of designs previously presented for the 2015 and 2017 program. The inscriptions have not yet been altered from the original and so will need to be updated on the designs that are ultimately selected for this program. We'll be showing the coin designs alongside the accompanying medal designs for these. We'll start with the CFA's recommendations from their meeting last Thursday. You'll see design 10 for the obverse was recommended by the CFA and design six for the reverse.

And I'll note that as we move through the candidate designs.

All right. We'll start with observe one depicts a simple profile of Liberty. Obverse two presents Liberty looking confidently to the future while holding an olive branch and a torch.

Three shows Liberty in profile accompanied by symbols of prosperity, specifically grapes representing prosperity, oak leaves representing strength and an olive branch for peace. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and represented by the three flickers of the flame. The artist included skyscrapers as a 21st century symbol of a free, modern society's success in the background.

Four presents Liberty dressed in armor with additional elements inspired by Thomas Crawford's Statute of Freedom which stands upon the dome of the U.S. Capitol. A shawl hangs over her shoulder while she holds a sword, wreath and shield.

Five depicts Liberty holding a torch and an oak branch. In the background, the rising sun symbolizes the beginning of a new era. We should note
that this design does bear some similarity to the design that was ultimately struck on the 2016 American Eagle platinum proof coin.

Six depicts a close-up view of Liberty. Seven
features Liberty wearing a Phrygian cap and a gown adorned with starts. She holds the American flag in her left hand. Eight shows Liberty releasing a dove, freeing the symbolic bird to spread peace. In her left hand, she holds a torch.

Nine depicts a close-up view of Liberty as she looks toward the future. Ten features Liberty with 13 rays of light symbolizing the free and creative spirit of America's people emanating along a headdress. Again, this was the CFA's recommendation for the obverse for this coin and medal.

On to the reverses, reverse one depicts an eagle clutching an olive branch and a bundle of arrows. Two features an eagle carrying an olive branch and an oak branch. Three depicts a close-up view of an eagle with three types of oak leaves representing the east, middle and west of the United States.

Four depicts a profile view of an eagle. Five
places the viewer below an eagle in flight, catching a glimpse of an olive branch in its clutches. Six depicts an eagle as it prepares to land.

Again, this is the CFA's recommended reverse for this coin and medal program and I should note they particularly noted that they liked how the eagle's feathers in this design echoed that of the headdress on the obverse of Liberty.

Reverse seven shows a close-up view of an eagle, emphasizing its powerful form. Reverses eight and nine feature an eagle in flight while rays of light rise from behind a mountain range. In eight, the rays appear as 13 stripes, complimenting the 13 stars displayed. This is eight and nine.

And finally, reverse 10 presents a close-up view of an eagle. That concludes the candidate designs, Madam Chair.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you very much, April.
Robert, would you like to start, please?
MR. HOGE: Okay. Thank you. I thought this is really a very handsome group of pieces and I'm glad that we've revised them from our previous reviews of

2015 and the 20171792 designs.
I was struck by a number of points on several
of these. I probably would not go with number four, the Liberty from the Capitol. It's just a little bit of a severe image. Number seven, the Phrygian cap image looks so much like the French Marianne, just with stars added. Who knows?

Number 10 I think is kind of different
looking. But the ear looks sort of off on it for me. MS. LANNIN: What? Could you repeat what you said about number 10?

MR. HOGE: I'm jumping around. I just thought -- I'm sorry. I'm jumping around here a little bit. Number -- I'll actually go back and mention number one I think is an attractive head. But perhaps it would be a little bit sort of, oh, too modest for the size of a medal.

I felt these things were really quite nice.
But I thought that number eight was especially attractive. I like the look of the idea of they're releasing the dove and the forward-looking aspect of it. It's very traditional looking. But at least the
hair is somewhat modern. I wouldn't be too unhappy really with any of these things though because I think we have a very attractive group here.

One point I might mention though for number six is that something is the matter with the ear on Liberty's -- sort of her left ear, the side of her head. Anyhow, that does it for the time being for me. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: Robert, would you like to talk about the reverses as long as you're with us?

MR. HOGE: Actually no, but --
MS. LANNIN: Oh, well then all right. I'll come back to you.

MR. HOGE: No. Let somebody else talk about the obverses.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. Heidi?
MR. HOGE: Or are we doing them all at once?
MS. LANNIN: All right. Heidi?
MR. WEINMAN: I think we're going to do them all at once.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.
MS. WASTWEET: We've kind of talked about
these before and I don't have anything particular to add. On the reverse, I'm still leaning toward reverse nine $I$ think is the most creative and well-drawn. But yeah, I don't have any other huge comments to add.

MS. LANNIN: Heidi, do you want to talk about the obverses?

MS. WASTWEET: I don't have any particular comments to make, no.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. Donald?
MR. SCARINCI: This is -- honestly, I think this is a very easy one. I think the CFA got this right. You know, and $I$ think this will be a very, very cool coin design, if we can make the -- you know, let me rephrase that.

I think this will be a very, very cool coin design when Ron and his people make the reverse flow into the obverse. That's the trick to this coin. That's what makes this a piece of art as opposed to just, you know, a two-dimensional coin.

This is exactly the kind of piece that I've been talking about where the obverse and the reverse and cohesive. There's a flow to the obverse from the
reverse. The coin is a three-dimensional object, not a two-dimensional object. This is the example of a pairing -- this pairing is the example of that.

And whether it was designed by the same person or not, the art of it is going to be -- is going to be thrown over, you know, to the sculpt and to the production of it because you want to make the obverse and the reverse -- you know, these lines flow.

That's the genius of this. So I think -- I think to me this is an easy discussion. This is really a no-brainer.

I do want to say a few things about some of the others. I do want to talk a little bit about this program and what $I$ don't think we're looking for in a constructive way for the future.

This program, if you remember -- and I think all of us agree that what we're hoping to do with this is to create -- is to allow the artists to express their creativity to come up with 21st century designs of Liberty, Liberty in new and meaningful ways, meaningful ways to the 21 st century, not hearkening back to history.

So I think in the wrong -- you know, in the wrong spirit of this program, you know, something like 4c, it's just wrong. You know, I mean, that's nice to -- that image hearkens back, you know, but it doesn't mean anything to someone living in the 21 st century.

You know, maybe in the Civil War era, you know, or maybe in World War I, you know, I mean maybe that'd be a coin that might mean something.

You know, regardless of whether I like it or not, $I$ don't even want to comment on whether $I$ like it or not. I want to be constructive to the artists to try to make them understand what they're trying -- what we want them to try to do here, right?

This is not what we want them to try to do. This is -- we want them -- this is what we're escaping, right? Same thing with 7 -- you know, with 7c. A Phrygian cap, like let's go to any school in America and ask a kid what a Phrygian cap is, right? They'll look at you like you're from Mars, right?

So meaningful, you know, in the 18th century, absolutely. In the early 19th century, you know, maybe, right? But today, absolutely not. So let's
forget about the Phrygian cap.
You know, and then, you know, some of the other designs, you know, those are the two I want to highlight specifically as, you know, whether they're nice or not, it's not what we're looking for in this program and not something $I$ really want to see again in the future.

So in the future, what $I$ want to see are images -- you know, images like this one. And look, you know, six -- you know, six -- for the artist who did six, you're in the right -- you're in the right church, you know, with six. You know, your thinking is right.

For the artist who did three, except for all the fruit and stuff, you know, I mean, there's Liberty today. I mean, there's a modern woman, I mean, dressed in a way that anyone could identify.

You know, we're not -- you know, we're not floating in space with these flowing gowns like in 5c, which has this Art Nouveau -- you know, that's really nice Art Nouveau. But it's not the 21st century. So I think as we move forward, you know, let's
see more images that people can identify with. And I just wanted to comment on that.

But I think -- I think we -- I think we've got it here and I think the CFA is absolutely right and here challenge is really going to be to make the obverse and the reverse flow. That's really where this is going to be a great piece of art versus not. Ron? MS. LANNIN: Ron, you wanted to make a comment?

MR. HARRIGAL: Yes. I'd like to respond on that comment. Yeah. We definitely are looking at it and we had discussions with the entire team on this design concept.

The one thing I would like to remind the committee is that this is a medal and a coin. So it's going to have a different orientation on it, obverse to reverse. So just keep that in mind when you're making your recommendations. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you.
MR. SCARINCI: Well, we -- well, we can't.
When we make this as a medal. You know, in fact, when you make it as a medal, what you're going to want to do
if you can -- I mean, I know you can. So I won't say you can't.

But you can take these lines over the edge and use the edge when you make it as a medal because you're not encumbered by not doing that. You can go -- you can go --

MR. JANSEN: The word is bleed.
MR. SCARINCI: You can wrap it around.
There's no magic. There's no rule that says medal turn has to be -- you know, medal turn and coin turn, if it's a coin -- there's no rule.

You can break the rules. That's the idea of medals. You always break the rules with medals, always. And in fact, break -- the more you break the rules, the more -- the better it is and the more excited I get.

MS. LANNIN: Excuse me. Robert, whoever's on the phone, could you mute your phone please? Thank you. Donald, I'm sorry.

MR. SCARINCI: So I'd just make the point when you do this as a medal, the art of this is those lines connecting the obverse and the reverse. That's what
you want to capture even more in the medal. I mean, you can capture it in the coin. But that's harder. I'll give you credit. That's a lot harder. The medal is easy.

MR. WEINMAN: Once again, there's somebody on the phone that is --

MS. LANNIN: It might be the connection.
MR. WEINMAN: It may be. If everybody on the phone could just ensure that you're on mute, I think that'll solve the problem.

MS. LANNIN: Oh, interesting. Tom?
MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. And just keeping with the same theme that has been mentioned, when I look at these portfolios, I kind of take a broad look at the whole designs and then my gut feeling of what I gravitate towards when I'm looking at the whole portfolio.

And I instantly look at 10 and six for the reasons that have been mentioned. And if you recall when we did the Boy Scout -- Boy's Town, I guess it was, with the medal with the tree and then turning it over and so forth. This is very much like that and I
think when you're looking at these, you know, it translates coin to medal, et cetera.

The thing I really like though about this Liberty is it's Liberty in motion. Look at her hair. It's flowing. You have Liberty moving forward. You have the rays and then you have the continuation of the rays with the eagle moving as well.

So I think of all the designs, this one really struck me as she's looking forward. Everything's looking forward and everything -- when you then turn it over to the reverse, you pick up the eagle in the proper fashion for the coin and the medal. So that's what it is.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.
MR. URAM: Thank you.
MS. LANNIN: Erik?
MR. JANSEN: Overarching comments and then I'll go to obverse and reverse secondly. Nobody has mentioned the fact that this program, I assume, continues in the ultra-high relief manufacturing. Ron?

MS. LANNIN: High relief.
MR. JANSEN: We're optimizing relief in this
coin again, right?

MR. HARRIGAL: Yes. We are designing for the high relief. The medal's going to have a higher relief than the coin proportionally. So we're designing it to the medal and then we'll proportionate it down to the coin.

MR. JANSEN: To the best you can, yeah. Yeah, yeah.

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah, to the best we can for the medal, yes.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah, because $I$ mean with a couple of designs I'm going to recommend, there's a whole lot of asymmetry to metal moves and it's going to make some challenging fill problems for you obverse or reverse.

But putting that aside, I think I want to remind the committee in a high relief environment, the background negative space becomes the essence of the punch to making the high relief really hit the eye appeal.

The second overarching point $I$ want to make -I think the committee -- and Donald touched on some of
this, but the committee originally endowed this as the modern liberty program, modern meaning to put aside the Phrygian past and put aside a lot of the Art Nouveau flowy and otherwise graphic lines that we see in so many classics and really try to extract what in our modern world do we want to endow this art to bring to our mind.

And so, I'm going to choose some things really focusing on modern. Moving to the obverses, one is simply too simple for a large palette. It's just -- it would be lovely in a small design. It's very vanilla. I don't think the crest across the front necessarily looks like it's going to stay on her head. So I'm going to dismiss that one.

And I'm going to dismiss a number of other designs that just don't pass the modern muster. Item three is a montage. The designer, God bless you, but there's absolutely no energy in this. She's looking through, not at whatever that thing is rising out of her hand. So I dismiss it as a coin that just lacks the subtle but absolutely important element of energy. Design six, again, $I$ think to quote Donald,
which is sometimes a dangerous thing to do, I think the artist is in the right church here. Keep working at it and keeping coming at us with ideas that challenge us.

I end up on design number 10. And I'm going to make some specific comments here. I do have an issue with the anatomy of the ear. I agree with Robert on that. I looked at that design and I saw Liberty living in a torrent of our pace of change.

The wind that is blowing her hair back not a little bit, but if you've ever been in horizontal rain, you know what wind feels like. And that's horizontal hair. That is the modern flowing hair design. And the artist on this absolutely nailed it.

I'm pleased that the CFA concurs with this. In high relief, we've got such an engulfing space, negative space around this that it's going to just -she is just going to come out in high relief, especially on the medallic version of this, and it's going to knock your socks off.

I am hoping in the sculpt we can keep those -the hair on her brow really high to again accentuate the rate of change that we're facing in society, that

Liberty is having to stand firm in.
It's a subtle thought, but sometimes looking left is looking at the past. Looking right is looking at the future. And so, I'm going to put the idea out there, assuming that this design is chosen, I'm going to put a motion out there to flip this coin so she's looking to the right.

I don't think that's going to have a huge impact on the art. I think the stars are transportable. The word "liberty" might be a little bit of a challenge. But that's kind of where I'm headed on this because this hands down is my choice on the obverse for those reasons.

Moving to the reverse, I'm going to one-up the comments again. Think relief. Think modern. The choice of number six totally works. However, I'm actually going to try to call people's attention to design number 10 .

This is a very graphical drawing. I don't think have we ever featured just this kind of a very tight headshot of an eagle on a coin? Anybody got any historical precedents here? And I like that because
this is the modern thing. We are so spun up as a centrifuge in our society where you can't be the whole bird. You're either the head or you're the tail.

Now, I'm not going to say what head we have here or what the tail might mean. But we're spun out to the ends in society. And I think this is anatomically a wonderful rendition. In high relief, again, we've got the encompassing negative space to pull this up.

God bless you on your medal flow analysis, Ron, if this was a design that was chosen because either the coin flip's going to be easy or the medal flip's going to be the hard one. I don't know. One of them is going to be tough.

MR. SCARINCI: Not that we're -- not that you're pressuring Ron in any way.

MR. JANSEN: Well, Ron will always tell us what's possible and what's not possible. And that's what I appreciate. So I'm not going to go through the other designs other than to say I'm not going to -- I wouldn't fight number six.

And I wouldn't fight number eight or nine.

That's a very lovely design. It has a lot of -- it has a lot of regal nature to it, which is what we should be doing on a high denomination coin. I think 10 is the bold move for modern Liberty. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: Thanks, Erik. All right.
Herman?
MR. VIOLA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have to say I like a lot of these designs. I have to say I also can't improve much on what Don had to say. He seemed to capture it all. Number nine, when you're talking about this medal looking to the future --

MR. JANSEN: Obverse or reverse?
MR. VIOLA: I guess it would be the obverse. And if that -- if she's looking at the future and she's as scared as I think a lot of us are, I'm not sure I'd want to see that on a coin.

But I would -- I would be happy with the reverse 10. I think that is very dramatic. But I'm also very happy with the one that the CFA picked. So I think we're on the right track with this one. Thank you.
MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Herman. Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you. I'm going to throw a tiny wrench in all of this. Sorry. I agree with Don and the CFA with number 10 obverse and six reverse.

However, the anatomy of the ear really is torturous to me. And I think if this is chosen, we can just take away her ear and leave the lobe to indicate that there's something there and let the hair flow over it. That would be probably a way to remedy that. But going through all of these obverses, I'm inclined to look at number nine, even though she might be scared. I think this is pretty dynamic. It has -- I think when it's polished up, it's going to be really popping out. And if we used the reverse six to complement the crown, we may be able to flip it so that the eagle is going in the other direction.

I don't know if we can do that here, just to turn that around so that when it's struck, we'd probably have a little bit better medal flow.

On the other hand, to look at number 10 on the reverse, if that were used with number nine, it would be simple on both obverse and reverse and I think
pretty powerful. So those are my choices. I wouldn't hesitate to go with number 10 obverse. But I do like this eagle. I have to agree with Erik. It's different. It's powerful and maybe with number nine, it shows the same amount of fear. Thank you. MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Jeanne. Mike? MR. MORAN: Ron, I want to get back to something you said a minute ago on how you would approach the relief. In the earlier issues on the gold coin, if $I$ remember right, and we released -- I think we released it in a press release.

And I may be missing a decimal. But we define ultra-high relief and high relief as specific measurements. And the ultra-high -- or the high relief I believe was 0.28 millimeters. Is that right? MR. HARRIGAL: I couldn't tell you right now. I think we were --

MR. MORAN: I can at home. But I'm not at home. MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah. I don't have that information with me right now. MR. MORAN: The thing that concerns me is the
way you approached it in saying that you would get the relief that you could get from the silver medal at 2.5 inch diameter, which is different from what we've gotten before with the 40.6 millimeter diameter of the American silver eagle that we used on the silver medal. And then, we're back to the relief on the gold $\$ 100$ piece.

I would be disappointed if the relief is -- in doing in that method is less than what we were able to achieve on the first two coins. I think it would be noted quickly in the numismatic market and we'd be subject to some criticism for it.

I caution you on that. I don't want us to do that. I want us to maintain the high relief on the $\$ 100$ gold coin. That was the original concept of the subcommittee that worked on implementing the Mint's proposal for a gold coin issue. The silver medal was an after -- it wasn't an afterthought, but it was a second step. And if we're working at it from the other direction, and particularly from the wider, larger diameter medal, I think we may end up constricting the relief or not
achieving the relief that $I$ certainly personally want on that gold coin.

So, now looking at these, I'm going to say -let's look on the obverses. And maybe whoever's running those, if we could just get them all up there? Okay. Looking first at number three, that one -- and it's been mentioned here -- has potential. It looks like a modern girl. It fits the modern scenario.

But the artist missed it on two things where I think we might be more favorable to it. The fruit over on the left-hand side really doesn't add anything to it.

But the thing that concerns me the most is when you take a close look at the buildings, even though the artist talked about them in the narrative, they really look like '30s and '40s buildings. They're not modern.

And I think the artist missed the chance to highlight Lower Manhattan and the new World Trade Center there. It would have been a beautiful design with consistent conception of what the 21 st century looks like. And it would have been a no-brainer for me
and I would have chosen it right away and would happily choose it if we could modify it.

Going down through the others, $I$ for one am tired of the military portrayal of Liberty. I think that needs to come across to the artistic community, the IAB people, that when you do the next one for 2021, and there will be a next one, stay away from that theme.

We do enough as it is with the commemorative coin programs and the medals that we ought to be able to do a Liberty without putting her in a chainmail suit and put a sword in her hand. Looking at number five, she's dragging a tree. This doesn't work. A branch would have been fine, but that's a tree.

The anatomy is off on number six. That neck just -- it just doesn't fit. The concept is good. The angle is good for the face. But for our artist, you've got to get the anatomy right or it just doesn't go.

Seven plows no new ground. I personally like eight because I like the concept of the dove of peace in the hand. But to make that thing work, you've got to get the same relief on that dove as you do the
woman, Liberty. Otherwise, you're going to lose your perspective across the plane of the coin. I don't like eight, or $I$ mean nine at all, never will.

Ten, yeah, I get it completely. But when I
try to envision, you're going to achieve -- I think you'll achieve the highest relief on that forehead and the curl of hair, the roll of hair there.

How are you going to tail that off and maintain those rays? Is it just -- you can't have a cliff there, guys. There's really no way to. How are you -- where are you going to make that design actually come across as a human head with rays emanating from it?

It doesn't do that in that sketch. It really doesn't. And you've got -- that hair, if it's blown, it's going to be blown parallel to the high relief of the hair in the roll there. So that's got to maintain that relief. And all of a sudden, you've got this area that I cannot envision -- and that's what's troubling me.

It would have been an easy choice. But I can't get the execution and how that's going to look on
a high relief coin. And we need to think about that after we talk about or after we vote because $I$ can see the train. It's left the station on number 10. But guys, those rays are going to come way and the hair's going to go the other way in terms of -- it's just not there.

All right. Reverses. We have a lot of nice eagles here. But we've done a lot of flying eagles, particularly on the back of our dollar coin and I'm tired of them.

I'm ready for the head of an eagle. And that gets to -- well, not that one. I can't get past a rooster on that one. This is the one that $I$ really like.

MS. LANNIN: Yes.
MR. MORAN: It has personality. The feathers are going to fade to the edge of the coin or the medal. I think it will look good and it has my vote going forward.

MR. WEINMAN: Excuse me. Number seven, just for the record.

MR. MORAN: Number seven. Yes, number seven.

Let's go to number three. It looks more like the 101st Airborne shoulder patch. And we need -- we need to not go down this road in the future. If we're going to do the head of an eagle, you can't do it like that, at least not for me to get my vote. All right.

Now, let's go to the CFA, design number six.
I get it. I liked it the first time. But I have problems with those wing feathers. That's not -- and Jeanne will probably get me on this. When an eagle is diving, the wings are first tucked and then they come out as you get to the prey.

And then, you can see the claws are there. That's an aggressive eagle. But those feathers should be bracing the eagle for the blow that's going to come and they're not doing that.

From a bird lover's point of view, there's problems there. And I know what we did. We loved that on number 10, the obverse, the flowing rays and hair and the matching feathers. Let's don't get caught up with what is cute versus what is correct. So there are my comments.
MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Michael. Dennis?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Can I add to --
MS. LANNIN: Oh, I'm sorry, Jeanne. I didn't see you.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Oh, I'm here. I just want to add to Mike's comments about the wing. It is true. It is not correct to come in. But I'm going to go one step further.

The secondary and primary feathers are not equal in length and this is what it's indicated. So those feathers that are near the lowest and near the back, they should be a whole lot shorter. And if they were shorter, then I think you would get the idea that this wing was coming in and starting to break it.

But the way it is right now, those of you who are doing bird wings, please pay attention. Count the feathers. You need to do that. And make them the right size.

I think that the artist did compensate by shadowing those flight feathers on the top. You've got a little bit of shadow there. But as you come down toward the shoulder, those feathers are a whole lot shorter. And I think you just have to go and look at
some of the other designs, and you'll see that some of the other artists did recognize that.

So my compliments again to those who submitted these designs. I think it was a portfolio that was very interesting to work with. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: Thanks, Jeanne. Dennis?
MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I agree that this is a beautiful portfolio. There's a lot of wonderful draftsmanship here and creativity. Some of my comments -- I've taken a lot of notes on this program. And some of my comments will be repetitive of what we've already heard.

But since they are going into the record and will be hopefully read by future artists in this program and others, $I$ think it's important to get that repetition in. And so, some of my comments will run counter to what other committee members have said. If we reserve our endorsement for designs that reflect a new, modern, 21 st century depiction of Liberty, ideally we want to see things numismatically that we have not seen from the late 1700 s, the 1800 s or the 1900 s.

Donald, you talked about this. Here are some things that we've already seen plenty of in American numismatics. Long-haired, profiled bust portraits. Phrygian caps.

The ancient Roman liberty cap and pole motif and the Statue of Liberty. Other elements that we might discourage but not necessarily try to avoid completely are diadems, coronets and tiaras. These have never been popular real headwear in the United States.

Flying eagles, we've had dozens of them since the 1790s. Seated liberty woman, standing liberty woman, basically women in repose and active or unmoving. I don't think we need to see that.

Flowing garments in a neoclassical style. And here's something to consider. Maybe something we don't need to see is human beings at all. You know, we can go above and beyond the concept of depicting liberty as a person or something tangible. Maybe think intangible.

I wanted to throw this out as well. Some old designs from pats U.S. coins that might be considered
innovative today. If you look at the 1926 Oregon Trail memorial half dollar, the obverse of that coin has a family in a covered wagon, are either heading west into the sunset.

This is a design by James Earle Fraser and Laura Gardin Fraser. It's iconic Americana. Okay. It's symbolic of the American liberty of movement and self-actualized rebirth, which is the American dream. It's not a standing liberty.

If you look at the 1992 25th Olympiad half dollar, which has a leaping gymnast, you'll have to go back to your -- maybe, or maybe you can envision it.

MS. LANNIN: That's not a plug.
MR. TUCKER: That's not a plug. This is a design by William Cousins. The gymnast is leaping in the air. It's very graceful. It almost has a high relief, if you look at it.

And her feet are stretched from -- they're at 9 o'clock and 3 o'clock on this coin design. So it is a human figure. But she's not standing. She's not sitting. She's not looking. She's leaping. She's active.

So to me, the two designs in particular in today's portfolio, that show Ms. Liberty in a nontraditional way are number six and number eight. In number six, for the obverse, Ms. Liberty has a presence and a power not seen in American coins of the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. She's beautiful. She's strong. She's looking downward and toward the viewer, which gives the impression that she holds a position of height, which conveys strength, authority and freedom.

The arcs at the lower right are wonderfully open to interpretation and I would love to hear what the artist thinks about those and why those were included. They could be a robe or a cape moving in the wind. They could be feathers or palm fronds. They give this design a sense of motion. It's dynamic.

And movement is a dimension that we don't always see in American coins. It's something that we've talked about in the past, certainly in modern coins. And almost never in older traditional motifs. To me, the combination of Ms. Liberty's exotic and beautiful look here, the illusion of motion and a
nod to tradition with the laurels in her hair makes for a bold and innovative design.

If we look at number eight, this is one of the depictions of Ms. Liberty that I endorsed back in March of 2016, which was my first CCAC meeting.

And yes, this design uses many traditional symbols such as the robe or chiton, the rayed tiara and the lamp of knowledge and enlightenment, both of which are reminiscent of the Statue of Liberty. These are all things that we've seen in American numismatic design.

What elevates this design is the action of Ms. Liberty's release of the dove. It gives energy and motion to an otherwise static scene. It's an attractive scene, it's true, but essentially just another standing liberty without that element. The flight of the dove embodies so much hope, anticipation and potential.

And there's a secondary layer of meaning in this symbolism. Liberty here is not just a passive freedom or potential energy to do or not do whatever you want. This is kinetic energy. This is Liberty
active in the spread of peace.
The dove traditionally represents or
symbolized peace. So this is modern American Liberty, guided by enlightenment, using her strength and goodness to release peace into the world.

To summarize, obverse six has strength in its simplicity. Obverse eight has strength in its symbolism.

When I looked at the reverses, I had all of these thoughts of war and peace and freedom and liberty in mind. And Mike, I think you made a good point about the constant use or the repetitive use of war or military themes in the depiction of Liberty.

For me, the reverse designs that stand out are two and five. These two designs, and these are ones that we haven't really touched on much here, but these two designs give the eagle some symbolism, but beyond simply being the traditional embodiment of America.

All right. We know that the eagle represents America. Let's do something more with it. All of the naturalistic eagles, all of these eagles would grab the dove of peace out of the air and eat him for lunch.

You know, we commented on how aggressive they look. We've commented in this meeting and in past meetings on some of these designs.

When we give the eagle something symbolic to carry, he becomes more of a symbol himself, something with purpose. So we have to be aware of the message that we're sending. For this reason, I discount the ones that are simply showing portions of an eagle's anatomy. Yes, the eagle represents America. But let's go further with that.

If we give him an arrow, that casts a shadow on the peaceful liberty message of the obverse design. So I forget which one it was. One of these, it's number one, $I$ think we can discount that. We just discard number one because of that conflict with the arrows.

But if we give him an olive branch, which is another symbol of peace, along with the dove, and an oak branch, which is a symbol of strength and maturity, it makes the eagle a protective companion to the dove, rather than a competitor, an adversary or a potential threat.

So for this reason, combining those two themes and those two designs, I lean toward the one that shows Ms. Liberty releasing the dove and then either two or five for the reverse. I do like 10. I think it's a nice design. Again, all of these are nicely rendered. We just have to think about the potential that we have here.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Dennis. I'd like to say that I'm pleased that the CFA came up with the combination that they did. I think that it's wonderful. It's dynamic. If we can adjust the feathers to the Jeanne standard to make that anatomically it's correct, this happens to be my favorite combination.

I think we should keep almost all of the eagle designs kind of in a back drawer for us because I think at some point we're going to find that we're going to need just an eagle's head, plainly, simply, angrily, whatever. But I think that we've had a really great run with the eagle designs.

This, the obverse number 10 is just absolutely my favorite. Number nine I liked for the separation of

Liberty by the rays. But she looks a bit too uncertain for me. In number 10, Jeanne's suggested fix-it of having the hair flow over her ear, because it's a rather large ear for the size skull she has. Just show the lobe of her ear $I$ think is an excellent workaround. I'm very pleased with number 10 for an obverse and number six for a reverse. And that's all $I$ have to contribute. Would anybody else like to mention anything? All right. I think we should vote. MR. WEINMAN: Once again, Robert and Heidi, if you could send me your -- send me your scores. Yes. Mary? Mary? Why don't we recess until we have a total? Let's actually -- let's do at least 2:00. MS. LANNIN: We're going to take a 10-minute recess while we total everything up.
(Whereupon, the foregoing went off the record at 11:36 a.m., and went back on the record at 11:46 a.m.)

MS. LANNIN: Can we please have everyone seated for the reading of the vote? These are the results.

MR. WEINMAN: Okay. The result of the vote is
as follows. For obverse -- I'll pull up the screen -obverse number one has received one vote. Obverse number two received two. Obverse number three received three.

Obverse number four received one. Obverse number five received three. Obverse number six received 12. Obverse number seven received one. Obverse number eight received 10. Obverse number nine received eight. And obverse number 10 received 19. MR. MORAN: There it is.

MR. WEINMAN: Moving on to the reverses, reverse number one received two. Reverse number two received five. Reverse number three received three -I'm sorry, zero. Sorry, my apologies. Two, five and then obverse number three received zero.

Obverse number four received one. Obverse number five received five. Obverse number six received 13. Obverse number seven received nine. Obverse number eight received six. Obverse number nine received seven. I'm sorry. Reverse, all reverse. And finally, reverse number 10 received 15.

MR. JANSEN: What's it take to approve?

MS. LANNIN: What's the number to approve,
Greg?

MR. WEINMAN: We have 10. So we need 15. And so, you have it. You have it.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. We have it.
MR. WEINMAN: With 15, unless you want to make a motion.

MS. LANNIN: Erik, would you like to say something?

MR. JANSEN: Seeing that by the vote, we would have nominally chosen reverse 10 as a reverse and reverse -- obverse 10 as the choice, I want to focus on the obverse. I said previously that I might want to do some modifications or at least recommended modifications. And amongst that are two of them. One, I'd like to invite the committee to discuss how to maybe take a look at the ear here, whether it's right, wrong --

MS. WASTWEET: Erik, I can't hear you.
MR. MORAN: Put your mic on.
MR. JANSEN: All right. My -- is that any better?

MS. WASTWEET: Yeah, perfect.
MR. JANSEN: Okay. My mic is blinking. I'm focusing on the reverse -- excuse me, obverse number 10, that appears to be the committee's choice by vote. And I'm wanting to invite the committee to discuss a couple of modifications there, one to discuss how we feel about the ear, whether it's right or wrong or just more than it needs to be.

And second of all, $I$ would like to at least revisit the idea that looking left is at the past and looking right is at the future and entertain the thought, even though I kind of haven't done the full projection in my mind of how it changes the layout of Liberty if we do that. But I would just toss that out for thoughts before any motion gets put on the table. MS. LANNIN: Michael? MR. MORAN: Heidi, can you hear me? MS. WASTWEET: I can. MR. MORAN: Help. I mean, Erik is going one way. I'm having problems envisioning how you avoid a cliff with the hair. The hair's too long over the ear. The ear's too big. Fix this thing, please.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Take the ear out.
MS. WASTWEET: I would just make note of, you
know, the ear and the hair could be a little more finetuned and leave that discretion up to the artist to not be a slave to the drawing but, you know, use their artistic license in the anatomy.

I'm not opposed to flipping it to the other
side. I think that would work too. But I'm fine either way.

MR. MORAN: What about --
MS. WASTWEET: If we try to sit here -- but if we sit here and try to dictate, oh, make the ear, you know, 10 percent smaller and put the hair over the ear and all that, it's just too difficult.

MR. MORAN: How about the fading off of the head and the hairline within the rays, considering this whole thing is going to be high relief?

MR. JANSEN: Ron, do you have any thoughts on that?

MS. WASTWEET: Well, the -- it looks like the liberty letters are meant to be raised. So inevitably, the rays that are coming off of her head, especially in
the high relief, they're going to have to go from high and then tilt back towards the field as it reaches the rim because it's the only way to do it.

MR. JANSEN: Would those letters necessarily have to be positive relief? Could they be incused? What would that do to the field's design?

MS. WASTWEET: They could be. They could be. Yeah, and you have to treat the rays very delicately so they don't, you know, make the letters camouflaged so to speak.

MR. JANSEN: Again, in high relief, we've got this extra dimension to --

MS. WASTWEET: Your mic's not on, Erik.
MR. JANSEN: Say again?
MR. MORAN: She can't hear you.
MR. JANSEN: I think the battery on this mic

```
    is --
```

MR. URAM: Go with that one. That one's --
MR. JANSEN: All right. Is that better?
Yeah, that sounds better.
MS. WASTWEET: Yeah, I can hear you now.
Yeah.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. In the high relief, what would you -- what does your intuition tell you on going incused with the word liberty? And if we were to flip it --

MS. WASTWEET: It's better.
MR. JANSEN: If we were -- yeah, it seems to me as well. If we were to flip it, it puts liberty emanating -- the word starts down at her blowing hair and moves up to the 12 o'clock position. How's that going to feel?

MS. WASTWEET: I think it's not quite as elegant as having it start at the top.

MR. JANSEN: I know, and that's my sense as well.

MS. LANNIN: Okay, Erik. I'd like to say something. Our end of the world is trained -- our eyes are trained to go from left to right. I like it in this position.

MR. JANSEN: Not the whole world is obviously. Some read right to left.

MS. LANNIN: No, no. But it's -- you look -you start at the left. I like it flipped in this
direction. To me, one of the very first things you see is how steady her eye is.

MR. JANSEN: OH, yes.
MS. LANNIN: And I think that the elegance of that and then flowing off into her hair and the rays, I think we're trying to redo what's really a beautiful piece of art.

And I think that what we need to do is trust that the sculptors at the Mint will take care of any small issues with the lobe of the ear and covering that up. I think you're trying to do too much.

MR. JANSEN: I'm good. I'm good with that.
MS. LANNIN: Okay.
MR. JANSEN: I just think this is -- and this is coin geek stuff.

MS. LANNIN: Yeah.
MR. JANSEN: But this is modern, flowing hair.
MS. LANNIN: No, I think this is -- this is really a beautiful -- a beautiful profile.

MR. MORAN: Heidi, it's Mike again. Looking at the rays, we've got light and dark there. Do you envision those all, both the light and the dark, in
varying degrees of relief moving from her head to the rim?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes. But there can't be a lot of difference in the elevation from the white rays to the gray rays.

MR. MORAN: Right.
MS. WASTWEET: And you can see that the artist has shaded them very close. It's not black and white. It's light gray and white. So that to me indicates that it suggests a step from one ray to the next.

MR. MORAN: Okay. MS. LANNIN: Any other questions or comments? Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I'm going to -MS. LANNIN: Is it in? MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I'm going to just reiterate that the simplest fix for this ear thing is to suggest to the artist to just leave the lobe on there and take away the ear part.

I think it will help this design a whole lot and it wouldn't interfere with the rays that I feel like, you know, are the rays of liberty. I don't know,

Heidi, if you agree with that or not. But I do envision the ear gone, except for the lobe. Thank you. MS. WASTWEET: Yeah. I think that that would be a good solution to this, a softer movement of hair across the ear that obscures the ear more.

MR. JANSEN: Thanks for the discussion.
MS. LANNIN: Ladies and gentlemen, I think we have a pairing. And now, let's break for lunch.

MR. MORAN: Just a minute, Mary. MS. LANNIN: No? Oh, Mike? MR. JANSEN: Just not so fast. MR. MORAN: I know. I know. Let's go to the reverse.

MS. WASTWEET: All right.
MR. MORAN: Let's say in the event -MS. LANNIN: Okay. MR. MORAN: -- that Treasury overrules the CCAC in favor of the CFA selection, let's go to the CFA solution. I think that the -- we need to make our position known that these feathers need help. MS. LANNIN: So again, $I$ think that that should be left up to the discretion of the Mint
artists. Ron?
MR. HARRIGAL: Yes. We do check for anatomy and do corrections and, in this case, unless it's a stylized eagle that is meant to be stylized, as you would say, we would definitely look at the correct depiction of the feathers.

MR. JANSEN: And with all due respect, I might ask that in your letter to the secretary, you mention that this was a close runner-up. MS. LANNIN: Oh, absolutely. MR. JANSEN: And in that regard, that these feathers are not only kind of anatomically correct but also resist the urge to turn it into 13 feathers and truly have some respect for the bird, even though we try to bleed the wing off the edge. MS. LANNIN: All right, and who knows what we'll see in the --

MR. JANSEN: Who knows what we'll see. But it'll be good, independent thought, I'm sure. MS. LANNIN: Thank you. We are breaking for lunch.
(Whereupon, the foregoing went off the record
at 11:57 a.m., and went back on the record at 1:07 p.m.)

MS. LANNIN: All right. I would like to call our group back to order. The next order of business is the review of the designs for the 2018 American Innovation $\$ 1$ Coin Program. And I would like to turn the meeting over to April.

MR. WEINMAN: Before that, real quickly, once again this is a reminder that if you are on the phone, please mute your phone. We're hearing background noise. And so, please mute your phone. Thank you very much. April?

AMERICAN INNOVATION \$1 COIN PROGRAM
MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. On July 20, 2018, the president signed a bill authorizing a new numismatic $\$ 1$ coin program honoring innovation in the United States.

The common obverse design for this program must feature a likeness of the Statue of Liberty extending to the rim of the coin and large enough to provide a dramatic representation of Liberty, as well as the inscriptions "\$1" and "In God We Trust".

Beginning in 2019, four coins will be released every year, one for each state, territory and the District of Columbia. To introduce the program, the legislation allows for an introductory coin to be released in 2018 with a reverse featuring George Washington's signature on the first United States patent as well as the inscriptions "American Innovators" and "United States of America".

A portfolio of designs for this 2018 introductory coin was presented to the CCAC on July 31st, with a single obverse and multiple reverse designs presented.

Given the feedback, we've developed a new portfolio with multiple designs for the obverse and a new set of designs for the reverse.

We'll start today with the obverse designs and look at the recommendation by the CFA, actually the CFA's recommendations for both obverse and reverse. They had two recommendations for obverse, design eight and design 12. And for the reverse, they recommended design 13. I'll make note of this as we move through the portfolio.

Starting with the obverse designs, all obverse designs feature images of the Statue of Liberty.

Starting with obverse 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 -- again, this is one of two obverse recommendations by the CFA. (Telephone music playing.) MS. STAFFORD: Somebody put us on hold. MR. WEINMAN: Once again -MS. STAFFORD: They put us on hold. MR. WEINMAN: Please mute your hold. MR. MORAN: I see what they're doing on the other side.

MS. STAFFORD: Design obverse 9, 10, 11 and 12, the second of two obverse recommendations by the CFA.

Moving on to the reverse candidate designs, reverse 1 depicts George Washington's signature on the first patent, along with the inscriptions "American Innovators" and "United States of America". The design also features a quill and ink well, symbolizing the signing of the patent, and a rising sun, symbolizing the dawning of an era of American innovation. Reverse two depicts George Washington's
signature above the inscription "Issued First U.S. Patent". The design also features Thomas Edison's lightbulb as an iconic symbol of the inventions of American innovators, as well as the illumination of innovative ideas. The additional inscriptions are "American Innovators" and "United States of America". Reverse three depicts George Washington's signature and the inscriptions "United States of America" and "American Innovators". The design also features an image of the 15 -star flag that was in use during the early years of the U.S. Patent Office. Reverse four depicts George Washington's signature above the inscription "Signed First Patent". Additional inscriptions include "American Innovators", "1790" and "United States of America". The design also features an image of the U.S. Patent Office relief found on the Herbert C. Hoover Building in Washington, D.C., the headquarters of the Department of Commerce and once the home of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Reverses 5, 6, 7 and 8 all feature George Washington's signature and the inscriptions "American

```
Innovators" and "United States of America". The stylized gears represent industry and innovation. Designs 5 and 8 include the inscription "Signed First Patent" under Washington's signature, with design 5 also featuring the inscription "1790". Design 7 includes the inscription "1790 First Patent Signed By" above Washington's signature. Here is reverse 5, 6, 7 and 8.
\[
\text { Reverse } 9 \text { depicts George Washington's }
\]
signature on the first patent as if inscribed on a piece of paper and the inscriptions "American Innovators" and an American cowboy hat, a symbol of an independent spirit and resilient nature.
The design's border features American-created C computer programming language, shown here as a code to display the words "United States of America" as included as an inscription. Additionally, the Philipshead screw, another American invention, is depicted on the border.
Reverse 10 depicts George Washington's signature and the inscriptions "American Innovators" and "United States of America". The design also
```

includes a cowboy hat and an astronaut, depicted as if on separate pieces of paper but also placed to suggest the astronaut is wearing the hat, a playful combination of two American icons to create a uniquely American figure. The Philips-head screw, another American invention, is featured on the border.

Reverse 11 features George Washington's signature on the first patent, as well as a hand holding a quill, representing the moment of signing. Above the signature is potash and the fertilizer it was transformed into by the process invented by Samuel Hopkins, for which the first patent was granted. Finally, the design includes the inscriptions "United States of America", "First Patent" and "American Innovators".

Reverse 12 features an artist's conception of the first patent that was issued on July 31, 1790. President George Washington, whose signature is boldy depicted, has just signed the document, as noted by the quill pen. The design also includes the inscriptions "United States of America", "American Innovators" and "First U.S. Patent July 31, 1790".

Reverse 13, again the CFA's recommended reverse design for this program, features a document representing the first U.S. patent issued featuring a bold depiction of George Washington's signature.

The 13 stars along the rim represents the 13 states in existence in 1780. The design also includes the inscriptions "First Patent of the United States of America July 31, 1790" and "American Innovators".

Finally, reverse 14 depicts George Washington's signature under a man steering a large vessel. This represents the U.S. -- the first U.S. patent, which advanced changes in the production of potash used in making fertilizer and considered the first industrial chemical. The design also features the inscriptions "American Innovators", "First U.S. Patent Grant 1790" and "United States of America". MS. LANNIN: Thank you so much, April. Do we have Robert on the phone? We don't have Robert. But we do have Heidi on the phone. Is that correct? MS. WASTWEET: Yes, I'm here. MS. LANNIN: Heidi, would you like to begin? MS. WASTWEET: Oh, I'll --

MS. LANNIN: Is that unfair? Would you rather

```
wait?
```

    MS. WASTWEET: No, I can go first.
    MS. LANNIN: Okay.
    MS. WASTWEET: So on the obverse --
    MS. LANNIN: Heidi, is that you making those
    additional noises?
    MS. WASTWEET: No. That is not me. That is
    not my phone.
    MS. LANNIN: Okay.
    MR. HOGE: Hello. This is Robert. I'm
    finally connected.
    MS. LANNIN: Okay, good.
    MR. WEINMAN: Oh, good, Robert.
    MS. LANNIN: Good, good. Okay. Heidi, why
    don't you start?
    MR. HOGE: Hello?
    MS. LANNIN: Robert, we can hear you.
    MR. HOGE: Hello?
    MR. WEINMAN: Can you hear us, Robert?
    MR. HOGE: Yes, I hear you.
    MR. WEINMAN: Okay. Okay, just --
    MS. LANNIN: Heidi is going to speak first, and then I will call on you, Robert, okay? MR. HOGE: Okay. MS. LANNIN: All right, Heidi. Go. MS. WASTWEET: Okay. So one thing I noticed on the obverses as a group, only number 10 attempts to bring in another element other than the statue itself, which I found really curious because the first thing I'm -- the primary thing I'm looking for in these designs is innovation.

But the artists really seem to just focus on the statue and they didn't bring in any other creativity at all. So that's very curious.

And the other thing $I$ see are a lot of these are an extreme perspective from looking from the bottom basically up the nose of the Liberty. And as a coin sculptor, there are three things -- three rules that I have of things that $I$ never put on a coin.

One is teeth, and open face -- you know, an open-mouthed smile showing teeth. The second thing is an animal with a muzzle pointed straight at you. And the third thing is this extreme angle of looking up the
nose of a person.
So by that, it disqualified number two, number three, number five, possibly number six, definitely number 10. So those -- I'm not even going to consider those for that reason. They look fine in the drawing. But on a coin, in a bas relief sculpt, this never looks good.

Design number one, $I$ do think this angle is fresh and new and can be considered innovative. I don't love it. But it is unique. Design number three I've eliminated because of the angle. But I want to remark that $I$ do like the composition of the letters. I like the way those are stacked. It's very nice. Number four, I don't like the way the dollar sign is at an angle because when these are in hand, people are going to naturally turn this coin so that the one is straight and that means that the statue is going to be falling backwards because they're not looking at this on a page. They'll be looking at this in the hand.

Number five $I$ think is not dynamic enough. Number six, it seems like, you know, we've seen this
angle done a lot. Number seven, I don't like the way the words "In God We Trust" run over the face and the face is really crowded down into the corner of the coin. I don't think this is going to sculpt well. Number eight is my personal favorite. And the reason for that is it has something we rarely see in design and that's white space. It has a lot of white space, breathing room. So it has a cleanliness to it that $I$ really like.

I do find that the "In God We Trust" lettering is kind of boring. You know, it doesn't -- it's just straight across. I wish they had done something a little more there. And then I'd also like to see the dollar sign and the one the same height. But I like the idea here.

Number nine $I$ think is just unattractive. Number 10 I've already disqualified because of the angle. Number 11 I think is interesting. This one could work and it also has some clean white space there which I like. I'd be okay with that one.

Number 12 is just a CFA pick. I'm not crazy about that one. I don't think it's really innovative.

It's kind of attractive. But $I$ wouldn't call it innovative.

So moving to the reverses, on the reverses, I think it's a problem to put an image of a specific invention because that's going to imply that the first patent was for that invention; for example, number two with the lightbulb. It implies that the lightbulb was the first patent, which it was not.

And the other thing is we don't know down the line what inventions are going to be featured on the other side. I'd rather have something generic on this first piece.

Number three $I$ think is innovative. It's a really interesting design. But it loses points for me because of visibility of the text "American Innovators".

I do like design number four. I like using the shield. It's also wordy and it looks more like a medal than a coin. If $I$ had this in my hand, I wouldn't think, oh, this is a coin. I would think this is a token or a medal.

Designs five, six, seven and eight all utilize
gears. I think this is a really good symbology to use here because it's generic enough. But the gears really speak to innovation and industry and I think that's a really good symbology for us here.

Of these four designs, I think I'm leaning towards design number eight. I like that the gears are incused. That's something we don't see too much of. And I like that. The shield is small.

But I think it works that way, sort of -- you know, we don't have to see all of the detail. It's a nice little small shield that adds interest and significance and it's well laid out. I like this one a lot.

Number seven I also liked. (Cough,
inaudible.) So I'm divided between seven and eight as my favorite.

Number nine, I would think this is a patent for a hat and number 10, I don't -- I appreciate the effort to do something really different here. But I don't think it's working. Number 11, I think the reference to the potash is too obscure. And number 12 is okay. I wouldn't call it innovative. But it's
okay.
The CFA pick of number 13, I don't think this is going to coin well at all. There's wording on top of wording and it works in a design, in a drawing.

I don't think that's going to work on a coin, especially a dollar size coin. It's going to be very confusing. And it's all words, which I prefer to have some image in there somewhere.

And 14 , it's okay that we can't really read the signature. But $I$ think all the rest of the wording should be legible, which it's not. And the potash reference is accurate, but $I$ don't know that it's terribly interesting.

So I'm going to throw my votes towards seven and eight. And I think that concludes my remarks.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you so much, Heidi.
Robert, are you with us?
MR. HOGE: Yes, I am. Thank you. I concur pretty much fully with what Heidi had to say. I was actually disappointed with this portfolio because so many of the designs seemed very two-dimensional, much more so than is necessary. And I wasn't very pleased
with the ones that are not so two-dimensional, mainly with the hat and the one with the space cowboy, number 10. Some of these designs are just too weak. They're obscure. They're flat. They don't do a whole lot.

I think the gears are probably effective, as Heidi had mentioned, even though they're basically twodimensional things. So my favorite probably is probably numb seven or possibly number eight.

And actually, number one, even though we rejected it the first $g o$ round is really not the worst of these designs, I think. And I agree with all of the other comments that Heidi made as well. Thank you. MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Robert. MR. HOGE: For the -- so I'll just talk about the reverses there. Now, for the obverses, these things -- you know, being tied to the Statue of Liberty gives us a certain limitation. And a number of these really are reminiscent of pieces we have already seen. So it's hard to say what is good.

I do take an exception to number 11 because of the fierce, stern look of her face. That's much more appropriate for a Roman emperor than for, you know, a
representation of liberty. And I agree with Heidi's comments about the perspectives on a number of these. My favorite, as was the case with Heidi, was number seven. It uses negative space very well. I'm a little troubled by the excessive use of shading in the design of this piece. I assume though that it could be sculpted well and be an effective design. I actually kind of liked number seven.

I wasn't troubled by the "In God We Trust" being in smaller letters across the truncation of the lower jaw area because one thing that $I$ find a little bit distasteful on these coins is the enormously prominent use of the words "In God We Trust".

I actually really kind of go along with the thoughts of President Teddy Roosevelt in that we really didn't need this kind of thing on coinage. "In God We Trust"? What else are we trusting?

And in fact, we have here the image of
Liberty, which is a pagan Roman concept, depicted on American coinage with a radiating crown, which is also a symbol of ancient polytheistic divinity.

So we have a number of considerations here.

Number five is not as attractive. But it's kind of prosaic. And I don't like seeing the torch of enlightenment being truncated the way it is on a number of these other designs.

I think number three is fairly effective because of the prominence it gives the figure of Liberty. But again, the "In God We Trust" is extraordinarily prominent on this thing. I think number one is effectively different. But I just don't know if it's appropriate for a coin. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Robert. Donald, you look like you have something to say.

MR. SCARINCI: I do.

MS. LANNIN: Good.
MR. SCARINCI: I think let's look at the big picture first, right, because the big picture is this is going to be a series of coins.

You know, and in a series, like when -- if you recall, the way we did the America the Beautiful coins, we actually had the privilege of seeing a pattern of what the standard obverse -- you know, actually the standard reverse inscriptions were going to look like
and we actually saw a pattern in the design other than that. And that played itself out on every other design throughout the series.

What we have here is there's two things -there's two big picture things we're deciding today, right? Big picture thing number one is what the obverse of this entire series is going to look like. Big picture number two is when we go to the reverses, are we going to put -- you know, on the reverse, we have to include USA and we have to include "American Innovators" as words.

So the design that I like the most without the stuff in the middle is design number 11, reverse 11 that has "United States of America" on top, "American Innovators" on the bottom.

And that's fairly consistent with what we did with the America the Beautiful series, you know, "United States of America" on top and "American Innovators" on the bottom.

And then, as we do this series, whatever's going to change is going to be in the middle, right, so that every coin would theoretically, you know, look

```
    like that, unless you're telling me the legislation is
    different. Go ahead.
    MS. STAFFORD: "American Innovators" as an
    inscription is only required on this introductory coin.
    MR. SCARINCI: On the first coin?
    MS. STAFFORD: Yes.
    MR. SCARINCI: Okay.
    MS. STAFFORD: And on the subsequent reverses,
    "United States of America" is a required inscription as
    well as the jurisdiction or state that's being honored
    with the significant innovation going forward.
    MR. SCARINCI: So we don't need "American
Innovators" on every coin.
    MS. STAFFORD: Just on this introductory.
    MR. SCARINCI: So, but we do need "United
    States of America" --
    MS. STAFFORD: Yes.
    MR. SCARINCI: -- somewhere.
    MS. STAFFORD: Yes.
    MR. SCARINCI: So we should probably put it in
        the same place, if we could. But it's not necessary.
        What is missing, of course, from the obverse and the
```

reverse, the obvious thing that's missing is the date.
Like --
MS. LANNIN: Edge.
MR. MORAN: Right.
MS. LANNIN: It's on the edge.
MR. SCARINCI: -- where are we putting the
date? So we're putting the date on the edge. So could
be put the "In God We Trust" on the edge?
MR. TUCKER: No.
MR. WEINMAN: Because the legislation
specifies.
MS. STAFFORD: It's in the legislation.
MR. SCARINCI: It specifies the date on the
edge?
MR. WEINMAN: I was trying to pull the
legislation. I didn't have it --
MR. JANSEN: Date to be --
(Cross talk.)
MR. JANSEN: I have it.
MR. WEINMAN: The inscriptions are oddly
specified.
MR. JANSEN: Date, Mint mark and "E Pluribus

Unum" on the edge.
MR. WEINMAN: Yeah.
MR. SCARINCI: Oh, okay. All right.
MS. LANNIN: It's a whole new ballgame, isn't it?

MR. SCARINCI: It's a new ballgame. Well, thank God this coin's not going to circulate. MR. JANSEN: Is that a good or a bad thing? MR. SCARINCI: So -MR. TUCKER: Donald, could I interrupt? MR. SCARINCI: Yeah, please. MR. TUCKER: With kind of a side bar -MR. SCARINCI: Please do. MR. MORAN: Bail him out. He's in trouble. MR. TUCKER: A numismatist named Ross Johnson has proposed, or asked this question, Greg. Would it be acceptable for the artist to incorporate the date into those designs?

In other words, keep it on the edge, as mandated by legislation, but also use artistic flexibility and interpretation to put the date -- he actually asks date and Mint mark, incorporate that into
the design.
MR. WEINMAN: Typically there's no -- I don't believe there's anything in the legislation that prohibits additional inscriptions. And often we do have additional inscriptions when they advance the design in some way.

So I don't know that there's necessarily a
legal impediment. But it would be a policy question that would have to be -- that would have to be examined internally. It's probably not -- it's probably not prohibited by the legislature.

MR. SCARINCI: Well, we've certainly got -MS. LANNIN: So under those circumstances, Donald, how would you --

MR. SCARINCI: We've certainly -- we've certainly got an outside the box program here, which I guess is what we talk about all the time, right, outside of the box.

This is a little outside of the box. So if we're outside of the box, then we should stay outside of the box for the whole series, right?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

MR. SCARINCI: And why not? And why not? So, you know, if you look at it that way, okay, if we've got an outside of the box program and we're going to do things in this series outside of the box, then let's do it, in which case is it probably the most -- the only one of the Statue of Liberty designs that we haven't really encountered before is probably number one.

I mean, that's a view of the Statue of Liberty that we haven't seen. Of course you can make the argument this is Liberty looking backwards, which in some ways is what we're going to do. We're going to look at the history of American innovation.

We're not going to look at something that hasn't been innovated in the future. We're looking at what's been done before. So that is logical. You know, you want a solid portrait of some sort on an obverse.

That always makes a good obverse, a good, strong obverse. This is a very unusual angle, never seen before. I don't recall seeing this in any medal that I've ever looked at. So it's got a uniqueness to it. Everything else has been done before.

What I don't like about eight, to some degree, you know, is the flame is kind of cut off a little bit. You know, so that could probably be fixed because we don't want to cut the flame off. That would almost -I could see us getting criticized for, you know, did we put out the flame of liberty in this coin. So we don't want to cut off the flame.

You know, but that would be probably, of all of these designs, you know, the -- you know, the -- a little on the more conventional side. And certainly we haven't seen this angle. So that would be different.

I don't like -- I don't know what the CFA was thinking about with number 12. Really that's just all arm and flame to me. So I just don't like that particular view of the Statue of Liberty. So I'd probably be inclined to go with either one or eight, providing that eight does not cut off the flame.

And in terms of the reverse, if we're not required to do anything, then $I$ have to look at the reverse -- then I would have to look at the series as a series of medals. Let's just pretend it's a series of medals. So what would we see if we were doing a series
of medals from the first medal, right?
What we would see in the first medal is
labeling the series of medals, as is very often the case. Here's a series of medals. This is what it's about. And in which case, the very boring selection of the CFA, which is kind of surprising that they recommended this because it's probably, you know, the simplest and most boring design.

But if you look at it from the point of view it's the first coin in a series, so if you're going to display the series, you're going to display the reverse of these coins and you're going to display this one first, which tells you what the series is. So as boring as it may be as a coin individually, as part of a series, you know, it certainly justifies its boredom by labeling the series, you know, which might be more appropriate than any of these other designs, you know, you know, because certainly the gears -- you know, the gear theme, which is kind of cool, you know, I mean, kind of cool what they did with the fears.
But, you know, innovation is not necessarily
gears. The hat on the astronaut is kind of cute because, you know, it shows like kind of beginning and end to where we -- you know, where -- how you begin and how you end.

So from the series point of view, the astronaut with the hat, yeah, okay. It symbolizes the beginning and the end.

The safest thing, until we see more of what this series is really about, probably the safest coin design to go with is what the CFA recommended and that's, you know, reverse 13 on the reverse. But so I guess net-net, I would probably go with obverse one and reverse 13, knowing full well that reverse 13 is boring as well.

MS. WASTWEET: Hey, Donald?
MR. SCARINCI: Yeah?
MS. WASTWEET: If you look close at number eight, the flame's not actually cut off. It just touches the rim and that's actually specified by the legislation is one point that I'll -MR. SCARINCI: Oh, it's not cut of? MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yeah. See up on the top
of the larger --

MS. WASTWEET: Yeah. It looks like it. But
if you look closely, it's actually not. It just
touches the rim.

MR. SCARINCI: Okay.
MS. LANNIN: Old eyes.
MR. SCARINCI: Yeah. Old guy. I mean, yeah,
if it -- if it's not --

MS. LANNIN: There you go.
MR. SCARINCI: -- if it doesn't cut it, then it's not -- then we won't be criticized. No, it's a perfectly -- number eight is perfectly nice.

I mean, I'd probably -- if we did go with number eight, I would certainly rather see, as Bob suggested earlier, you know, we don't need to like make "In God We Trust" the biggest thing on the coin.

Then we could probably take "In God We Trust" and put it around the rim somehow, you know, make it more circular as opposed to putting it where it is and make it smaller. I don't think it's necessary to be that big.

What's cool about number eight, if we could
carry it off, is the use of negative space. But we've got the negative space in number one as well. Of course, then we're going to hear from Ron tell us that, you know, that won't -- number one will create some sort of a design issue for future coins because it's heavily on one side. You have the images on one side. So how do we design -- no?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: It's -- that one's -MR. SCARINCI: Is it? MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes, that's nice. MR. SCARINCI: Anyway. That's it. MS. LANNIN: Tom, would you like to go next? MR. URAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't mind number one at all. I think it has -- the look of it, it reminds me of a flyover if you're in the airplane, you know. You fly over and there it is and that's it.

But I do like the idea of number eight, of taking the "In God We Trust" and putting it behind from like 1 o'clock to 3 o'clock and then lowering the one down as well. And that gives you a lot of negative space as well as a good image. So I lean towards that versus trying to project number one in a way, if we could do that. That would -- now, if you decided to put the date, there would be plenty of room along that edge behind to do the same.

So I would lean towards number eight with a little bit more modification more so than trying to force number one into being. I think, as Heidi mentioned, all these others with the looking up and all the different directions is relatively tough.

On the reverse, I like the idea of using the symbol in number four. It says everything and it also has the initials. You could kind of call it almost a privy mark there, you know, that you'd have there. So I do like it and I like number eight as well. So four and eight.

Number 13 that was the choice of the CFA, it is very stark. I see what they're trying to do. I just don't know that you're going to get the same image on a coin with the background there.

I just don't know. I just don't see it happening. If it's just going to look faded out, in my
opinion, I don't know that you'd see the words. Maybe Ron would want to address that later on.

So I'm going to lean more towards number four actually, even more so than the gears because, as was pointed out, the gears don't necessarily represent innovation. It does represent progress, but not necessarily innovation entirely.

So I would lean more towards the institution and the Patent Office and the date. That's why I would go with number four more so. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Tom. Erik?
MR. JANSEN: Is this mic working?
MS. LANNIN: Yeah.
MR. JANSEN: Okay. I'm not going to advocate a particular design. I'm learning and listening and trying to benefit from the thoughts that are being put out there.

Having said that, I find myself eliminating a number of designs and then kind of finding myself ruminating on three or four that are left. I wish there was a favorite that popped out of here. But there isn't. I'm not going to belabor designs that
fall out of this.
On the obverses, $I$ think obverse eight is probably an easy design to go forward with because it doesn't complicate a lot of medal flows, probably well understood for Ron going forward so that it gives us more freedom on the reverse.

I like the variability on design 10. But it's got the profile problem that Heidi pulled up. I think that would be very interesting with the stripes on the side, a very interesting design to carry forward because we're going to look at this design for a long time.

Design number 11 might emerge out of there because $I$ think it chins all the bars without a big demerit. I wish the sculpt could be a little more kind and smooth of the face.

It may be accurate to actually what's up there in New York City in copper on the face of the thing. Perhaps there could be some liberty in making the rendering of the face a little more comforting as opposed to harsh as it is.
So I'm going to sit and listen to everybody
and I'm not sure where I'll end up on this one.
When it comes to the reverses, I think there are some fun things here. But I'm going to eliminate 10 through 14 for various reasons that have been highlighted. I think it's unfortunate that the CFA chose what might be a medal design in 13.

I think that's quite honestly a tragic alternative here, given we've been telling artists for years give us symbols. Don't give us tons of text and don't give us collages.

I wish -- I wish I could get over the comment that was made at the very beginning, that since the first patent wasn't a lightbulb design, two doesn't work because design two is the idea of ideas. And I actually like design two on that basis.

It doesn't feature 1790 as such a large feature that four and five have. I don't think 1790 is a big thing here. Yet it's the largest item in text on the coin. So I have a hard time with that, although I fundamentally like the layout of four. If first patent was promoted in 1790 was maybe demoted to the same font size, I think I could go with
four. I like the idea of the gears. We've used gears before. I'm reminded of the platinum coin we did just, what, two years ago. And the gears were kind of our salvation as bridging the gap to the industrial reality of America. So the gears to me kind of work.

I like seven or eight. I could work with either one of those. I think they have the right kind of emphasis and symbology to carry this thing forward. I like the idea of an incused feature on the coin. So that's where I end up. I'm not sitting here advocating any one design. I'm listening and we'll see where $I$ end up after everybody's added their thoughts that are clearly better than mine. Thank you. MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Erik. Herman? MR. VIOLA: Thank you. Well, I'm not going to advocate any design myself. I don't have any real favorites. I'm not sure if this is working. MR. JANSEN: Push the button. See if it -here, just pick this guy up and go. MR. VIOLA: Okay. Thank you. I'm not going to advocate any design. But $I$ think a lot of them are interesting. But I would say, you know, frankly I like
-- on the obverse, I kind of like number one. But, you know, it's nice and simple, straightforward. But I guess my vote would be for number four.

And then, on the reverses, I'm glad we're not going with the cowboy hat or this astronaut and cowboy hat. So I think I would like, you know, seven or eight on that one. But $I$ don't think we want any of the -like 13 or the last ones there. So I would say I would go with seven or eight on the reverses. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Herman. Jeanne?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the rework of this portfolio very much. I know we were very hard on the initial portfolio given to us some time ago. And I understand why we had such a unilateral set of designs.

However, sending them back and then coming -whoever it was who decided to rework these things -I'm very proud to be on this committee today to see what was able to be produced after such a harsh critique the last time. So thank you. Thank you, Mint staff, and thank you artists for coming through with all of this.
I really appreciate it.

To go forward on the Liberty on the obverse, I'm somewhat disenchanted with the Liberties that are, you know, with the raised arm that kind of look like a deodorant commercial. I'd just sort of want to eliminate those.

So number one, obverse one for me is very clean and fresh. I like it very much. I like the fact that Liberty is identified by the windows in her tiara.

I don't know if we need to have any more icons to state that this is Lady Liberty. I like the direction that she's looking and I also like the fact that we're, you know, over her head.

As someone said, we are in an airplane coming in over her. So with that in mind, looking at number eight, I just think that this one, although very nice -- I think it's very good -- I think we would -- I would anyway tire of looking at this for 15 years where number one, I think every time we have it, is going to be refreshing.

Number 11 is just a great design. But her features sort of take my breath away. So I can't stand
behind that one. And number 12, which is the CFA's -one of their choices -- I guess I'd prefer that one more than number eight, even though her arm is raised. I think this is kind of an interesting look at her. So my choices for obverse is definitely number one and possibly eight or 12.

For reverse, I have to agree with what's being said. The lightbulb is not the first U.S. patent. But it is an idea, and I complement the artist on presenting that idea to us. I very much like the idea behind number 14, although I would not vote for it. But I think the fact that there is something astir chemically with the potash and fertilizer. As a chemist, someone working with glazes and patinas, it's interesting to see how the artist interpreted that first patent. So again, kudos to whoever did that.

For reverse 13, with so much information, yes, it will be a good medal. But $I$ think as a coin, we're going to just absolutely lose it to the frosting and the incused letters.

So now, for me, I think I'm going to have to probably go behind one of the gears and that would
probably be number eight because it is dynamic. I think it's going to strike up nicely. It won't be boring. So if we paired that with the very exciting obverse number one, I think we'd have a great coin and a great medal. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. LANNIN: Thanks, Jeanne.
MR. MORAN: First, let me make a general observation as to how I approached this. To me, innovation leads to enlightenment and progress. Without innovation, you won't get enlightenment or progress.

So when I looked at the obverses, I was looking at the images that employed the torch, and not a partial torch, but the full torch because, to me, that is the central point here.

Even though the legislation mandates Liberty, to me, the torch is the enlightenment and that's what I'm looking for.

The second thing I did in judging the obverses is the Statue of Liberty is a monumental sculpture. And in order for a monumental sculpture to be successful, certain features have to be exaggerated in
order for the sculpture to be a success when viewed from a distance, which is what its intent is.

So you can get too close to the Statue of Liberty and result in a not so good representation. And to me, number 11 is exactly what happens when you do that. So I threw that one out.

The other thing that I'm looking for is the design does not have to be cutting edge. But because it's going to be here for 14 years, it has to stand the test of time.

I'll give you an example of one that $I$ think fails that and that when we cut away from the profile bust of Thomas Jefferson on the nickel, the alternatives don't work.

So we're looking for something that is more traditional, that won't compete with the individual designs that are to come on the reverse. So I'm throwing out the edgier ones and I'm throwing out any of them that don't have the complete torch.

So the two that I felt were most indicative of what I wanted to see were number eight. But I caught my breath on this one for one thing.

I like the negative space. When you see the Gobrecht dollar, the original one from 1836, there's nothing on the front except the date and you see the Liberty. This is close to it. And it's really good in that regard.

What troubles me is the creative use of the grayscale here to highlight the face and the profile of the face, which I'm afraid when we strike it up will be obliterated by the arm, or hidden by the arm. I don't know if obliterated.

On the other hand, I'm reminded this is a collector piece. It's not going to be mass produced. And the Mint very well could separate the two by relief.

The other one that I like in particular, even though it's a bit up your nose -- Heidi, if you're awake -- is number 12. Yes, the torch is outsized. But no, it's not inappropriate because it is what I'm talking about, innovation here. And this is enlightenment.
So I really can handle this because it's not a
full frontal on the Liberty, the exaggerated features
that the sculptor used in creating the work are not as readily apparent. So I'm going to be looking at those two and splitting my votes.

On the reverse, there's some I still can't stand. Number one is one of them. I'm sorry. That's just -- it got me back in July and I just can't get there. Jumping around, sorry about that, we do have one innovation here that I think needs to be pointed out to us and that's on number 14. That's a two-legged pot, guys.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah, it has no legs to stand on.
MR. MORAN: It's gone. Thirteen, trade token.
No way. That's not -- don't start the series with this.

To me, one of the absolute best designs I've seen in terms of out of the box is number eight. Look at that. They use the incused, raised relief. They take United States of America and put it in a band across the coin like that as a divider.

We haven't seen that before. That really needs to be recognized as out of the box thinking, really good and a great kickoff. To me, the gears
represent progress. You have the symbol of the U.S. Patent Office there. I think it just plain works. MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Michael. Dennis? MR. TUCKER: May I borrow this? MS. LANNIN: Oh, absolutely. MR. TUCKER: Thanks. Mike, I feel like you and I must have been -- our brains were just connected while we were looking through this portfolio because your -- what you just said matches my notes very -MR. MORAN: Thank you. MR. TUCKER: -- almost exactly. As I was looking at the obverses, I too was struck. I wrote down in my notes here enlightenment is necessary for innovation. And this design of course is for the American Innovation Program. So the symbolism is precisely wrong if the torch of enlightenment is missing or only partially there with the flame cut off. So to me, any of the designs that show the torch of enlightenment either missing or only partially there with the flame extinguished are unacceptable. So that leaves obverses two, three, eight, 10 and 12.

Number eight stuck out at me for all the same reasons that you mentioned. It has numismatic precedent. It's evocative of certain designs we saw early in the nation's history in the early 1800s. I understand what you're saying about the design challenges with number eight.

Really my favorite was in obverse 12, which is very -- you could say it's similar to what Don Everhart did with the reverse of the presidential dollar program. But $I$ don't think that's necessarily a bad thing.

I mean, it's an interesting, innovative view. And because of that foreshortening, it really dramatically emphasizes the aspect of enlightenment. So to me, obverse 12 is a very strong contender and it's the strongest in this series.

For the reverses, I liked number three's unusual and interesting use of typography. I don't think that makes it strong enough to be the best in this portfolio. But I did want to mention that $I$ think that that's a good use of typography.

And within these designs, I think the best
ones are the ones that incorporate the words "Signed First Patent" because that really is going to give -that's going to give the viewer some context that they're going to lack if they don't have that. You know, you've got the signature of George Washington. But it doesn't really -- it doesn't really give -- that doesn't give you the context of what this program is about.

Number six, I had a problem with the way the words "united" and "states" are separated. I think that's problematic when you're referring to the United States as a union, although I do like the gear concept. So all of the ones with gears $I$ found appealing.

And for me, it was kind of a tossup between five and eight. I think five has a nice balance. But eight I thought was the strongest, except for one weakness. You know, I love the dynamic energy of the tilted lettering. I think that's wonderful.

My only problem with it was $I$ was wondering if the emblem of the Patent Office would be too small for coinage, especially on a coin that's only a little bit more than an inch in diameter.

MR. MORAN: Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah.
MR. TUCKER: And that would be the only thing that would lead me to dismiss this design, which is otherwise very engaging. But since I've heard other committee members talk about it, if our team doesn't think that -- that that's too small, then my strong vote would go for number eight, otherwise number five.

MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Dennis. It must be something in the water at this end of the table because I agree with both Mike and Dennis.

I like number one on the obverse. I think we should keep that, but not necessarily for this program. I do like number 12, what the CFA has chosen as one of their selections.

I agree with what Dennis said. This is about ideas. And so, to have the torch be so outsized I think is really very important. There's a lot of negative space there. I think that that's a really beautiful design.

When it comes to the reverses, I too like all of the gears. And again, my question would be the same as Dennis' on number eight. Is the symbol of the

Patent Office too small?
To me, it kind of looks like a merit badge, you know, for something. It's a little tiny. But what I really like about this besides the United States going across at an angle is that none of the gears touch each other, which to me is a swirling of ideas. These are individual ideas. They're not locked together. And so, that's what makes America so innovative. Everybody's got an idea about how to do something.

So I think that number eight is going to coin really well. The question is to Ron and company about the Patent Office symbol. But I would definitely go with number 12 and with number eight.

MS. WASTWEET: Mary, can I comment on your -MS. LANNIN: Sure.

MS. WASTWEET: When I see that little badge there, I kind of think of a privy mark that you can -MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MS. WASTWEET: -- you know, quite a detailed image into a privy mark because it's not necessarily vital to the overall design --

MS. LANNIN: Okay.
MS. WASTWEET: -- to see that in detail. MR. SCARINCI: Can we make it a privy mark? MS. LANNIN: Oh, you're giving Donald ideas, Heidi. He wants to make it a privy mark. Donald, what else would you like to comment on? Thank you, Heidi. MR. SCARINCI: That solves everybody's
problem. I mean, Heidi -- oops, Heidi just hit it. If that were a privy mark, we've never done a privy mark before.

We've talked about it once before in doing a privy mark on the platinum series. But thank God we never did it because that would have hurt the series. I mean, people collect that as a series. MS. LANNIN: Okay. MR. SCARINCI: Right? So if you do platinum, that would have interfered with the series. This is interesting. If we did a privy mark -- and there's nothing in the legislation that says we can't do a privy mark.

And I bet you -- and I bet you they'd love it because it's innovative. And so, we do a privy mark.

We turn this into a -- we turn that little thing into a privy mark.

MR. TUCKER: Could you define that for the record?

MS. LANNIN: And it's find the privy mark. MR. SCARINCI: Define privy mark?

MR. TUCKER: Yeah, because this will be on the record. Not everybody's going to know what that means.

MR. SCARINCI: Uh --
MR. TUCKER: Different -- what the design
element --

MR. SCARINCI: Go ahead. It's traditionally -- its' traditionally, you know, done to define the location or any special feature of the --

MS. LANNIN: It's an identifier. It's like a mint mark.

MS. WASTWEET: -- of the coin. Kind of like a mint mark, right. But privy mark --

MR. TUCKER: So the mint --
MR. SCARINCI: But if we make this a privy mark, we could put this on every coin. MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

MR. TUCKER: To define the coin.
MS. LANNIN: So who is -- somebody's going to help me with this because my mind is going. Who is the famous cartoonist from The New Yorker who's now dead, but everybody turned to his cartoons because somewhere quotes his privy mark was the name Nina, his daughter. MS. WASTWEET: Hirschfeld.

MR. WEINMAN: Hirschfeld.
MS. LANNIN: Hirschfeld, that's it.
MR. WEINMAN: He used his daughter's name.
MS. LANNIN: And so, Heidi, this is really
good. So this as a privy mark, finding it somewhere in each of the coins for the next 56 coins would link the whole series together and be really interesting. It's sort of our "Where's Waldo", right?

MR. SCARINCI: Right. It makes a blind series kind of interesting.

MS. LANNIN: Yeah.
MR. TUCKER: I like -- I like the idea of a privy mark and hiding --

MS. LANNIN: Not hiding it, but just it's here.

MR. TUCKER: well, or incorporating. But I would just wonder if the Patent Office emblem is the appropriate symbol because, as we've discussed in the past, not every innovation is an invention, right? Not every -- not every innovation -MS. LANNIN: The swirling of good ideas. MR. TUCKER: No, no. I like the idea of a privy mark. I'm just saying that the Patent Office does not necessarily embody and sum up every American innovation.

Innovations can be -- they can be nonphysical. They can be -- they can be mental, emotional, cultural, intellectual.

MR. JANSEN: They aren't necessarily going to be patented ideas.

MR. TUCKER: Right. Objects or machines or -MR. JANSEN: Right.

MS. LANNIN: Why don't we meet you halfway and say everything that could be patented has this privy mark or was patented?

MR. JANSEN: I'll put another idea out there. And it falls back on a technical issue of administering
what's in this code.
This code calls out edge lettering. It calls out incused edge lettering. And it calls out "E Pluribus Unum", the date and a Mint mark.

Now, historically that's not been enough stuff to get a coin to go through a Schuler machine. And so, you've always embedded some stars or some other tactile piece of the die to run it through, right, Ron? Extended blank space on the Schuler die is a problem.

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah. I mean, yeah, we fill -we fill it where we need to --

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.
MR. HARRIGAL: -- so that it continues the design.

MR. JANSEN: And so, I might -- I might say could we fill it instead of with a star or with a circle, as you've historically done on the presidential dollars, fill it with a shield?

MR. HARRIGAL: I think the one challenge on this would be to get the detail to make it actually look like the symbol --

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. Yeah. I appreciate that.

MR. HARRIGAL: -- at that size. I mean, you're looking at like, you know, the old typewriters. You know, like one of the keys. That's about the size of --

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.
MR. HARRIGAL: -- the entire emblem.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.
MR. HARRIGAL: So I don't think you'd get the detail on the edge.

MR. JANSEN: Okay.
MS. LANNIN: But it could just be that shape,
Ron. It wouldn't have to be anything --
MR. JANSEN: Yeah. We're not looking for any
internal detail, just --
MS. LANNIN: Just a shield outline.
MR. JANSEN: -- the shield shape.
MR. HARRIGAL: I don't think you'd get the detail on the inner part of it. You'd get the silhouette.

MS. LANNIN: No. Nothing. It'd be blank. MR. JANSEN: No, no. We're only looking for an outline.

MS. LANNIN: Just the outline of a shield.
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Like a badge. MS. LANNIN: Like a badge, yeah.

MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah. I mean, that's fine,
yeah. Just like -- just like a star or a badge or whatever.

MS. LANNIN: Exactly. Exactly.
MR. JANSEN: Yeah.
MR. HARRIGAL: Yeah, you could get that.
MR. URAM: The other thing would be, you know, that it all came about with the Franklin half dollar where we had to have an eagle --

MR. JANSEN: The eagle, yeah.
MR. URAM: -- on the half. And, you know, it's very well-defined. I mean, it's not that large either.

And it made it for that -- whether you want to run it through the whole series or something, I'm not so sure. But I think it's appropriate for this device.

MS. LANNIN: So okay, so for Dennis' idea, that in case we get to a state that wants to patent an idea or --

MR. TUCKER: Not patent.
MS. LANNIN: Well, I mean use for their -MR. TUCKER: Or honor --

MS. LANNIN: Honor an idea. What would we use? If this is, in quotes, our "gimmick" for this series --

MR. TUCKER: Well, we mentioned the gear
maybe. I mean, we've talked a lot about gears. But again, the more $I$ think about that, again, that gets back to mechanics and machinery. And I think even that might be a bit limiting.

And also do we -- do we want to limit our artists by giving them more things that they need to incorporate into the design?

MS. STAFFORD: So just a comment on the gears, the CFA actually spoke to the gears and thought that because not all innovation was necessarily an invention or mechanical, that perhaps that was a bridge too far to represent innovation.

However, $I$ hear this committee saying they see the note of progress and industry and innovation and -MS. LANNIN: Multiple ideas.

MS. STAFFORD: -- and it being more representative. So simply what Dennis was referring to is when -- Mr. Scarinci, you were talking about privy mark and if the Patent Office bas relief doesn't work because of its intricacy or it's too close to an actual invention that has been literally patented.

We just were having a conversation over here saying perhaps that gear symbol extends throughout as a privy mark solely representative of innovation, industry, progress and that moving forward symbol -symbolically rather than literally. So we just wanted to close that loop.

MS. LANNIN: So the privy mark wouldn't -- on this coin then we're saying that the reverse could include the patent symbol. But on future coins, our, quote, "privy mark" somewhere would be a small gear. MR. SCARINCI: Well, I mean, let's see what we can do with this as a privy mark and see what it looks like.

MS. LANNIN: So you're saying make it smaller or make it that size?

MR. SCARINCI: Make it smaller. Make it
smaller.
MR. JANSEN: Oh --

MR. HARRIGAL: I mean, yeah, when you look at like what the Canadians have done with their Maple Leaf, they made it real small. It's recognizable as a maple leaf. It would be a graphical element like that.

But you would see the outline of the symbol and you'd see probably a silhouette of the image on it. But it would be recognizable and a tie-in through the whole series if you wanted us to do it.

You could make it probably about as small as the lettering across the bottom there and still make it recognizable.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.
MR. JANSEN: Well, and --
MR. SCARINCI: And, you know, I'm sitting here thinking about innovation in general and I'm trying to think of an innovation that is not patented. What is that? And if there's anything -MR. JANSEN: Religious freedom. MR. SCARINCI: And if there is an innovation that is not patented, then why are we emphasizing
patents here?
MR. HARRIGAL: Donald, that company wouldn't be in business anymore if they didn't patent it.

MR. SCARINCI: They have to patent it.
MR. HARRIGAL: What I'm saying is like if you
have an innovation that's innovative and you don't patent it, you probably wouldn't be in business very long.

MR. SCARINCI: Right. Right.
MS. LANNIN: Even though there could be an
idea. I'm guessing that the governors of the states are going to want a thing, a thing that's patented.

MR. JANSEN: I'm not sure that's necessarily possible. I'm not sure there are patents that are registered, for instance, in American Samoa.

MR. TUCKER: And why constrain them? Why?
Why should we constrain our artists, anticipating what the governors of the states --

MR. JANSEN: Our --
MR. SCARINCI: Well, what's an innovation
that's not patented?
MR. JANSEN: It could be a trade secret. It
could be a cultural standard.
MR. SCARINCI: Yeah, but --
MR. JANSEN: It could be all kinds of things.
MR. SCARINCI: -- then we're not going to put it on a coin.

MR. JANSEN: Why not?
MR. SCARINCI: You wouldn't put a trade secret on a coin.

MR. JANSEN: Well, I'll give you an example. MS. LANNIN: says the lawyer.

MR. JANSEN: I'll give you an example. I kind of thought through this. When it comes to -- and not to single out, but when it comes to one of the Pacific territories, we might choose travel by the stars --

MS. LANNIN: Like a turtle.
MR. JANSEN: -- an innovation of their time.
I daresay the patent system was around.
MS. SULLIVAN: One example I've been throwing out when I'm talking to governors' offices is just -to get them to think outside the box is, you know, jazz music, the Harlem Renaissance, all of these general ideas that are --

MR. JANSEN: Right.
MS. SULLIVAN: I mean, nobody's going to argue with me that jazz is not innovative. But it's not patented either.

MR. JANSEN: Perhaps I can advance this and defer the discussion so we can move on here. Are we not going to at some point in the future discuss the standard layouts of this series, much as the perimeter standards were established for the ATB quarters and so forth?

And in that discussion, perhaps we could put the thought out here, if the design carries a patent, the rim gets this or the perimeter -- the standard template gets this for those that want to collect by patent number.

MS. LANNIN: Oh, that's interesting.
MR. SCARINCI: But I'm sorry. If it's not -if we're going to do coins that are not patented, then why is Congress telling us the first coin has to be about the Patent Act?

MR. JANSEN: Because that's what they told us.
MR. SCARINCI: Isn't that -- wouldn't that be
their intention in this series, to -- innovations that
are patented --

MR. JANSEN: No, I think you're thinking of innovation far too narrowly.

MR. SCARINCI: But then why are they telling us -- I guess I'm reading this like a lawyer. You know, why are they telling us that the first coin has to be about George Washington's signature with the Patent Act if --

MR. JANSEN: Are you questioning the wisdom of Congress?

MR. SCARINCI: No, no, no. I'm questioning their intent, the legislative intent, right?

Wouldn't the legislative intent be if they're mandating that the first -- if they're mandating the first coin has to be the Patent Act with George Washington's signature, then why are they doing that if every coin is not about a patented innovation?

MR. JANSEN: I don't know --
MR. SCARINCI: It doesn't make sense.
MR. JANSEN: -- that any patents have stemmed from Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, for that
matter, Puerto Rico --

MR. SCARINCI: I'm sure there have.
MR. JANSEN: -- or the Commonwealth of the North Marianas.

MR. SCARINCI: I'm sure there have. Everybody's got patents. There's tons of patents. But I don't know. I mean, why would Congress do that? I mean, what's the intent of the legislation?

Is it to -- you know, jazz certainly is an
innovation. But is it the type of innovation that
Congress has in mind to be commemorated on this series,
given their statement that this first coin has to be a
patented --
MS. LANNIN: Yeah.
MR. JANSEN: It's such a --
MS. LANNIN: No.
MR. SCARINCI: Why not?
MR. JANSEN: It's such a clear idea, that if
they intended that, I think it would have been in the
text.
MR. SCARINCI: It's not in the text.
MR. JANSEN: And it's not in the text.

MR. TUCKER: Donald, why are we focusing on the patent --

MR. WEINMAN: The particular legislation -- to some extent, as the executive branch, we take the legislation as we receive it.

MR. SCARINCI: Right, and it doesn't --
MR. WEINMAN: And you're right. Sometimes, you're right, some pieces of legislation do in fact have a bunch of whereas provisions upfront where they do explain it. This one -- this particular piece of legislation does not.

MR. TUCKER: The first coin also features the signature of George Washington. So maybe that's what we should focus on. The important thing is not the patent aspect but the first aspect. He was our first president. You know, the father of the nation, et cetera.

So you know what I'm saying? Don't read too much into what's been legislated and constrain ourselves and restrict our artists in the future to just things that have been patented. I think that's too narrow, too narrow.

MR. SCARINCI: Yeah. Okay. Okay. If it doesn't say it, it doesn't say it. If Congress doesn't say it --

MR. TUCKER: Right.
MR. SCARINCI: Is that me?
MR. JANSEN: No, you're fine.
MR. SCARINCI: Oh, are we voting?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I don't know. Are we voting?

MR. SCARINCI: No. I don't think we're voting.

MS. LANNIN: Any further discussion? Our minds are twirling. I think I like the privy mark idea and --

MR. TUCKER: Can I --
MS. LANNIN: Sure.
MR. TUCKER: I just have -- I'm sorry. One other thing, $I$ would not limit it is actually -- I wouldn't want to see this program setting up a template where you have to have United States of America and the name of a state or territory in certain places. I like the fact that we've --

MR. SCARINCI: No template.
MR. TUCKER: -- got a lot of creativity, creative potential here. I would not want to see that constrained. And I think it will be nice to let our artists work their magic.

MS. WASTWEET: I agree.
MR. MORAN: Can I make one last comment, Mary?
MS. LANNIN: Sure.
MR. MORAN: I think we need to let the privy mark idea go here because it will take up space in the future designs and really doesn't bring enough to the table and just get on with it here.

I would say, and I think this would work, if you want a use for a privy mark, use it for the one ounce, 0.9995 that we stick all of our coins with that come out of here, the same with a half-ounce or a quarter ounce.

That's where it belongs. Put it there and do away with that inscription because it'll still work in the market. But here, I think we're unnecessarily trying to fuzz up the future. And we need to let it go as an idea that has a better application somewhere
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    else.
```

MR. SCARINCI: Okay. MS. LANNIN: All right. Thank you very much. MR. SCARINCI: It's Heidi's fault. MS. LANNIN: It's Heidi's fault. Yeah. Thanks, Heidi. All right. We are going to vote. And we are going to take a 10-minute recess.

MR. WEINMAN: And Heidi -- Heidi and Robert, please send me your tallies here.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you, ma'am.
(Whereupon, the foregoing went off the record at 2:18 p.m., and went back on the record at

2:29 p.m.)
MS. LANNIN: All right. We are back from our short break, and I am going to ask Greg to read the totals for the obverse and reverse for the new series of American innovators. Greg?

MR. WEINMAN: We'll start with the obverse. Obverse one has 15 votes. Obverse two has two. Obverse three has zero. Obverse four has zero. Obverse five has one. Obverse six has two. Obverse seven has two.

Obverse eight has 18, which is the highest number. Obverse nine has one. Obverse 10 has one. Obverse 11 has one. And obverse 12 has 14. The two that received the required number of votes would be number eight, followed by number one.

For the reverse, reverse one has three.

Reverse two has six. Reverse three has seven. Reverse four has 14. Reverse five has four. Reverse six has four. Reverse seven has seven. Reverse eight has 29. MR. TUCKER: Wow.

MR. WEINMAN: Reverse nine has zero. Ten has zero. Eleven has zero. Twelve has zero. Thirteen has one. Fourteen, zero. So the reverses that -- was number eight. MS. LANNIN: Okay. So any further discussion? MR. MORAN: That was a good decision. MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I mean, no -- oh, do we --

MR. SCARINCI: If we -- if we do -- so obverse one carried. Obverse --

MR. WEINMAN: Obverse one received 15. MR. SCARINCI: Obverse eight.

MR. WEINMAN: The requisite number, but your second choice.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: So do you mean to tell
me --

MR. SCARINCI: So obverse eight is the one
that won. So --

MR. MORAN: I don't like that one.

MR. WEINMAN: Obverse eight received your most votes.

MR. SCARINCI: What do people think about the placement of "In God We Trust" like --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes. I did too. (Cross
talk.) I voted for this. I voted for that.
MR. SCARINCI: -- kind of in the underarm of Liberty? You know, should it be smaller and lower or should it be more around the right rim somewhere?

MR. JANSEN: Right rim.
MR. SCARINCI: I mean, and smaller? I mean, it doesn't need to be that large and it certainly just doesn't seem like it looks right under the underarm of Liberty, no?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I don't like this

```
underarm thing.
```

MR. SCARINCI: No.
MR. JANSEN: And -- and --
MS. LANNIN: What if --
MR. SCARINCI: We have to put it somewhere else or do something with it.

MS. LANNIN: What if $\$ 1$ slid down to let's say the 8 o'clock position, fairly center --

MR. JANSEN: And?

MS. LANNIN: And "In God We Trust" stacked
exactly the way it is now is at the 2 o'clock position? So they'd just be diagonal.

MR. SCARINCI: Two o'clock. Oh, put it on the other side there?

MS. LANNIN: Yeah, the other side, for
balance.
MR. SCARINCI: Could we make -- I mean, I kind of like the negative space. That's the only thing I -MS. LANNIN: Oh, okay.

MR. SCARINCI: Honestly the only thing I like about this design is the negative space on it.

MS. WASTWEET: I agree.

MR. SCARINCI: But if we -- but what if we put the "In God We Trust" smaller, down a little further and then put the dollar down a little further and then had more negative space everywhere else?

Like let's not take up the negative space. Let's use the negative space.

MR. JANSEN: Could you even put the dollar on the edge? I mean, I'm not a big edge person at all.

MR. MORAN: The perimeter --
MR. JANSEN: On the edge, yeah, so as in conforming with the perimeter.

MR. MORAN: It's like --
MR. VIOLA: With all the other information that's on there.

MR. MORAN: -- because the dollar has to be on the obverse. It's in the legislation.

MR. SCARINCI: Oh, it's in the legislation.
MR. VIOLA: Well --
MR. MORAN: But my suggestion on this would be to obviously shrink the "In God We Trust". We need to keep Liberty's vision clear. And I would probably put the dollar and the symbol behind her.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: No, if she --
MR. TUCKER: I agree with that, Mike. MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: If you have the dollar which she's looking at, do we want her looking at the dollar?

MR. SCARINCI: I --
MS. LANNIN: Maybe move the dollar up a little bit and shrinking "In God We Trust" can be lower. MR. SCARINCI: Wait. Wait. Mike had -- Mie has it. He's close.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: He's close.
MR. MORAN: That's something for Donald to say that.

MR. SCARINCI: "In God We Trust" goes down, right?

MS. LANNIN: Let the record show that Donald has left his seat and is pointing at things.

FEMALE: Is the microphone going to --
MR. SCARINCI: "In God We Trust" can be shrunken and put down here and how about the dollar goes over here?

MS. LANNIN: Yes.

MR. VIOLA: That's it.
MR. MORAN: Exactly.
MR. VIOLA: That's it.
MR. WEINMAN: Yeah, but Donald -- Donald, use a microphone.

MR. SCARINCI: Right. This way -- this way -MR. WEINMAN: -- so that she can hear you. MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: No one can hear you. MR. SCARINCI: How?

MR. JANSEN: Go ahead. Give him a dry maker and write on the screen, Donald.

MR. SCARINCI: Because then, then what we have is, you know, we've got the one asset of this coin, the one asset of this coin is the negative space.

So take this, put it here. Take this, make it small, put it here to balance it. And then, keep this beautiful negative space on top.

MR. JANSEN: With the enlightenment of the torch the feature.

MR. SCARINCI: Correct.
MS. LANNIN: So would you like to a motion, Donald?

MR. SCARINCI: Yeah. I'll make that motion. MR. MORAN: I'll second it.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. All in favor of Donald's motion, say aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)
MS. LANNIN: All opposed? Motion carries.
I'm going to say 10 to zero.
MR. JANSEN: Good job.
MR. SCARINCI: Good.
MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Donald. Good job.
MR. SCARINCI: No. No, it was Mike's idea. I
just articulated it.
MS. LANNIN: Thank you, Michael.
MS. STAFFORD: Any comment on the reverse?
MS. LANNIN: Any other comments that we need to talk about for the reverse?

MR. WEINMAN: Ready for a motion.
MR. MORAN: Wait a minute. I've got a question.

MS. LANNIN: Sure.
MR. MORAN: We go to that reverse, do we have to have that shield around the Patent Office symbol?

MS. LANNIN: Yes.
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.
MR. TUCKER: Yes.
MR. JANSEN: The shield is the patent office symbol.

MR. TUCKER: That's what it is. Yeah, that's what it is.

MR. MORAN: All right. Then $I$ have no more comments.

MR. TUCKER: Otherwise, it really would be a privy mark.

MS. LANNIN: All right.
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay.
MR. SCARINCI: Now, for the next quarter, privy marks.

MR. JANSEN: I have one question before we adjourn, Mary. Are we going to as a committee address, even if it's a discussion of no standards, are we going to address at any point in a future meeting a standard template issue for the next 14 years of these innovation dollars?

MS. LANNIN: I would like to think that we
would. It's a good question.
MS. STAFFORD: Yes, we are. Yes. We actually discussed that in our administrative meeting this morning.

MR. JANSEN: I thought I heard that.
MS. STAFFORD: Yes.
MR. JANSEN: I just wanted to hear it.
MS. STAFFORD: And I think given the
discussion here today about potential devices to
connect the 14 other years of the program, we should have that at either our next meeting or the November meeting, yes.

MR. MORAN: Since $I$ feel we have maybe five minutes here, on the $\$ 100$ gold coin and on the silver medal, have we ever thought of doing a privy mark for those weights and fineness?

And I would just say that for a one ounce, a shield with a letter one about it. A half-ounce would be a shield and a two. And the shield represents the 0.999 and it gets rid of that damned inscription, which is ugly.
MR. SCARINCI: Mike, I think -- oops, Mike, I
think the privy mark might be the way to go with this series. It gives it something special.

And if in fact the secretary agrees with us that we use the gears, then the gears could be the privy mark, right, as our theme. And somewhere in each design, we use the gears as a privy mark. It makes this series special.

And if I recall correctly, and I don't know if you're still on the phone, Bob, but historically, right, the privy mark was a symbol of something special about a coin. It was struck for a king, you know, it was -- historically.

So this series is really not going to circulate. It's got -- you know, it's really being designed, you know, as a collector series really. We've never done that before.

It's the first time we're doing that. So a privy mark is perfectly appropriate historically. It would make sense.

MR. MORAN: Well, I agree with that on this because that's one of the big criticisms from the collector community is that the date is on the rim.

And when you get it certified, it's gone.
MR. SCARINCI: It's gone.
MR. MORAN: Yeah, and that's probably one way
we can finesse that and satisfy the collectors for putting a privy mark in each year --

MR. SCARINCI: Yeah.
MR. MORAN: -- that they can recognize. It doesn't have to be big at all. It shouldn't be big.

MR. WEINMAN: Interesting thought.
MR. SCARINCI: Interesting thought. Makes it --

MR. MORAN: We could even put that one on the obverse. Doesn't have to be on the reverse.

MS. LANNIN: Before you all disappear, I need a vote. Our next meeting is October 16th. So if we have no further business, would someone make a motion to adjourn?

MR. VIOLA: I make the motion.
MS. LANNIN: All right, Herman. Anybody second?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I'll second.
MS. LANNIN: Jeanne. All in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.) MS. LANNIN: See you in October.
(Whereupon, at 2:38 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)
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