

United States Mint  
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee  
Meeting  
Tuesday, November 29, 2011

The Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee met in Conference Room A, Second Floor, at 801 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Gary Marks, Chair, presiding.

CCAC Members Present:

Gary Marks, Chair  
Michael Bugeja  
Erik Jansen  
Michael Moran  
Michael Olson  
Donald Scarinci  
Heidi Wastweet

United States Mint Staff Present:

Richard A. Peterson, Deputy Director  
Kaarina Budow  
Don Everhart  
Andy Fishburn  
Ron Harrigal  
Leslie Schlager  
Greg Weinman

## Contents

Welcome and Call to Order	4
Swearing-in of New Member	4
Discussion of Letter and Minutes from Previous Meetings	7
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2013 America the Beautiful Quarter Designs	8
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2012 Platinum Program	67
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2012 First Spouse Bullion Coin Program	105
Annual Report Discussion	145
Conclude Meeting	166

## Proceedings

9:05 a.m.

## Welcome and Call to Order

Chair Marks: I'm going to go ahead and call this meeting to order, a meeting of the CCAC for Tuesday, November 29, 2011. We have got a big day in front of us. We have got a total of 89 designs covering, I believe, it is 14 coin faces, spread over three different programs. So we have got our work cut out for us and also later we will be talking about some of our recommendations for our next annual report.

And then I would make a note on the agenda, the 4:00 p.m. item, the presentation by Michael Bugeja, we're going to move that to probably our subsequent meeting and give Michael a little more time and also give him the benefit of our full attention. I am thinking that by 4:00 this afternoon, we might not all be there.

So, I might ask you if Doreen Bolger on the line?

Mr. Weinman: Is Doreen on? No.

Chair Marks: Okay. I will note for the record that in the room we have Michael Bugeja, Erik Jansen, myself, Gary Marks, Michael Olson, Donald Scarinci, Heidi Wastweet, and Michael Moran, who we will be introduced to here just shortly.

## Swearing-in of New Member

In fact, with that, we are going to move our first item on the agenda, which is the swearing in of our new member, Michael Moran. And Acting Director Dick Peterson is here and I will ask him to take the floor.

Mr. Peterson: So Michael, if you could join me up front here.

Let me swear you in. This is the oath of office that

every public servant takes. And so before we do this, we would thank you in advance for your service. And I have taken this oath twice; once going into the Navy and once coming into the Mint. And I think as you read this and then later we will have you sign inside the Bible. It is quite moving.

So Michael if you could raise your right hand and place your left hand on the Bible and repeat after me. I, Michael Moran --

Member Moran: I, Michael Moran, --

Mr. Peterson: -- will support and defend the Constitution of the United States--

Member Moran: -- will support and defend the Constitution of the United States--

Mr. Peterson: -- against all enemies, foreign and domestic; --

Member Moran: -- against all enemies, foreign and domestic; --

Mr. Peterson: -- that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; --

Member Moran: -- I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; --

Mr. Peterson: -- that I take this obligation freely; --

Member Moran: -- I take this obligation freely; --

Mr. Peterson: -- without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; --

Member Moran: -- without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; --

Mr. Peterson: -- and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties --

Member Moran: -- I will well and faithfully discharge the duties --

Mr. Peterson: -- of the office on which I am about to enter; --

Member Moran: -- of the office on which I am about to enter; --

Mr. Peterson: -- So help me God.

Member Moran: -- So help me God.

Mr. Peterson: Thank you and congratulations.

(Applause.)

Mr. Peterson: So Michael has a distinguished career in numismatics and we will let him tell you about it. But he has written a very interesting book on the old San Francisco Mint and I just want to note that the new San Francisco Mint will be 75 years old this year in 2012.

And so, Michael, please give us your comments.

Member Moran: I will say when I wrote the article on the San Francisco Mint, that was where I learned about Frank Leach and he was a first class director. I learned that the Mint really did generate an element of professional pride and camaraderie that was to be respected at that point in time and I am sure I am going to see it here as well.

I will tell you one quick story and then I am going to sit down because we have got a long agenda. What really got me started on Saint-Gaudens, I was a collector for a long time, my grandfather got me started on Indian Head pennies. But back in 1960, I decided I was going to get a \$20 gold piece. It was the prettiest thing I ever had seen. I had no idea who Saint-Gaudens was. So I saved up my lawn mowing money all one summer and bought a gold piece. It wasn't a rare one but it was a nice one, 1924. It cost me \$47.50, which was my entire earnings that summer at \$2 a pop mowing yards, plus three percent sales tax.

I brought it home really proud of it. And I show it to

my father and he flips it over on the back. And he says what does that say Mike down there? I said well, Dad, it says twenty dollars. He says tell me again what you paid for that. That was the end of it. I mean, you could hear the air going out of the balloon. But I still have that \$20 gold piece and, yes, I got the last laugh.

Anyway, I am proud to be here. I am proud to be a part of this organization in this small way and I hope that I can help it in any way I can. And with that, I will sit down and be quiet.

(Applause.)

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael, and welcome to our committee.

I spent some time with Michael last night and I know that he is going to be a wealth of knowledge and information on numismatic subjects. So, I think Michael is going to be a great addition.

#### Discussion of Letter and Minutes from Previous Meetings

Okay, the next item on our agenda is our discussion of the minutes and the letter to the Secretary covering our September 27, 2011 meeting. You all received a copy of the letter and the minutes in your packet. Is there any discussion or comment on either of those documents?

Member Olson: Move to approve.

Chair Marks: I have a motion to approve. Is there a second?

Moved and seconded to approve the minutes and the letter for the September 27, 2011 meeting.

Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

We will now move down to the review and discussion of candidate designs for the 2013 America the Beautiful Quarter designs. And I understand Ron Harrigal will present the designs. Ron?

#### Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2013 America the Beautiful Quarter Designs

Mr. Harrigal: Okay, good morning, everyone.

The 2013 design candidates for America the Beautiful Program. The United States Mint America the Beautiful Coin Program is a multi-year initiative authorized by Public Law 110-456, the America's Beautiful National Parks Quarter Dollar Coin Act of 2008. The Act directs United States Mint to mint and issue 56 circulating quarter dollars with reverse tail side designs emblematic of the national parks or other national sites in each the District of Columbia, the U.S. Territories Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, and of course the states.

The quarters are issued sequentially each year in the order of which is a featured site was established as a national park or a site.

I would like to bring the first picture up of course is the common obverse which we started for this program with the restored 1932 portrait of George Washington by John Flanagan, including subtle details of the beauty in the original model. The inscriptions are United States of America, Liberty, In God We Trust and Quarter Dollar.

The first reverse design is White Mountains National Forest. Established as a federal site in 1918, the 800,000 White Mountains National Forest located in New Hampshire and Maine, mostly of course in New Hampshire, is managed by the United States Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service.

The forest draws those who seek adventures, spectacular views and/or wildlife viewing. Hikers are treated to hikes above the tree lines in the alpine area. Others hope to catch sites of moose or other wildlife and enjoy the back country. And millions of visitors travel each year through this area, enjoying some types of recreation areas along the way as they see fit. The White Mountains National Forest, land of many uses, reads the sign as it greets you as you come into the multiple-use managed forest lands here.

In creating this site, we were presented with some unique challenges. Because many mountain peaks and vistas are in the park, the White Mountains National Forest can be viewed from many areas. Some of the designs, viewpoints are from states or private lands looking into the forest.

The first design, NH-1. The design depicts Mount Washington, the highest peak in the Northeastern United States at 6,288 feet, framed by white birch trees located in the White Mountains National Forest. The design has you looking to the east side of Mount Washington, which is the northern part of the forest. White birch trees are an iconic species that symbolize the regeneration of forest after disturbance within the forest, such as fire or wind. They are not specific to this forest, however, they are found in abundance here.

Mount Washington is located in the Presidential Mountain Range, a landmark familiar to many visitors of the White Mountains National Forest.

And just as an anecdote here, the white birch tree is the state tree of New Hampshire.

The second design, the design depicts Mount Chocorua, the eastern most peak of the Sandwich Range, framed by birch trees. Other elements are not necessarily managed by the National Forest Service but the main focal point, Mount Chocorua, is.

This view is an iconic image of the White Mountains National Forest. You would be standing at a picnic site, looking across the lake into the forest system lands.

The same image, same source images were used in this design. Number three, the design depicts two white-tailed deer amongst the white birch trees in front of Lake Chocorua. The iconic view of Mount Chocorua is seen across the lake.

Design four depicts the Bicknell's Thrush, the Neotropical migratory songbird perched on the balsam fir tree in the White Mountains National Forest. The Bicknell's Thrush is only found in the forest in the summer, when it is time to breed. The White Mountains Forest offers the largest summer breeding habitat for the bird.

Design five depicts a moose, which is found in the National Forest in abundance. While moose can be found in other areas in North America, according to the U.S. Forest Service, many visitors hope to see a moose when they visit the White Mountains National Forest. The iconic view of Mount Chocorua is seen across the lake.

And these are our five designs.

Chair Marks: Okay. Would the committee like to go one at a time with each of the five quarters or do you want to see them all?

Member Wastweet: I think one at a time.

Chair Marks: We'll do them one at a time?

Member Olson: It would keep better track of them.

Chair Marks: Okay. So at this point, I will thank you, Ron, for your input. Are there any questions for Ron and/or if they are design-related, I would suggest that we direct those to Don Everhart. Welcome, Don.

Mr. Harrigal: I would like to make one statement

that, when the CFA reviewed them, their choice was the first design.

Member Wastweet: I do have a question, Ron. The Bicknell's Thrush, is that unique to that area?

Mr. Harrigal: It is not totally unique there but this is of course the largest habitat for the summer breeding grounds.

Member Wastweet: And then when you talked to the park people and they told you what was important to them about the park, what did they indicate to you?

Mr. Harrigal: I think I have to turn it over to Kaarina because she is actually the one --

Member Wastweet: Oh, okay.

Mr. Harrigal: -- that had the discussions with the park. So let me let her speak to that.

Ms. Budow: Hi, good morning. I should consult with Leslie as well who worked directly with the park. There were certain vistas that they said were very emblematic and they indicated of course certain wildlife, flora and fauna which we tried to focus in.

Anything else, Leslie you can think of?

Ms. Schlager: I would also say Mount Washington, although it is not managed by the -- The Forest Service does not manage the entire Mount Washington area but it is iconic, Mount Chocorua, and believe it or not, they really thought the moose was very emblematic because so many people come to see a moose.

Ms. Budow: We assured that these vistas though are in the actual park itself. So that is also a consideration that we always take into account.

Member Wastweet: Was there any talk about the Lehman Caves?

Ms. Schlager: The Lehman Caves are in actually Great Basin.

Member Wastweet: Oh, sorry. I'm on the wrong page. Sorry. Thanks.

Chair Marks: Are there any other questions for any of the staff, technical in nature? I don't want your opinions necessarily right now but I want to make sure we have addressed all the technical questions there might be.

Okay. With that, I will put us into our review. And Michael Moran, the process is that we kind of go one at a time. So what I am going to do is I am going to start with Heidi and I am going to run down the line but I will give you a break and let you listen to the rest of us on this first one.

Member Moran: I thought maybe you were going to make me go first just to initiate me.

Chair Marks: No, I'll have you weigh in last. I will give you an opportunity to be more towards the front later on. But being brand new to this, I think you might appreciate --

Member Moran: Thank you.

Chair Marks: -- seeing how each of us kind of go through our reviews.

So I will start with Heidi. We will come down to Don and work down the line and we will circle back to Mr. Moran. Heidi.

Member Wastweet: All right. I don't have any big discussions here. I know the CFA preferred design number one. I feel this design is too busy and exactly what the CFA and CCAC has been asking not to see. So I am not in favor of number one for that reason.

Number two, I think would work well. It has a good composition. There is plenty of interesting negative space. It will work well for the proof version of the

coin. The textures are varied enough that it will give a sense of depth on the coin. I think number two is my favorite of these designs.

Number three, I caution anytime you have a muzzled animal like a deer heading straight into the viewer like this, it never works well on a coin. It may look fine on the drawing, not going to work well on a coin. I am deeply against number three for that reason.

Number four, I like the idea of using an animal that is, like Ron said, most of the population is in this area. It is iconic of that area. However, this design has too many layers going on. We have a mountain in the background and then a tree and then the bird. And the bird has quite a bit of volume to it. So that is not going to work well within the very narrow scope of a quarter. We have very little depth to work with and that is going to compromise the depth. So I am going to be against number four just for that reason.

I like the bird. If the background wasn't there. If it was just the bird and maybe some foliage around it in a decorative fashion, I think that would have been my choice but it is not working as presented.

Number five, even though the park was in favor of the moose, I feel that the moose is too common. We see this across Montana and Idaho and very emblematic of Yellowstone. I don't think it is specific enough just to White Mountain. And so I can't get excited about the moose.

There is a lot of texture in the background that is going to obscure the moose when it is reduced down to the small coin. There is not a lot of polish going on for the proof version. So I can't get excited about number five.

So my pick would be number two.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Heidi. We will move down to Don.

Member Scarinci: I was kind of debating between number one and number two of those that were presented here. I ruled out, although I want to say that I want to give you encouragement on number four and number five because what we keep saying and I think what the CFA keeps saying and I don't want to characterize what they are saying, but what we certainly are telling you is none in a design aspect or some unique view, or some isolated -- you know, isolate rather than attempt on a small piece, a small disc of metal the size of a quarter to depict something as grand and as beautiful as one of these parks. So isolate, identify, and pick out something that is iconic to it.

So I really wrestled with, well, then why won't I support number four and number five. And I guess I would support certainly number four if there had been more support from the park, from the people who really know the park.

I could understand number one. One, number one if it were a dollar coin, a dollar size or a half dollar size, I think number one has a lot of potential, especially in the proof version. But as Heidi points out, just too busy for a coin and way too busy for a small coin.

My only -- you know, the last time I think New Hampshire had a mountain depicted on it, the mountain was on the state quarter and that mountain ceased to exist. So what is very neat about coins throughout history is that a lot of the things that we know about the ancient world, we only know because an image of it was captured on a coin and that is now the case with the New Hampshire state quarter, you know, which for thousands of years, that mountain will continue to be known because of that state quarter and memorialized forever there.

And I think that is one of the things we try to achieve, I think, with our coins. And with a program like this, depicting some of these natural wonders

that are preserved for all of us to see, you know, I think --

So anyway, I think I am coming down on number two, unless somebody is going to persuade me about the bird.

The moose, I don't think I am persuadable about the moose because even though you captured a detail that, you know, kind of looks like Bullwinkle, I think. So I am not there on the moose.

I could be persuaded on the bird, depending on what people say.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Donald.

First of all, I will say that the artists have produced I think some great renderings here. I guess where I get hung up is that we are presented with these designs and they are, I think, about eight inches round. And as an eight-inch rendering it looks really great because we can see all that detail.

Heidi mentioned this idea of too many layers. And while on an eight-inch variety, I don't think that is a problem, but sometimes I think that we should be presented just the little actual-size drawing that is going to be the coin. Because I think if that is all that we saw, it would heavily influence our decisions.

And it circles me back to what Heidi and Don have just commented on that, on one hand there is too many layers and I think the way to resolve that is for what Don said and that is to isolate and find those iconic images that we can portray on a one-inch disc that for the casual observer glancing at it as it passes to their hand and into their pocket that they might immediately know what that image is.

And if we look at number one, while it is a great eight-inch drawing, I really think that as that goes in someone's hand and into their pocket, if they glance at it, it is going to look like a bunch of lines.

I'm not sure that there is -- there is not really going to be a pop for the visual experience.

Number two, Mount Chocorua -- am I pronouncing that right?

Mr. Harrigal: Mount Chocorua, yes.

Chair Marks: That looks like that could be a grand image. I wish it was up closer because here again, if we look at the one-inch rendering down on the corner here, which is actually what is actually going to be, it disappears into a very small dimple or spot on the coin.

Three, the deer, I think are a great add to the design but here again, there is too much going on. There is too many layers. There is no one focal point and the deer becomes so small that while -- if they were the singular focal point of this design, I think it might have more punch to it. But I think it is all diffused.

Number four, I like this one. I wish it could be a little more simple. I like the fact that the thrush is very large. To the naked eye, I can look at the one-inch rendering here down in the corner of the page I have been given and I know immediately that that is a bird. And we know that birds are very popular, especially in coins. There are a lot of folks who collect just bird images on coins.

I think this is a great, it is moving in a great direction. I think I will move to the numismatic side. When this design, if it were selected, would be produced as a proof, I think what we are going to find is again the punch is robbed away from it or stolen away from it because what we are going to have is the bird will be a frosted device but then the tree behind it, the mountain range behind it, and the outline of the bird will then be lost on a one-inch coin.

If the mirrored images could have more wholly surrounded the bird and given more of that

contrast, I think we would have had a much more dramatic image. But I do like the fact that the bird is made very large to the point where on a one-inch coin you can actually decipher what that is.

And then the moose, here again it is a larger image but even on the business strike we are going to have a lot of device. It is going to be a solid device and the only clear area is right up here at the top by the words White Mountain. So even certainly on the proof version, you are going to have, and I think you have seen this on some of the other state park images that we have had produced in proof version, that you have a lot of frost. Almost the entire image is frost. And so there is a lacking in contrast.

In coin art, I think what oftentimes can make the difference in an image is being able to balance those mirrored images with those frosted images, so that there is contrast and pop to the design.

The moose I think is nice and big. I like that. I'm not so crazy about cutting off his legs. But as a coin, it is just, it is going to be a lot of device and there would not be a whole lot of pop.

So at this point, I think my choice would probably be number four, although I think there is room to improve that. And I am taking Don's comments under advisement and thinking about them, about number two.

So with that, I will pass on to Michael Olson.

Member Olson: All right, very similar comments to what we have already heard. Number one, there is just too many lines there going in the same direction. Big or small rendering, I don't think that is a very appealing design.

Number two, at this point, would be my preference. The one thing I did notice on this design, Gary had mentioned the fact that this mountain doesn't look much like a mountain in this view. The other thing that I noticed was it is very symmetrical. There is

three trees on each side. Maybe that is, if there was a picture taken and that is what it looks like, I guess that is one thing, but that would be something that may want to be revisited if this one is the one that is selected to maybe throw it off a little bit. It is nature. There is not a lot in nature that is perfectly symmetrical.

The number three, the deer look like they are posing for a picture on a family vacation. It doesn't look natural. Somewhat of an appealing design but as has been stated, the deer would be awful small on there and it may be difficult to replicate.

Number four, I think that one, the fact that we are talking about White Mountain and we see just a little blip of something behind the bird, doesn't really cut it for me. If that bird was specific to that area only, I think it might be a nice design to work with. But since it is not, I guess I am not sure how it would portray the mountain with that design. So I would not be in favor of that one.

Again here, I don't know who was taking the pictures, whether the moose was taking pictures of the deer or the deer of the moose first. But he looks like he is taking his turn with a portrait. Maybe on some of these designs where we have got animals, I guess I would prefer they are not looking directly at the viewer, maybe off to the side so it looks a little more natural.

My support primarily will be going for design number two. That's it.

Chair Marks: Michael Bugeja.

Member Bugeja: I have a quick question I would like to direct to Don real quickly.

When the designs are conceived, what kind of canvas do the artists use?

Mr. Everhart: Well, we are given a format which has the copy on it, like in this case White Mountain and

the date and everything but it is at still the eight-inch diameter.

Member Bugeja: It is an eight-inch diameter canvas.

Mr. Everhart: It is the same size we sculpt them at.

Member Bugeja: Well one of the things I do on the quarter designs is to reduce the image to quarter size. And that led me to think of art history and Victorian miniatures and how did they depict scenes.

One of the questions that I ask whenever I look at the legislation is what is the conventional medium for the image or icon in the legislation. And the conventional medium for White Mountain would be the postcard. All right? And that is a very different kind of canvas than the coin.

So I had some fundamental questions. I mean, quickly I am going to go through these but then I wanted to bring up some of the means of my critique. In other words, to give you an idea of why I am making the comments that I am making, with a little bit of theory behind it.

I agree that number one is way too busy. If you reduce that to a 25-cent coin, it almost looks like grass. So you lose the tree image.

On number two, I have much of the same feeling. It is a little bit better. There is good orientation in terms of this being a little higher elevated angle.

Number three with the deer, way too busy. I didn't - - again, the trees and the mountain, too many layers as Heidi said.

Number four, I actually like. The tree in the background behind the bird I think is a distraction. I wondered why it was there and whether it was needed.

And then we have what looks like a Canadian coin

on number five.

But I wanted to give at least the designers and the artists just a little bit of how I came to something, what I look for in the design. The first I look for is what is the icon. Is there a symbol there that is really representative of the image. The second is a fundamental question I ask is, what is the conventional medium where this type of an image would be depicted? And because the legislation is America the Beautiful, the parks, we are going to come back to the postcard often.

In addition to that, I look for orientation. And the orientation on all but four is straight on, six-foot tall photography. In other words, a six-foot person with a camera taking straight-on pictures. And what I do sometimes is try to elevate to use software to see how that would look at different types of orientation, which every artist and every photographer actually take into account.

The next I look for is contrast and relief in the numismatic world. And I think Gary handled that quite cogently when he talked about the proof and the frosted images. If I got rid of that tree on number four, I think the frosted image of the bird would be okay.

I also look for sensory data. Most of the coins that I see are quiet. And sensory data is -- the five sense -- There are six senses. The five senses, taste, smell, sight, all of those, but there is also movement as the sixth sense.

Now when I take a look at all the coins they are static but number four actually has the implied sensory datum of sound, which I find appealing.

So I just wanted to give the designers a little bit of how I look at things but given all of that, my preference would be four, with a possible elimination or at least reduction of the tree immediately behind the bird.

Chair Marks: Okay. With that, we will go to Mike. I'm sorry, Erik Jansen.

Member Jansen: Thanks. The benefit of being last, you can thank everyone for helping me frame my own choice here.

And thanks, Heidi, for the sculptors' take on this. I think sometimes that is the hardest part for me is to know exactly how this gets reduced to relief and the proof consequences and so forth.

I am going to focus on the two that have my attention right now and that is number two and number five. I had originally come here and voted for number one but I think it is too busy and I think the comments are right on in that regard. It is going to be interesting with the CFA's recommendation there versus what I think will be something different from us from what I have heard from everyone here. And it doesn't sound very consensual at this point from us either.

I call number two kind of my default choice because of the deer comments and the bird is not getting my attention as is because it is kind of complex and so forth. So I take two as a default choice because number one is too busy. I think it will coin up well. The proof surfaces are good. The mountain will be good in relief.

I had an interesting thing happen to me when the moose first came to my attention as I was reviewing these, I kind of said, moose? Now, I have never been to White Mountain. I have been to most of the national parks west of the Mississippi, several of them east. But I know a moose and the sixth sense here is called swampy because that is what moose are. They are swampy and they do stand there just like that when they see you.

So I am pushed over the line on number five because I talked to a couple of locals that actually went to school at Dartmouth and they immediately said oh, it's the moose. It's the moose.

So I am going to yield the benefit of the doubt to local knowledge and say I am going to vote for number five and back it up with number two. Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Erik. And we will move now down to Michael Moran.

Member Moran: My first time in the box. At the risk of being cute, I think number one, you can't see the forest for the trees.

I do like number two. I would word it this way: that is nicely framed. I wish there were five trees instead of six because odd numbers are better. But still, it will coin well.

Three is a mess. It's too busy. For me, four had potential. The problem is it is not recognizable as a bird distinctly to somebody that is not an ornithologist or knows the nature of the area.

As to five, I do like the moose. Being from the south, they are an unusual animal to us. When I think of a moose, I don't think of the West. I think specifically of Maine and it hits right on for me.

So I'm like Erik. I am going to split my votes between two and five.

Chair Marks: Okay with that, is Doreen on the phone? No. Okay.

I will ask the committee members to register their tallies on the scoring sheet that was passed out to you ahead of the meeting for White Mountain. And at this point, I am going to look back to Ron for our next quarter.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay, the next design we are looking at is Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial. Established as a federal site in 1919, this memorial was built to honor those who fought in the Battle of Lake Erie during the War of 1812. Equally, the memorial is a symbol to the long-lasting peace

between Great Britain, Canada and the United States.

The memorial is one of the tallest of its kind in the United States, rising 352 feet above western Lake Erie and is often described as a dominant feature of the Lake Erie islands. The Doric column at Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial constructed of 2,340 granite blocks each weighing between two and five tons is the only International Peace Memorial in the Park Service and stands 47 feet taller than the Statute of Liberty in New York Harbor.

The top of the memorial features an 11-ton bronze urn and is an observation deck for visitors. An elevator takes visitors to the open-air 360 degree observation platform.

At the center of the base of the massive column is a rotunda, a round room, and below the rotunda floor are six bodies buried from the Battle of Lake Erie, three Americans and three British officers.

Hold on a second. I have got a little technical difficulty here. I opened the box. I need to close it out. I don't know why these pop-up boxes keep on coming up.

All right. Design number one. The design depicts a statue of Master Commandant Oliver Hazard Perry located in the visitor's center of Perry's Victory in the International Peace Memorial. At the age of 27, Perry led American forces in the naval victory of the Battle of Lake Erie, receiving a Congressional Gold Medal and the thanks of Congress. It was Perry who coined the famous quote, we have met the enemy and they are ours, after defeat of the British squadron.

Okay, second design. This design was inspired by three flags flown at the memorial. This design uses artistic license to capture the essence of the three nations bonded together in lasting peace.

Design three. This design represents three flags shown at the memorial. When standing near the northern seawall looking towards the memorial south, the American flag is on the left, closest to the memorial, and the Canadian flag in the middle, the British flag on the right.

So there are three candidates to consider.

Chair Marks: Okay, are there any technical questions for staff?

Member Wastweet: I have a question. How did we end up with only three designs for this one?

Mr. Harrigal: Well we started out with more. When it came down to it, these are the three that we actually -- made it through the gauntlet of the reviews, the clearance materials and actually to the final round. We start out with a lot more.

Member Wastweet: But on the --

Mr. Harrigal: I can't really give you specifics on the what happened and those sort of things.

Member Wastweet: Right.

Mr. Harrigal: But clearly, we have the memorial here and that is the centerpiece of what the park wanted us to focus on.

Member Wastweet: Okay.

Chair Marks: Any other technical questions? Okay, hearing none, I am going to go ahead and start this one.

I think we have one choice here. And I think we have one choice because I truly believe it would be in error for us to recommend a coin that would have the image of a foreign nation's flag on it. Both Canada and Britain of course are good friends of the United States but still, there is just something -- I think there would be some criticism. I know that these flags, we just heard these flags, exist at the

memorial. They are a part of the memorial. I get that. I understand that. But I still think that for those who are sensitive to such things, which I think are a significant part of our population, that when presented with a coin with the flag of a foreign nation on it, it is going to be a problem.

So I will urge you all to consider that designs two and three not be our recommendation. And because we have only been given three options here, that means there is only one left to pick.

Number one of Commandant Perry, I am looking for what I can say about it.

(Laughter.)

Chair Marks: I'm sorry. I didn't mean it to come out that way. The Commandant was, I think, the focal point of this battle. That is what I am understanding from our presentation. So if we look for an iconic image like I have talked about and others have talked about, it is probably a good subject to put the Commandant's likeness on this coin.

At the same time, I am back to my issue of layers and pop. I think the stuff around it, the window framing and the walls on either side, while I know that is part of that environment there, I just wish that we could have found a way maybe to show this image without all the window dressing, if you will. How do you like that one?

Mr. Harrigal: That's great. In keeping with the metaphor.

Chair Marks: So with that I think we have once choice and it is number one. And I think this time we will go to my friend Michael Olson and we will move down to Erik Jansen and then we will move over to Heidi and down to Donald. So, Mike.

Mr. Harrigal: Gary, can I interject just one comment here from the site?

That statue is actually designed to be displayed outdoors and it was for a period of time. So by removing -- if the recommendation is to remove the window and the building around it, it would still be specific to the memorial and actually the Park would be okay with that.

Chair Marks: Okay. I think it would give it more pop.

Mr. Harrigal: But anyway, I want to hear your recommendations.

Chair Marks: Yes, you would give it more gravitas. I mean when you look at it, just seeing that image of that sculpture by itself, especially on a proof version I think would be certainly more spectacular than what we would have with this image.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, the actual statue was donated in 1929 and remained outdoors until 1990.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: So it was a substantial period of time.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you. And maybe it is a matter of artistic license to move it out of the building again but it is the image we want to look at. It is not all the window dressing around it.

So, Mike.

Member Olson: I echo Gary's comments. I do want to ask a question. I guess I don't want to assume this but did we send anybody up there to this memorial to take a look at it in person or did we get the pictures?

Mr. Harrigal: We did not, no.

Member Olson: The question I have here, I am totally against the fact that we'd have the two other nations' flags on there. Obviously they are good allies of ours, but we did win the battle. And the question I have, I believe it is customary for the

American flag to fly higher than flags of any other nation, if it is displayed on a U.S. property. And here we see it on par with the other two nations. I am totally in disagreement with that.

Mr. Weinman: As a point of clarification, this is actually the way the statute reads as to how flags of other countries should be displayed.

Member Olson: What is?

Mr. Weinman: Actually they are at the same level, equal height. It is in the statute. That is the protocol. It is portrayed in accordance with the proper protocol.

Member Olson: Okay. But given that fact, I still think we should be honoring the American hero and as Gary has stated, there is really only one that does that. I don't have as big a problem with the framing around it. I think that that does provide some unique perspective, which we have been asking for. You are in that enclosure and you are looking out and you can see the monument behind it. I guess I don't really have a real big problem with that design. Out of the three that were given, that would be the one that would be getting my support. That's it.

Chair Marks: Before we move on to Michael Bugeja, maybe I missed it but what selection did the CFA make?

Mr. Harrigal: They made no selection on this one.

Chair Marks: No selection.

Mr. Harrigal: Correct.

Chair Marks: That's why I didn't hear one.

Mr. Harrigal: I'm sorry. I should have mentioned that, Gary.

Member Bugeja: Just to correct the record, England is an ally and friend of us by default of two wars. I

speaking as a French Maltese person, just to clarify that record. And also that Canada still has the Queen's image and we don't.

Okay, I cannot approve of two and three as Gary has stated and for all those reasons. I think number one has the problem of the window bars. You reduce that to a quarter size and it could almost get a 3-D effect of those bars being a prison.

The thing about this is when you take a look at the monument, which is so tall and so distinct, we are dealing again with orientation. If the goal was to show the height of the monument, then number three has a little bit of that orientation in it. We talked about sensory data -- I talked about sensory data the last time. We always see movement when we see a flag. When we see a tree, it is always static. And wind also is one of those sensory data that can be incorporated in a coin. But, again, because two and three have issues, I am going to not recommend those.

If you eliminated the indoor aspect of number one, there is still an orientation problem with the statue being so much more in focus and in height than the monument. I think I am going to leave my comments there, rather than be too critical. I understand the situation of this particular scene.

There is, however, I think in the battle, Perry's ship, his flagship, sinks, if I am not mistaken, and then rather than lower his colors, which would be the flag, he got into a boat and went to another ship and defeated the British. Am I right on this history, anyone? I think he got into a rowboat. I mean, he is really heroic. In many ways, I would like to see that heroism displayed.

Again, Canada and England are our allies by default. We fought them. This was a battle that we won against them. It wasn't World War II over London. And if we want to depict history on the coin, we need to do it accurately.

Chair Marks: Erik.

Member Jansen: I completely lost the sensitivity on the flags. So, Gary, thank you for correcting my deficiency there.

So if I look at one, two comments here. First of all, I am going to defer to my expert on being a sculptor, and that is Heidi, having a discussion perhaps with the Mint on how to manage the depth and so forth here.

I look at how this particular design coins up in the lower right-hand corner, and I am less concerned about the tower disappearing than I am the bars turning into some kind of a jail or what the heck are those.

And so my second point would be really a question, Gary and the Mint, is it kosher to go back to the artist and say, well, we like the concept, but we don't like the windows?

Chair Marks: Just as a matter of practice from the past, the committee has approved motions following our tallies where we take our selected or our recommended design and we might make a motion to recommend some sort of change to it.

Beyond that, it is really up to the Mint whether or not they follow through on that. But I would suggest in this case being three images and at least in my opinion only one we consider that if number one is chosen, that we will -- in fact, lacking any other motion, I will make a motion as chair to recommend some change to number one.

Member Jansen: I think not that it is our job to handle the relationship between the Mint or the CFA or whether it is even appropriate for us to discuss the issue, I do think it is important that we try to raise the utility of this committee to the Mint and to the Secretary of the Treasury as high as possible. And in that sense, give them some direction here. And if that direction includes a subjective motion

that you just described, Gary, I would encourage everyone on this committee to support design number three on that basis.

Chair Marks: Three?

Member Jansen: I'm sorry. Design number one.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you.

Member Jansen: Just seeing if you are with me.

Chair Marks: We will circle over to Heidi.

Member Wastweet: Obviously we have no interest in two or three so I won't even talk about those.

And on design number one, before we, again, miss the forest for the trees, I would like to pull back and remind us that we are working on a series called America the Beautiful, talking about national parks. And this coin here looks to me like an historic battle coin. I don't understand. And maybe we can get an answer of why it says Perry's Victory instead of Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial.

Mr. Harrigal: Basically we have to -- we only have so much space to put on the coin. We do an abbreviated description of what the park is on the top. So we really can't put the whole inscription on it.

Member Wastweet: It seems like there is enough space that we could fit this in somehow. Because just to simply say Perry's victory is going to be very confusing to the public. Unless you are in that region and you know of this park, then it will make sense, but a lot of America is not familiar with this park. It is not part of the everyday language like Yellowstone Park may be. And part of the purpose of this program is to educate the public on our rich land system. And I don't think this coin does that at all.

So before we start talking about taking out windows and the height of the monument and the statue, I

think we are missing the mark altogether. I would recommend rejecting all as in alignment with the CFA.

Chair Marks: Okay, we will move to Mr. Moran.

Member Moran: Well I think the engraving staff is taking a lot of heat. At the same time, I have been to Put-in-Bay. There is not a lot there. And when you look at it from that perspective, you did as well as you could.

I for one agree about the flag comments, particularly number two. It is in your face.

I will say some positive things about number three. I think that the artist, the designer, engraver there, did finesse the issue of the flags in that the American flag is out front. The others are not as recognizable. And the perspective he gave the whole affair there is good in that the American flag appears above the others, even though we know it is not. And in that regard -- and it's simple. It really meets a lot of the criteria other than the fact that I think we are all going to come down to the point of foreign flags on our coins don't get it.

Number one, it is a mess. Again, we can't do that. You can't put the windowpanes in there. It is going to look like a prison cell. If you take the windowpanes out, you have another issue there. And that is, you have got the memorial in the background and you give it the same relief as you do Perry, they are going to conflict with each other.

The way you fix that, and I don't know if the Mint is willing to do that, is you put Perry in high relief and you put the memorial in the lower relief in the background and it clearly won't conflict and it will balance out. But short of that, number one doesn't work either.

Chair Marks: Okay. Heidi, can you tutor us a little bit on that comment about relief? Would that work?

Member Wastweet: Yes. And I realize that my comments didn't offer any positive criticism as far as a solution, so let's talk about that for a minute.

The quarter is extremely shallow. The only way that we could accommodate Mike's suggestion of low relief/high relief is if the monument were simply a silhouette, and that is possible.

If you take away the windows alone, the composition isn't going to work the same. So just by us asking to take out the windows I think is not enough to make this design work. If they want to go back to the drawing board and rearrange the elements and consider doing a silhouette of the monument in the background, it could work. But I don't think it is enough for us to just say take out the structure.

Chair Marks: I will offer that if I end up making the motion, it is just going to be isolate the sculpture. But we will have that discussion here in just a moment.

Member Wastweet: Yes. And actually on number two, number two could work if we just took out the flags. The water was really an important part of the battle and of the park. It is a key element. So it is nice that number two shows the water, as well as the landmark monument. So that is another option.

Mr. Everhart: Can I make a comment?

Chair Marks: Yes, please.

Mr. Everhart: On number one, if we do take out the windows, the relationship between the monument and the sculpture would have to change. You would have a lot of negative space on the left, which I think you would have to shift the position of the monument.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Wastweet: I agree.

Mr. Everhart: And I do think that we can show a difference in the relief, not only with the height of relief, but with the amount of detail that is put into it. So I think we can show that there is a spatial relationship on one.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you. That is helpful. Thank you.

Member Jansen: Gary?

Chair Marks: Well, let's let -- hold your thought just for a minute. I want to get Don on the record here. So, Don, go ahead.

Member Scarinci: You know, Heidi, I think you didn't have much positive to say about these designs because there isn't anything positive that could be said about these designs. So let's just establish that you need to -- you blew it on this one. And, you know, you can only now try to resurrect it by doing something with one of these designs, and design one seems to have the most support, including mine that you could do something with.

So, you know, with some motion, you know, I will give number one a one as a vote. You know, but I don't want that to be misinterpreted as any acceptance that these are the kinds of designs that we really want to see. As far as I am concerned, this kind of -- this is part of the United States Mint's past. And it is part of the United States Mint's pre-January 8, 2010 past -- 2011 past. Okay?

So I hope we don't really have to do much more of this and see much more of this. And I am hopeful that, you know, we'll soon not and we will soon see more creative things.

The concept of only giving us three designs, that is also part of the United States Mint's pre-January 8, 2011 past. All right? For us to look at three designs and for the CFA to look at three designs and pick one among three where two of them are just

variations on a theme is insulting. That has been said before. That has been said when we had the Medal of Honor coin designs where we were presented with relief versions and said okay here, we have to decide. Well we are not deciding anything. So here, we are not really deciding anything.

But be that as it may, you know, let's just move forward and do things better, and let's just acknowledge and just accept that this is not the kind of thing that we want to see. This is definitely not -- there is nothing artistic here. And if any constituent group thinks that this is good, they obviously think this is good because they are only shown bad things. You know, because nobody could think any of these designs are good. All right? I mean, nobody, unless they are only shown bad things.

So I think that the other thing that I would want to -- I just want to state my position on flags, I don't have a problem with flags. The world is flat. This is 2011. America is in a new position in the world, a different position in the world. I have no problem depicting the flags of other nations, the brotherhood of nations, and working -- anything that indicates that we as a nation are acknowledging that we are living in a world community. I see nothing wrong with that in 2011.

So you know, just to put that on the record. So I wouldn't want to not see other flags. No problem. I agree with Congress, obviously. You know, Congress said that. Thank you for clarifying that, Greg.

So the only thing, you know, I mean I guess procedurally, Mr. Chairman, you know, the only question would be how do you want to craft it so that at least we could give, if there is a consensus on it, at least we could give coin number one some vote today. Because as it is, you can't vote for the guy behind bars, you know, the guy in front of the

bars. This is just horrific. So how do we make it so that we can make some lemonade out of this?

Chair Marks: I would suggest we go ahead with our traditional scoring and then after we see what the result of that is, then we can make some consensus decisions about where we go from there.

Member Scarinci: Okay. And just please, in the future, you know, let's -- bad taste, keep it from us, please.

Chair Marks: Okay. With that, I will ask the members to tally their scores on their sheets. And I will just note --

Member Moran: Gary, can I interrupt you for a second?

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Moran: Are we discarding Heidi's suggestion to just drop the flag concept on number two totally? It is mediocre. I understand that.

Member Jansen: Yes, that was the comment I was going to make was just to elevate Heidi's thought -- and put her before every time, will you? That way it is much easier for me. Elevate Heidi's thought of taking design number two and with removing the flags you have, I think, a self-balancing design which could suffice.

Now we could be criticized for just republishing, is it the Maine State Quarter that has got a lighthouse on a point, if my visual memory serves me well. Because Perry's Victory, I don't know, it must be a lighthouse.

Chair Marks: Yes, there is a lot of worms in that can. When you take the flags away, what are you left with?

Member Jansen: I am trying to salvage here.

Chair Marks: Let your imagination wander on that

one for a moment.

Member Bugeja: I do have a comment along that line, too, based on number two. I am not advocating number two, but that is a perfect example of taking a look at the medium from an artist's viewpoint. It is straight-on. What would be the orientation to lower our view and look up at that monument and still get a glimpse of the water? A photographer, for instance, would not take that straight-on view, would probably bend down and get the water and the monument.

And also there is something neat about the proof design on these quarters. Proof can actually turn a daytime scene into a nighttime scene. And to understand the medium and how it affects traditional art is, I think, my obligation as coming from a coin perspective. Michael Olson just passed a picture of parks at night with lighting. You can effect that with a proof because the proof would show the sky at night.

So I just wanted to make those comments, not that I am advocating for number two, but without the flags, it would be an interesting proof design.

Chair Marks: Okay. With that, we really need to move on. Given the schedule we have put together here, we have three more quarters to go through. If we spend ten minutes a piece on those and knowing we are going to have to have some substantial discussion at the end, maybe 20 minutes, that is what we are under if we want to stay on schedule, and we have got two other programs to look at.

So I am going to ask us, as I have done in the past for these next three quarters, I want a good discussion but I am going to ask us not to be duplicative of each other and to just be concise in your comments. Otherwise, we are going to get way behind the day.

So with that, I am going to go ahead and recognize Ron to present the images for the next quarter.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay, thank you, Gary. The next quarter is Great Basin National Park. First established as a national site in 1922, Great Basin National Park is located entirely in Nevada. However, the Park takes its name from the Great Basin, which stretches from California's Sierra Nevada Range on the west to the Wasatch Mountains of Utah in the east. From the sage brush at its base to its 13,063-foot summit of Wheeler Peak, the Park includes streams, lakes, alpine plants, abundant wildlife, and a variety of forest types, including groves of ancient bristlecone pines and numerous limestone caverns, including the beautiful Lehman Caverns. The Park also lays claim to one of the best views of the nighttime sky in the country.

So I will move on to the designs. Design one depicts the beauty of the unique qualities of the single bristlecone pine tree. It shows the rocky glacial moraines, which a tree grows on. These trees grow at an 11,000-foot elevation in the Park. According to the National Park Service, bristlecone pines are true masters of longevity. They endure not centuries but millennia.

The bristlecone pine found on Wheeler Peak was determined to be the world's oldest tree, 4,950 years of age. And the only other Park that has this exact species can be found in Bryce Canyon National Park in Utah.

Design two depicts the features of the bristlecone pine framing Wheeler Peak cirque carved by glaciers. The image of the cirque is unique and iconic, visible to visitors from many perspectives. Wheeler Peak stands at 13,063 feet.

Design three, the design features the bristlecone pine, its unique trunk system, and the Wheeler Peak cirque, represented here with more panoramic views of the mountain peaks.

And design four, the design represents the reintroduction of the bighorn sheep to the Great

Basin National Park. It is one of the largest mammals present in the area. It features the bristlecone pine tree as well. Both are found at higher elevations in the Park. The bighorn sheep was reintroduced to the Park in 1979 and 1980.

So we have the four candidates for Great Basin national Park.

Chair Marks: Okay. Quickly, do we have any technical questions?

Member Olson: I have one. On number one, is that the exact tree, the 4,000-year-old tree?

Mr. Harrigal: It is not. It is a representative tree.

Chair Marks: Okay. With that, I am going to go ahead and start with Don this time. Don?

Member Scarinci: Among the four designs, and I wish there were more than four designs, but among the four designs, I am inclined to support design number two, simply because I think you are at least close to doing something somewhat artistic. And you know, having the tree blend in with the texture of the rock and circle the edge of the coin is I think you are at least in the right church with something that might be competitive with other coins of the world that really are artistic. So you know, number two gets the most honorable mention.

Number four, I just can't even comment on it. I mean, it is just comical. I can't even believe you sent it to us. But I really can't even have any good criticism about it because it is something that you would see in grammar school.

Anyway, in the interest of time that says enough. Four designs bad. Four designs. I don't want to see four designs. You are not paying for us to come here to see three designs and four designs. That is the past.

Mr. Harrigal: Gary I would like to make one

interjection here.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Mr. Harrigal: The CFA did recommend design one on this series.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you. Understood.

Michael Moran.

Member Moran: I disagree with Don in a couple of respects, but only a couple.

First of all on number one, that reminds me of a Birger Sandzen, and I hope I pronounced that right, woodblock. I think it will coin well. I think it will look good. It is simple. It conveys the message of the Great Basin.

From there, it goes downhill for me in that they're not -- particularly number two is not distinct enough to recognize. Number three is too busy. And number four I do have a problem with they reintroduced sheep there. They call them park pets out west and I just can't get past that, personally.

So my vote is number one.

Chair Marks: Heidi?

Member Wastweet: Of all the designs we are looking at today, I think number one in this group is my favorite of all the ones that we are looking at. I like this design very much. It has a lot going for it that we have been asking for. It is simple. It has focus. It has texture. It has interesting negative spaces that are going to look great on the polished proofers and on the business strike.

I cautious the sculptures to organize the greenery so that it doesn't become just a mass of abstract texture as it is drawn and the sculptors could fix that under the guidance of our trusty Don Everhart. I like this design very much.

Number two, I feel looks like a frame without a picture. There is nothing in the middle. There is no focus. It looks like there should be something in the middle.

And, Ron, what would you feel about this as far as metal flow? Would you get ghosting in the middle there?

Mr. Harrigal: Typically that is where it would show up if it did. And we would have to, we would definitely have to adjust the relief in the Basin on this one in particular.

Member Wastweet: So it would cause some technical concerns, possibly.

Mr. Harrigal: There is higher risk of it on this coin than others, definitely.

When you look at coins like on the Wright Brothers or if you look at the Jamestown coins that we did in the past, where you have space like that, it almost looks like a silhouette of a sun. Sometimes it shows up in there. But it is basically the center of metal flow and you do get a texture difference sometimes there.

Member Wastweet: Thank you.

Number three, I could go with this one if it were sculpted correctly. What we are seeing in some of the quarters that are coming out is too much texture between the background and the foreground and it all blends together. This is drawn nicely so that the background is softer. While it has some merit, I am still preferencing number one.

Number four, this looks like just cut and pasted together. I can't get behind this one. I'm going to stick with number one as my preference. Thank you.

Chair Marks: Okay, we'll go down to Erik.

Member Jansen: I would agree and go with number

one. Each of the other three kind of coins up as a viny thing from nine o'clock around to six o'clock or more.

And I would be fearful on number three that the foliage actually ends up looking more like a Monterey cypress than a bristlecone pine. I am a West Coaster so I guess I am familiar with that.

And number three is just too busy, I think. So I will echo Heidi's thoughts and go with number one exclusively.

Chair Marks: Okay. Michael?

Member Bugeja: I like number one as well. There is a perfect example of in proof the difference between the mint state and the proof state. The mint state would be daytime and the proof state would be nighttime. And that is just really lovely. I love the cropping of number one. I think that is very good.

I do want to make some brief comments on the other three. While -- I mean I like the texture, the three different types of texture you have in number two. Now remember that texture is touch and that hobbyists touch coins and feel them and like them and you have three different types of textures with the leafs, the trunk, and the mountain.

I am not saying I like that. I like number one far more than I like number two, but that has some things to speak about it.

I think the background conflicts with the foreground in number three. And the vine at first blush when I looked at it, almost comes off as a bird on the bottom if you take a look at it.

Now I want to say something about number four. It is cut and paste, but from an artistic vantage point, there is a conceit between the ram's horns and the trees' gnarling shapes. And I think that if we didn't have the cut and paste type of design here, something really interest could have been done with

the horn and that limb.

Okay, those are my comments.

Chair Marks: Michael Olson.

Member Olson: Real brief here.

Number one I thought was very appealing. It is a very unique looking tree. I think it would work well in proof. It is not a cluttered design. In the foreground there, it has got some random stones. That plant or tree is pretty much specific to that area, so I think it is a good representation.

Two, the fact that it looks like a frame with nothing in the middle is just not that appealing to me. Three is too cluttered. And number four is just a version of two with a clipart sheet inserted.

So I will be giving three points to number one. I think it is a very nice design.

Chair Marks: Okay, I think first what I want to say is that as we make our comments today, and some of them are a little on the harsh side, I want the artists to know, the engravers to know, that I understand that a lot of what you produce, you are pretty much directed what to produce. And so as we look at these images today, I really hope that some of the harshness isn't taken too personally because you are part of a process that has generated these designs and oftentimes you are just following direction. And we know that there is a design and a plan to change that process and in fact, it is underway as far as implementation goes. So I don't want our comments to be taken as a direct offense at the artist. They are part of the process that produced this.

And from the point of view of rendering the objects they have rendered, they have done a wonderful job. Okay? It is about composition. It is about the specific themes that they are given to work with. It is about not being able to visit sites and really take

in the environment and with the sensitivity of an artist then to be able to interpret that back in a design. That doesn't happen right now. And that is not the fault of the artists. Okay?

So I just want that to be on the record that we have got a great group of very artistic, very talented folks that work for the U.S. Mint. And I believe that as the process changes, they are going to have more

liberty, more freedom to express artistically the kinds of things that we are looking for.

So with that, I am only going to make one comment because I really don't know what, if anything, that I will support. I happen to really love the bighorn sheep. When I lived up near Glacier National Park, I was privileged to be able to see this majestic animal many, many times. They would walk right by you. It is just a wonderful, unique animal. I wished that we would have been given an image that would truly incorporate the bighorn sheep as a focal image in one of these designs with maybe a suggestion of gnarled wood. I think that would have been a huge winner. We don't have that here.

And here again, I would hope that as we move forward in this process to redesign the process that our recommendation that the committee's initial suggestions about themes and narratives might be taken to heart and actually implemented as part of these reforms that we are going through so that we are taking ownership of these designs initially so we are part of the result when we get to the end.

It is not to micromanage by committee, and I have heard that come back to me that that might be what we are trying to do here. It is not. It is about getting us to take ownership so when we are at this point, if there is criticisms, we are criticizing ourselves.

So anyway, time is slipping away from us. So at this point, I will just ask the members again to fill in your sheets for the Great Basin National Park, and I

will look to Ron to present the next series.

Mr. Harrigal: Thank you, Gary. Let me get to my correct page.

Okay, the next series is Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine. Established as a national site in 1925, Fort McHenry is a star-shaped fort best known for its role in the War of 1812. It was during the bombardment of the Fort that Francis Scott Key was inspired to write the Star Spangled Banner, the poem that would eventually become the national anthem of the United States.

The Fort was named after James McHenry, a Scots-Irish immigrant, and surgeon soldier who became Secretary of War under President Washington.

All designs are based on modern reenactments. Design one depicts fife and drums being played below the Fort's ramparts as the Star Spangled Banner waves overhead.

Design two, the design depicts a soldier standing watch in front of a six-pounder field gun as the Star Spangled Banner waves overhead.

Design three, in this design fifes and drums play the national anthem as Star Spangled Banner waves overhead. And design four, in this design troops march out of the fort as the Star Spangled Banner waves overhead.

So we have four candidates to present to the committee for consideration.

Chair Marks: Okay. Any questions?

Mr. Harrigal: Oh, may I also add, Gary, that the CFA did not make a recommendation on this one.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you, Ron. Any technical questions?

Okay, again I am going to ask us to be as brief as possible, but please give us your opinions. If

someone else has stated your point of view on a particular item, I am going to ask you to kind of just go with the thought that your colleague offered, but if you have something new to suggest, please put that on the record.

With that, let's just start with Michael Bugeja. Are you ready to start?

Member Bugeja: Yes, I am.

Chair Marks: And then we will move to Erik and then rotate back.

Member Bugeja: Again, my initial comments earlier about the canvas of a quarter when depicting a scene might be appropriate here. So I won't speak about that again.

Number one has a few elements that conflict with each other. I worry about the two figures melding with their hats too closely to the background and maybe that getting lost on a smaller canvas.

Number two has those elements better defined. There is some more balance in there.

I love the orientation of number three, where you have the musicians coming out of the coin. I think that is very appropriate. I worry about the focal point being in the middle where there is a platform and there is an entrance. That focal point right there is a little too busy for me. Maybe that can be fixed.

On number four, again some of the previous comments apply. We have good orientation again with the musicians coming out of a coin. I wondered whether we needed the fourth musician closest to the E Pluribus Unum and whether we could shift those and change the orientation slightly to get the figures a little bit larger with the effect of coming out of that coin.

Chair Marks: Okay, Erik?

Mr. Weinman: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a quick

point of clarification, only because it has come up before regarding the size of the quarter? The program also calls for a three-inch silver version. And that hasn't come up in conversation so I wanted to make sure that was on the table.

Chair Marks: That is very true. Thank you.

Member Jansen: I don't think a three-inch version of these is going to present a major problem. It is just going to offer the detail that a smaller coin steals from you.

Let's see here. Number one I am going to end up recommending a bit out of default. The primary comment I want to make is echoing what -- maybe I can beat Heidi here. We have got another kind of soldier cannon fort quarter here. And in the theme of the program being beautiful America, maybe there is another way. I don't know. I have never been to Fort McHenry personally, although I am aware that it is a unique space or a unique shape, rather.

Item number two, the cannon is iconic of a fort. Fort, cannon, I get it. But it is kind of sad this guy is having to fight this one all alone. There are no other cannons lined up or anything. So that is what my head said is kind of a funny casting of a single cannon.

Number three, it looks to me like it was a drawing of a building that they dropped a couple of marching musicians on top of. When it is coined up, it feels like the action is somewhere off the edge of the coin. They cut off the top of the flagpole, which doesn't kill your eye, but it does kind of tend to make the story bleed off the edge again.

Number four, my comment, my note was is there an execution here today because you are leading with a guy with a sword drawn and it just -- I think it is an image that maybe is unfortunate because it doesn't convey necessarily the spirit and the happiness of the flag and Fort McHenry and what we

are trying to convey, at least along that theme line.

So I end up back at number one with something that works as a default and minor support for the second one because I think it has the icon on it of a fort.

Chair Marks: Okay with that, I am just going to mix this up. I am going to go to Michael Olson.

Member Olson: I have a question. Maybe it is for Kaarina. This site of this fort was the site of one of the most heroic defenses in American history at a very pivotal time in our nation's history. A lot of blood was spilled to keep that flag flying so Mr. Francis Scott Key was inspired to write his song, which is now our national anthem.

Why do we have four designs here that show soldiers marching around; three that show marching around playing music; and one guy looking off into the distance? Was there no thought to possibly depicting a scene of the defense of that flag or that fort?

Ms. Budow: There was. I don't know if any of this was discussed in the admin meeting this morning prior but there were actually some designs we tried showing unusual vistas of the walls of the fort, and we determined that they wouldn't execute. Also, the actual star fort of Fort McHenry is not unique. It dates back to I think the mid-15th century Italy. And also we took into consideration when these were being developed when we were doing the Star Spangled Banner commemorative coin, and there were some criticisms of the actual fort from an aerial view and the kind of snowflake ornaments-like quality to it. So we also took that into consideration.

But we really didn't direct the artists. We let them come up with what they thought were appropriate. We just gave them the images that the Park told us were most emblematic of the Park and the Park felt that these scenes were also very appropriate to

represent Fort McHenry.

Member Olson: But I guess the reason Fort McHenry is an icon for our nation is the battle that took place there. And I wasn't there, but I would venture a guess that while that battle was going on they weren't standing there playing music.

Ms. Budow: Well like I said, these are the images the Park felt were most appropriate to represent them. And like I said, we did try some other unusual perspectives, but we determined that they wouldn't execute. The artists really did try to stretch themselves on this particular project.

Member Olson: And I really don't have any problem with the art. All the pictures look fine. But I think for a fort of this magnitude and importance, I think there should have been more focus put on the fact that there was a very key battle to our nation's history and longevity that took place there --

Ms. Budow: Yes.

Member Olson: -- not people marching around playing music.

Ms. Budow: I think it is a good point. I think it goes back to, you know, you think it should be kind of an historical reenactment, should it be more present day.

When we were developing again the Star Spangled Banner, we knew that that coin would be Fort McHenry of 1814, Battle of Baltimore, and we thought the quarter for ATB would be more present-day. That was just our line of thinking.

Member Olson: Okay. And I guess --

Member Moran: Mike, could I reign you back in a little bit? It really was a British raiding party. They came in. They burned Washington and then they moved on up toward Baltimore, and they were going to try and do the same thing there. But there

wasn't a lot of blood spilled there. Basically the guys at the Fort hunkered down during the bombardment and waited because the British didn't have the firepower to go on and force the issue and go into the Harbor of Baltimore.

I really see Fort McHenry for two things, the flag and the Star Spangled Banner. It's as simple as that.

Member Olson: Well, my comments remain the same. There was a battle that took place there, and I can almost guarantee you they weren't playing music when that battle took place.

So all of these designs are very appealing. I'm sure that I will pick one that I will favor more than another, but at this point, I will listen to the rest of the comments and make that decision.

Chair Marks: I think I will start my comments by harkening back to a well-known design for all of us, and that is the Bicentennial Quarter with the drummer on it. And I think that was a very successful design and why, it was simplicity. And it had a drummer, just like we have some drummers on these. But all you had was the drummer and then the victory torch with some stars around it. Very simple. A very simple design. It had more relief than I think we are going to get on this one, which helps a lot, but I would have liked to have seen we are going to talk about the fife and the drummer, let's focus on a fife and a drummer and maybe throw the flag in there somehow.

This is a tough one. I mean, does that really illustrate Fort McHenry then? Maybe. Maybe not. Now I know that we had some criticisms about the shape of the Fort with the Star Spangled Banner program, but that was the Star Spangled Banner program. That wasn't a Fort McHenry program. Fort McHenry was an associated icon to the Star Spangled Banner theme. I think when we're focusing on a fort, it might have been nice to have a top-down image of a star, the star being an iconic

image in American iconology. Maybe that would be an image that would have added to simply having four. Maybe there could have been some creative way of illustrating the shape of the Fort. While it may be a common shape in the history of the world, I'm not sure how many of those types of forts we had here in our country.

So at that, I am just going to listen to the rest of you. I'm not quite sure what image to go with at this point. But I guess it just underlines the point that our new process needs to happen. Go ahead, Don.

Mr. Harrigal: I wanted to say one thing, Gary.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Mr. Harrigal: This is one site that the engravers did go to and take their own photography on, and they were inspired by the reenactments.

Chair Marks: Okay. But here again I am understanding that someone ruled out the shape of the fort just because of our discussion was on a totally different subject, the Star Spangled Banner.

Here we are talking about the fort, and now we can't see the fort. So it is just my point if maybe the committee could have had some ownership from the beginning to say you know, maybe my colleagues would disagree with me but we could have had that dialogue that we didn't have that maybe the shape of the fort had some significance to a design like this. Maybe, maybe not. But we never had that opportunity. There were just some themes developed internally and now we are to this point.

Mr. Harrigal: I can say that there were literally dozens of forts of this style in the U.S. I don't know exactly how many, but I mean, the shape itself is not unique to Fort McHenry.

Chair Marks: Well you know, there is a lot of muskets, too, that show up on --

Mr. Harrigal: Right.

Chair Marks: -- and a lot of colonial hats that show up on coins. And we don't decide that we aren't not going to show muskets or colonial hats. There are a lot of sailing ships. Lord, we have had lots of sailing ships on our coins.

Mr. Harrigal: Right.

Chair Marks: The idea that an image has shown up on our coins before, I don't know if that should preclude it. But anyway, I am getting a little far here.

Let's go ahead, Don.

Member Scarinci: This is great for step one, which is taking the artists out of their cubicles and letting them breath in the air and environment of the site that we are asking them to depict. But we are asking them to depict -- so this is a great -- so just getting them out of the office and getting them to the site is outstanding. But what we are asking them to do is to -- we are asking the artists to be artists. And you know, you are not going to see this, you are not going to see any of these designs at Pulse starting on Thursday in Miami. You are not going to see any of these designs at the Rack and Hamper Gallery opening next week in New York City. You are not going to see any of these designs at any FIDEM exhibition, you know, that is more recent than two decades ago. You are not going to see any of these designs getting nominated for coin of the year. You are getting a solid depiction of something. You know, you are getting a photograph in metal.

And you know, better to get the photograph in metal from the first-hand encounter with the site, than to get the photograph in metal from a real photograph that you are just copying onto metal.

So I encourage going to the site. And I really, really, really think that is important. You know, but

now we have got to go to the next step. And once the artist goes to the site, experiences the site, internalizes the site, we have got to let them be artists and we have got to come up with -- and we have got to give them time. And we have got to give them freedom. We have got to give them space. We have got to give them the connection to the muse to come up with art.

On these designs, I can pick any one of them. It does not really matter in my mind. We are picking between, you know, I am picking between a Kit-Kat and a Milky Way.

Member Jansen: Donald, I'm trying to practically envision an approach which lowers everybody's risk. Okay? Because I haven't seen all the FIDEM stuff. I hope to. But what I have seen and what I saw Heidi pull together is kind of quintessential good design, carries a lot of graphical interpretation, a lot of -- and the point here is to reduce risk. And I am wondering if there couldn't be a message sent out to the artists in residence or otherwise that consider as an artist, submit a design on two different paths. One would be what you view to be a convention of what you are asked for, a photograph in metal. And the second one to be, well, out there. And as a result, we don't end up with a committee that says, man, this is just really out there. And embarrass the whole process. That is what I am thinking, Gary, is how do we minimize risk and create opportunity at the same time.

Mr. Everhart: You know, let me and I do want to respond to that. You know, during our committee deliberations, we actually spent a lot of time on this, a lot of time on this discussion. And you know, the way you do that --

Look, these people are designing United States coins. And long after we are all dust, the artists whose initials are on these coins will be studied for a thousand years and remembered for a thousand years. They are immortalized in these designs, just

as we study ancient Greek artists in ancient Greek coins and coinage of other cultures.

So I understand the pressure and the excitement and the rush of having a United States coin designed -- you know, having your coin design become a United States coin. That has to be an amazing feeling to have that. And I think what we talked about during our committee discussions is, you know, don't penalize them. Don't penalize the artist. Give them two bites. Give them exactly what you just said. Give them two bites. Instead of telling them we may only pick one design, well, you know what, if one of the artists steps out there and produces art, let's see that. You know, but let's see that in addition to one of their other designs. Give them maybe the carrot to do art by saying if this is really of artistic merit, we are going to submit this but we are also going to submit the more conservative one. So if everybody turns up their nose and doesn't like it other than Scarinci, you know, you are still not out of the box.

So I think that is something in the way you restructure, as you restructure. And once you have an art director who is trained and who doesn't think Pulse is something that happens at a doctor's office, you know, once you have that, I think maybe we will start seeing -- maybe we will start taking this and go to level two, take it up a notch.

Anyway, thanks for that.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay. Moving to Michael Moran.

Mr. Everhart: You know, Don, I have done a lot of designs that I thought were out of the box and not normal looking and it seems like invariably they never made it to the finish. You know, they just whether the sponsor didn't like it or whomever, whether a committee didn't like it. They just never went anywhere. So I have kind of gotten away from doing that.

Member Scarinci: I know. I know. Don, Crocodile Rock is art. We can have that. And you can give that to us, but it has got to get -- you know, what we referred to in our report, it has got to get past the Mint censors and get to us somehow. And you know, and I think we are going to see that happen. I really am very, very hopeful that we are really going to see that happening. So that don't penalize the artist for submitting something that is out there. And let it get through. It has got to get through. We have got to see more designs.

Mr. Everhart: On the fort, I had a design which looked right down on the fort, because I thought it was unique. When it was reduced, it looked like a turtle. And I didn't think it was going to -- this wasn't going to work at that scale so I abandoned it and I just couldn't make anything work. I tried different views and everything but it just wasn't working.

Member Scarinci: Yes, it's tough and certain images don't lend themselves.

Mr. Everhart: And then we also have to design for two different scales. Like Greg said, the three-inch scale and the quarter. And I would assume that the quarter would get the priority, yet at the same time, you know, we're selling both of them.

Member Scarinci: Right. And maybe the day will come soon when there will be an annual art medal so that some of these designs that are on the shelves, and some of the things that we have seen when we visited the Mint in Philadelphia that the public just never sees, doesn't even know exist, some of the stuff are treasures. And maybe an annual art medal, an annual calendar medal of some sort the Mint will do so that some of these great designs that never see the light of day can see the light of day.

Mr. Everhart: The only problem is Congress would have to authorize that.

Member Scarinci: No. No, the Mint Director has the power to do medals. He has the independent power to do medals.

Member Moran: Are you ready for me, Gary?

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Yes, Michael, please.

Member Moran: I'm going to be brief. We have beaten this thing to death. I can live with one. I think that the engravers need to be careful to pop the soldiers out against that background. Otherwise, it doesn't work very well but it does have some balance. As I said before, when I think of Fort McHenry, I think of the flag and the national anthem and that's it, period.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Heidi.

Member Wastweet: I'm in agreement with a lot of what was already said, even though we have been told that these are reenactment soldiers, that is not apparent to anyone who gets this as pocket change out in the public. They are not going to have that Cliff Note.

I would get behind design number two if the soldier were taken out so that we have got the idea that this is a bit of a ghost town. The soldiers are gone. This is historic. I would have had the flag flying in the other direction to take up that base and balance that out.

So there are some things that could be done. Again, we shy away from doing art direction from this desk and this committee. I am frankly not a fan of any of these. I appreciate that this artists went to the site. I wish we could have seen some of those other experimental views. This is a difficult subject and I give them credit for that, but I am not excited about any of these.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, thank you, Heidi.

Please make your appropriate marks on your

scoring sheet. And at this point, we are going to move on to Mount Rushmore. Ron?

Mr. Harrigal: Okay, thank you, Gary.

Okay, Mount Rushmore. Established as a national site in 1925, Mount Rushmore, the Presidents' Mountain, is an iconic national memorial. The rock of Mount Rushmore consists of fine-grain granite rock and is one of the reasons the location was chosen for the memorial. It took 14 years to complete the work, starting on it in 1927.

Okay, basically I think we know what Mount Rushmore is all about. I am going to move on to the designs here.

Design one, this design depicts Mount Rushmore from an aerial perspective, and I also would like to note that we have done a lot of coins with Mount Rushmore on it before and they are pretty much of the traditional view from it. So something like this was considered a different perspective that we were looking at. And also the CFA was recommending design three, once we get there.

The design two, the design was inspired by the carving of Mount Rushmore. It shows men using pulleys to reach the areas which they are refining on President Jefferson's face.

Similarly on number three, this design was inspired by photos of men adding the final details to fine-tune Jefferson's face. And this design, the Black Hills are depicted in the lower left field.

Design four, this design depicts the model located in the sculptor's studio of Mount Rushmore. The model was created to depict the final Mount Rushmore design but insufficient funding forced the carving to end in October 1941. Originally the plan was to carve the figures from head to waist.

So we have four candidates to consider for Mount Rushmore.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay. Do we have any technical questions?

Member Wastweet: I do. On designs three and two, can you talk to us about the scale of the people to the sculpture? By my calculations, it looks like Mount Rushmore is about half its actual size here in comparison to the size of the people.

Mr. Everhart: I think it was felt that if you actually did the people at the real scale, they would look like ants. They would be so small, that you wouldn't even be able to figure out what they were at this scale.

Member Wastweet: Yes, I agree with that. I think they still look like ants.

Mr. Everhart: Artistic license was taken.

Member Wastweet: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: Heidi, I do have a picture here showing that scene. So I will share it with you.

Member Wastweet: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay. Are you done, Heidi? Any other questions?

Member Bugeja: I have a quick question. Mount Rushmore coins are going to depend a lot on relief. Will the relief be tested for contrast on some of these? For instance on number one we have what could be a busy background if you don't know the relief. But if the relief is where the faces come out of that design, I think that can be actually quite --

Mr. Everhart: I think that you can obtain that by using the technique of putting texture in, which would probably relate to the chisel marks on the faces and everything. You could set off that head in the front by, you know, really showing some texture on Washington's hair to the left of Jefferson's face.

Member Bugeja: Thank you, Don. That answers my

question. Thank you.

Mr. Everhart: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Any other questions? Okay, one of our traditions here is that any member can ask the chair to go first and in this case, Michael Olson has asked to go first. So I am going to start with him. Go ahead, Mike.

Member Olson: Thank you. I have been to Mount Rushmore twice. Once was a long time ago. And the second time happened to be this past summer. And there has been a lot of changes over that time. Major changes to the construction to the large and very nice visitors' center, which I passed a couple pictures around. I think the committee has seen them. I believe Don has them there.

I am going to be honest with you. I was pretty disappointed with these four choices -- actually three choices that we have because two of them are so similar.

Number one, design number one, it is a nice picture of Mount Rushmore. But my belief is Mount Rushmore is an iconic monument to our country and it is meant to be looked up at, not down on. I know there is a lot of aerial pictures of Mount Rushmore but when most folks go to see it, they are looking up. They are looking at four very important presidents in our country's history.

So number one doesn't really get it for me. Two and three, I know those are replications of pictures. I agree with Heidi's comments on the scale. I have got further issues with those. You know, we wouldn't probably do a Washington Monument coin with the monument half done. People are looking at a Mount Rushmore quarter, they probably would expect to see the entire monument, not a couple of faces with spider men hanging down in front of one of them. But I guess I hope that neither one of these is the one that is selected.

Number four happens to be in a building after you kind of go up and take a look at Mount Rushmore, there is a very nice visitor's center and there are several displays in there similar to this. But that is not Mount Rushmore. That is sitting inside a building under a roof. And further, it is not even what Mount Rushmore looks like. It is what it was going to look like if it would have been finished. But it wasn't and the portraits are what we have.

So I would be very disappointed if the design chosen to depict Mount Rushmore showed a plaster or whatever type of model that is sitting inside of a building.

I did bring a couple pictures from our family vacation, which I have passed around. There is an avenue of flags, a promenade, if you will, that leads up to the monument as you walk in with all of the state flags. And as you are walking up, you have a full view of Mount Rushmore. And I certainly am cognizant of the concerns that we didn't want to do a coin that has already been done two or three times, but this would have been an excellent opportunity to send some people out to take a few pictures, to take a look around. Maybe a view of Mount Rushmore looking down that avenue of flags, either at night or during the day. At night they light it up. There is a very nice nighttime display. And as Michael Bugeja indicated, it would have been a great opportunity for a proof coin, maybe a night view.

With that being said, the only design that is going to get any vote from me will be number one and it will be a one. I really wish we could have done something different with this coin.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Thank you, Mike.

I'm going to go next. I guess I have a question first. I'm assuming that the artists did not go to Rushmore.

Mr. Harrigal: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: Although some of the artists may have been there on vacation but nobody went specifically for this.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Sure. I was at Rushmore in early May and it was a beautiful blue sky day, the sun was out, and the mountain looked just spectacular. And when you go there, as Mike has described, there is this promenade of flags with the mountain in view and the four faces are very clear. It is the traditional look of Rushmore that as Americans we are all very familiar with.

And as you get past the promenade, there is a couple of layers of an observation deck, a very nice observation deck, and then there is kind of a theater thing where they do an evening program.

But had the artists had the chance to go here, they may have done what I did. And there is a trail that goes off to the left, a very nice trail, and it goes down and it takes you in closer to the mountain itself and the images. And as you approach from this left side, there are just some wonderful views of the sculptures but from a different perspective than we are used to. But you very much understand that it's Mount Rushmore. It just gives you that different look and you see all four faces.

And it is too bad. I think that if some of our artists had been there with this specific assignment, I think they would have gone down that trail. I think they probably would have seen those different perspectives, the perspective of a human being on the ground looking up at these things that any visitor can go and do.

I think it is important with this coin that we present our fellow Americans with an image of Mount Rushmore that they are familiar with. And because of that, two, three, and four are not images that they are going to be familiar with. Therefore, I don't think it really honors -- those do not honor

Rushmore for what it should be honored for, and that is to show it as is, as Americans are used to seeing it. I'm just suggesting it is too bad we couldn't have had one of those other perspectives that would have given us a new look at Rushmore, especially for those Americans who haven't been able to visit it.

So I am left with supporting number one because it is the view that most commonly is going to be understood by most Americans and I want as a nation for us to understand what that coin is. So I am going with number one.

Donald.

Mr. Weinman: Gary, first I'm glad that I wasn't one of the artists who had to take on this project because there is a certain intimidation and fear level. Number one, we have already done coins with Mount Rushmore. So been there, done that. Number one does take it from a perspective that we haven't done and gives you the common image that people are used to seeing.

And number two, and more important than the fact that a coin already exists, this is Gutzon Borglum's work, one of the greatest American artists. You know, for someone to go back and say, okay, now I have got to do something with Gutzon Borglum on a coin, or on another medal, or on another sculpture, I think that is always -- I would think that would be an intimidating thing to do.

So I applaud the creativity because Borglum -- you know, the creativity that the artists are showing here with two, three, and four is really about Gutzon Borglum, whose art was process. His art, his sculpture was process. And I like what they did. I mean, it's very cool what they did with two, three, and four. And, you know, I think here we have a situation where, yes, maybe two and three doesn't work on the size of the palette. You know, it might look cool on the three-incher.

But four, is not really all about just something that is locked up in a room somewhere. Four talks about the monument, talks about the park, talks about the sculptor and talks about process and method.

So I think, you know, tough assignment, tough project because of what this is. I kind of like depicting, I kind of liked using number four. And if, you know, just one person asks the question why is this Mount Rushmore and goes online to find the answer, they would learn a lot about a great American sculptor. They would learn a lot about an American icon and how it came to be.

So, I like number four. I am going to go with number four for this coin, for the whole educational aspect of what this series is about.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Michael.

Member Moran: I probably struggled with this one more than the others. I give the artists credit. They are out of the box on this with original thinking. They looked down on Rushmore. They take the original looks of the actual sculpting of the figures, and they look at what Borglum originally tried to do. But I think there are times when you don't need to be out of the box and this is one of them.

I struggle with number one as to how it will look on a coin because of all that background and, as Heidi would say, the texturing. I'm afraid the faces will get lost. I have seen Jefferson with that half face on the nickel. It didn't work.

I don't like any of them in that regard. I think we should have been more traditional.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay. Heidi.

Member Wastweet: I don't have a lot to add that hasn't already been said. Number one is straightforward. It is, like Michael said, it is a time when maybe being out of the box isn't necessary.

I certainly applaud two and three for trying to be more creative and give us a different angle. I really appreciate that. I don't think it is working. I don't think the scale is -- it doesn't work for me. The fact that Rushmore is so big is what it is all about. And even though the men are twice as big as they should be, they are still going to look like ants. It is not going to read well.

And two, three, and four all focus on the history of the site. In this series, I would like to focus on what the parks are today. If two and three were showing men cleaning it today, that might be more interesting to me than the people sculpting it in history. This isn't a history series. This is about resources that we have available to us today and the foresight that our country had in setting those aside for us.

So I am going to go with the straightforward number one.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, thank you, Heidi.

At this point, I am going to ask everyone to finish up their scoring sheets and pass those. I have asked Erik to be our tally man today, so he is going to tally these for us.

Michael, you had a comment?

Member Bugeja: I haven't gone yet.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Oh, you didn't?

Member Bugeja: No, I haven't gone yet. I started and then --

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Oh, I'm sorry. Let's go to Michael and then we will finish up with Erik.

Member Bugeja: I just want to make some brief comments. And, again, I am going to try to give a little bit of theory behind my comments and why I am making them.

Number one, I think Don has helped answer if we can get relief to show the contrasts or some other device. I think I can go with one. But again on orientation, what you are dealing with at Mount Rushmore is an icon that has been so prevalent in our memory that it has been satirized. And when you are dealing with an icon of that nature, it is always important to try to get another view. So I was asking, I couldn't quite remember, but I have not seen a Mount Rushmore where Lincoln is the focus, looking directly at Lincoln. I have always seen it from this frontal view. But when you go to these places, you sort of look for views that you haven't seen before. So, I mean, if we just turned that orientation around and looked at Lincoln, I think it would make people question why are we looking at Lincoln. Oh, that's a different image.

I don't know -- I know the term is appropriate both in art and in literature, my background is in literature, but minimalism in literature means if you can get rid of something and not have it change the image or the idea, what would those things be?

So when you take a look at two and three, you can get rid of, for instance, a couple of the figures, at least. When you go to three, you don't need the man on the scaffolding because we can understand that it's scaffolding. So a part of my problems with two and three, not only with scale which Heidi has articulated, but also with kind of a minimalist approach when you take a look at designs. What can you get rid of and still convey the same thing? I think it is an important consideration.

On number four, I think this was very interesting to me, but again I took Michael Olson's comments into consideration. It reminded me of the same issue that -- not issue, it's not an issue -- the same opportunity that existed with the ram and the gnarly tree horn. I used the word conceit. For those who don't know the literary meaning of it, it means taking two disparate objects that have actually nothing to do with each other and putting them

together so that similarities and sparks could fly. That ram's horn and that gnarly tree was such.

And when I looked at this, I wondered whether an artistic license would be how the sculpture should have been and how it actually is with that in the background. I'm not saying you can do that with number four, but the whole idea of thinking with some theory behind it I think can actually help not only enhance existing designs but also inform future ones.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Erik.

Member Jansen: At the risk of being moot as people may have already scored their sheets, I just want to stand up and absolutely thank the artists for two and three. Number three gets my full support. And I look at three as kind of, well, we did two, that was kind of the photograph rendered to medal, but there are a bunch of features that if changed make it more effective. I get to see Washington's left-facing profile in number three. I have fewer men dangling but I don't lose the effect. I have scaffolding in the background as opposed to the foreground. And I think, quite frankly, it makes a startling rendering with a large face just right looking at you. And in three inches silver, I think this particular piece of artwork would be stunning.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, thank you, Erik.

Okay, at this point I think I am accurate in asking you all to finish your sheets, pass those down to Erik.

We have got about 50 minutes before our scheduled -- oh no, I'm sorry. We have got about an hour and 15 minutes before our scheduled break for lunch. I think we have an opportunity here to finish two of our three programs before we get out to lunch. So but to do that, we are going to have to mix things up a little bit.

While Erik is putting the tally together for us, what I

want to ask us to do is go ahead and jump forward in the agenda and look at the platinum coins because there is only 11 of those images to process for us, as opposed to the First Spouse, which are 59 images. I don't think there is any way we are going to get through 59 images before lunch. But if we go through the 11 on the platinum, then we may even have time before lunch to circle back and have our discussion about these America the Beautiful Quarters and get that taken care of before we all break.

Are there any objections to that? I'm not hearing any. I think we are going to go in that way.

I'm going to ask the staff to go ahead and give us the presentation on the platinum and then go ahead and have our discussion on that. And then we will circle back, hopefully before lunch, and will be informed with the results of the America the Beautiful tally and maybe there will be -- and I believe there will be some motions to condition some of that.

So let's go ahead with that.

Member Scarinci: Gary, just a quick question.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Yes.

Member Scarinci: Are we going to order lunch?

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: My understanding lunch is on our own.

Member Scarinci: We are not doing lunch? Do you want to order it? Can we order it in and maybe --

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: My understanding was it was lunch on our own.

Member Scarinci: If we can order it in, I would rather not lose the time with each other and maybe -- well, we can pay for our own lunch.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, Greg will get the

answer for us. Meanwhile, Ron, can you run through the platinum for us?

#### Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2012 Platinum Program

Mr. Harrigal: Certainly. Okay, 2012 American Eagle Platinum Proof Coin Program. According to 31 U.S.C. 5112(k), the Secretary of the Treasury has the authority to mint and issue platinum bullion coins and proof platinum coins in accordance with such specifications, designs, varieties, qualities -- or excuse me, quantities, denominations, and inscriptions as the Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion, may prescribe from time to time.

The program began in 1997 depicting the Statute of Liberty on the obverse and the soaring eagle on the reverse. And that is the design we use on the bullion coin. On the proof coin, the proof platinum coin, the reverse changes from year to year.

In 2009, the United States Mint introduced a new six-year platinum proof coin series that explores the core concepts of American democracy by highlighting the Preamble of the United States Constitution. This program examines six principles of the Preamble beginning with "To Form a More Perfect Union" in 2009, followed by "To Establish Justice" in 2010, "To Ensure Domestic Tranquility" in 2011, and "To Provide a Common Defence" in 2012. In 2013 it would be "To Promote General Welfare" and in 2014 "To Secure the Blessings of Liberty to Ourselves and our Prosperity" -- or excuse me, "out Posterity."

The candidate reverse designs for this program have been inspired by narratives prepared by the Chief Justice of the United States for each principle. For the 2012 design candidates, the United States Mint sculptor-engravers were used to design the candidates and also we have some from the contracted Artistic Infusion Program artists.

The reverse designs in previous series have

featured eagles supporting the American Eagle brand to balance the goals of the brand identity and allow artistic freedom. And an American Eagle privy mark appears on the reverse of the design of the coin. The privy mark was originally used to identify the Mint or some aspects of the coin's production or origin. More recently, it has been used as a design for a marketing feature.

The obverse design since 1997 of the United States Mint Platinum Proof Coin has featured Lady Liberty on the obverse. Inscriptions on the obverse are Liberty, E Pluribus Unum, the year of minting, and In God We Trust.

Required inscriptions on the reverse are United States of America, 0.995 platinum, one hundred dollars and one ounce.

So one thing to note is on some of these designs you will see defense is spelled with a C which is how it is spelled in the Preamble and also justice's narrative.

Okay, here is a picture of the proof obverse and we will move on to the reverses.

Design one, Athena stands ready to defend, holding a spear in her left hand and a shield in her right hand. On the face of the shield is a fasces framed by a pair of eagle wings symbolizing defense in unity. Athena is the embodiment not only of the tools of war but also the wisdom and unity derived from shared principles of government.

Design two, Athena is holding a spear and shield and is seated between two male figures. On the left is the Executive Branch holding a sword, representing the role as commander of the military. On the right is Congress holding a copy of the Constitution, representing the power to declare war.

Design three, Liberty holds a sword in one hand and a liberty cap on the pole. She is flanked by a banner reading "Congress and Commander in Chief."

Design four, a vigilant minuteman from the Revolutionary War represents the protection and defense of the country during a time of the writing of the Constitution. The modern flag in the background represents the United States today.

Design five, figures representing the Executive Branch, right, and Legislative Branch, left, share the responsibility of holding up the shield of defense.

Design six are two linked shields representing the two branches of government responsible for our defense. The left shield, "Declare," shows a pen and scroll representing the congressional power to declare war. The right shield, "Defend," represents the Executive Branch and shows an eagle claw clutching 13 arrows, imagery that was drawn from the great shield. These two shields support the liberty cap.

Design number seven is a variation of number six with Liberty head and crest over the shield.

Design number eight, Liberty stands holding a sword and a shield at her side.

Design number nine, Liberty wearing a traditional cap stands at the ready with the American flag in her left hand and sword in her right.

Design number ten, an eagle clutching a bundle of arrows perched at the top of a shield encircled with a banner reading "The Common Defence."

And our final design is a variation of number ten.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, thank you, Ron.

Mr. Harrigal: And with this, I will turn it over to the committee.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, any questions for our staff?

Member Olson: I've got one.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Michael?

Member Olson: On number 11, was is the significance of the shape of that shield?

Mr. Harrigal: It is just a variation, in that when you look at number ten, it is a standard shape and very similar to what we used on the one cent. So just basically to give us a variation of a shield design.

Member Olson: Is there any historical use of that shape or significance to it?

Mr. Harrigal: I'll turn it over to Don. He might know. I don't know.

Mr. Everhart: It is just a decorative element.

Member Olson: Okay.

Member Moran: Mike, I think they used it on some of the patterned coins from about the 1850s. It never got adopted in anything.

Member Jansen: Yes, it looks almost like a two-center or something that might have shown up in the 1860s.

Member Moran: Yes, well, Longacre used it.

Member Jansen: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay.

Member Wastweet: CFA's preference?

Mr. Harrigal: I'm sorry. CFA liked number ten.

Member Wastweet: Did they have comments on why they liked ten over 11?

Mr. Harrigal: They did not. Typically, if you have been to the CFA meetings, one person typically would speak about what they like and what they don't like. Somebody makes a motion and they all agree or not. You know, there's not as much dialogue in-depth but it is not a debating or full

analysis like the CCAC.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: All right, with that we will launch into our -- Heidi, could you start us off on this?

Member Wastweet: Do you want to do the vote?

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: What's that?

Member Wastweet: Do you want to vote on which ones we talk about?

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Oh, yes, yes. Sorry.

Mr. Harrigal: I'd like to make one more thing -- and Greg has corrected me here. They did talk about the inscriptions, the one-ounce and the one hundred dollars, that they wanted us to move those to the outer -- not the outer rim but to make them more into the bottom inner text circle where it says .9995 platinum.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, understood.

All right. We have 11 designs here. It has been a practice of ours in the past with a number of designs for a given face that we go through an initial process where we identify those designs that we really want to talk about. If there is some designs in here that none of us are interested in, then we can save some time and focus on those that there are interest.

So Ron, as I go through this, can you bring up each image, starting with number one?

Mr. Harrigal: Certainly.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, so with number one, do we have interest in number one?

Member Scarinci: I want to say so, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, so we are going to keep number one. Interest in number two?

Member Scarinci: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Number three? Interest in number three? Okay, we will set number three aside.

Number four? I think there is.

Member Scarinci: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay. Number five? I will say yes.

Number six? Okay, we are setting six aside. How about seven? Okay, we will set that one aside.

Number eight?

Member Jansen: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Yes?

Member Jansen: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Number nine?

Member Jansen: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Ten? Interest in ten?

Member Olson: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: How about 11?

Member Jansen: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay, so there were three that we have kind of set aside. Number three, number six, and number seven. And we will proceed on the balance. And so I will ask -- since we have gone through this process, I will ask the committee to focus on those eight that we have identified interest in.

So with that, I am going to ask Heidi to start off our discussion.

Member Wastweet: Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: You laugh. You wish I hadn't.

Member Wastweet: On design number one, I think we are hitting the symbology correctly. This coin is about defense, not offense. I like having a shield involved as our symbol. So I like it in that regards. The composition is nice.

The only thing that I don't like about this design or any of these designs is they simply look 100 percent old fashioned. It is not just calling back to our history but living in our history and there is no elements at all in here that I see are pulling it into a contemporary zone.

The other designs in this series, while they had a classical foundation to them, there was some element in them that we liked that brought it into a contemporary realm and I am not seeing that in any of these designs.

And in that regard, I am rather disappointed in this group. I like that we have so many choices but all the choices are so similar that it's disappointing.

Design number one I would be fine with other than the fact that I have already stated.

Design number two, I think that even though there is a lot going on here, it could be achieved because of the depth and size of this coin. There is a little trouble with her left elbow being over the shoulder of the man behind her, that is a little challenge, and then having the staff in front of that. It's a sculptural challenge I think that our sculptors can navigate that okay.

I don't see the need for her to be sitting on this floating island. I don't understand that. I think that can be done away with. Not a fan of that.

On to number four. Again, too historical for my tastes. I appreciate that the flag in the background is supposed to be modern-looking but it really

doesn't come across that way. The overwhelming image here is an historic figure and it is more of an offense with the rifle, rather than a defense of the shield.

Number five, here again we have the shield which I like. There is the controversial spelling of the word defence. I understand that this is a historical spelling. Again, that's going to have to be explained to every person that owns one.

The 0.9995 at the bottom, I don't like the way it touches the shield. I don't like the way it is spread out. I think that should be better organized. The characters are again old fashioned but they are drawn well and the composition is nice.

Number eight, I think this Liberty is very unattractive. I don't like the spikes on her head. They look very heavy, where the iconography of our country and the Liberty with the rays coming off her head are supposed to, in my view, represent a radiant light coming from our idea of liberty. And these spikes look so heavy and, I'm sorry to say, punk rock and not in a good contemporary way.

I also am looking at the sprigs of olive branches at the bottom. They are just too small and insignificant. They look straggly. I don't like that.

The shield is down to the side so she is really not defending herself. She has given up defending up herself. She is holding the sword in a downward position which is not offensive or defensive. So I am not drawn to this design.

Number nine, compositionally, this has got some movement going to this. It is interesting composition, but I can't get past the fact that the flag is too long. It is out of proportion. She is not defending herself at all. She is waiving a flag and a sword. It doesn't say defense at all.

Designs 10 and 11, which are virtually the same, I think they are attractive. Again, we have the

controversial spelling of the word defense.

I like the second shield, the one on number 11 because it is a little different. And just for that reason alone I like that. The snake-necked eagle again looks very old fashioned. We see this in very old coins, not modern coins.

And that is all the comments I have.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay. Michael?

Member Wastweet: If I may, there is one thing I forgot.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Sure, please.

Member Moran: You can take my turn, if you want.

Member Wastweet: Oh, never mind. That was it.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Okay.

Member Moran: I really couldn't look at any of these without taking them in context with what is on the obverse being Lady Liberty. And as a result, I had some trouble with the allegorical figures as you go through these, the first one and the second one. And I will let it go as far as that goes on. Neither one of those would get my vote.

I think Heidi is right that the plinth down there is unnecessary. And I really think that the lettering for the one ounce, the fineness of the platinum and the one hundred dollars is immaterial to the coin. It is not going to be spent. It needs to be put in as small lettering as you can get by with and still not have it be too small.

Number four is reasonable. I do like it. I think it is understandable and if these were the minutemen and it was for defense not offense. So you don't have the field cluttered up with having that explained. Again, I think the valuations down there are too big.

Number five looks like Broom-Hilda on the left. But in terms of -- and I am going to take it -- I think you can take that one ounce and the one hundred dollars if the committee decides on that one, it all needs to be put down there in that bottom half-moon if you want to call it and get it out of the field and make the lettering fit. It is an example of where lettering gets in the way of the design and clutters it.

The next one is number eight. I can't get -- I leaned over to Heidi when I saw this -- and Broom-Hilda. It just doesn't get it done for me. It is way too heavy.

The next one, that one reminds me -- there is a vignette on the old French, I think it was the ten franc bill, very close to that. And Heidi's comment about the flag is correct. While it does impart motion, it takes way too much to get it done. I can't go there.

Ten and 11 really need to be considered together. They are both the same with the exception of the shield. The shield is unique on number 11 and I like it there. I don't like that empty space on number ten. Again, I think that the lettering and valuation of the coin, the necessary evils there, need to be compacted and put down at the bottom in much smaller print in a semi- half-moon-like affair.

And I think it also is consistent with the Liberty on the front, although it is not consistent with what has gone before with the platinum series. But probably my vote is for number 11.

CHAIRPERSON MARKS: Donald.

Member Scarinci: You know, Mike, it is tough to go -  
- they always put the new guy after Heidi.

Member Moran: A rite of initiation.

Member Scarinci: So, you just have to struggle through until the next new guy. Then they go next to Heidi.

Member Moran: I like sitting next to her.

(Laughter.)

Member Scarinci: I think, first of all, you know, a point I want to make with these designs, we are so close in design one and design nine. We are so close to depicting Liberty in a new and modern way. And you know, without all the old stuff, without the shield and the design from the past and the fasces, that may mean something to an academic and a scholar but I have said this before when we have talked about the shield design on the penny. You know, ask any kid in school and that doesn't have any emotional value today.

I mean, that is an image from a different time and a different place, and a different mind. And the new images, you know, the post-internet age, you know, where kids are growing up and where kids are seeing Liberty in new ways post-9/11 and seeing the defense of our country with eyes that we didn't see. And I say we as one of the older guys. You know, one of the older people.

The post-9/11 era has a different view of the defense of our nation. And coming up with it artistically is really your challenge. And you know, I think the person who does that, the person who does that will come up with the next Adolph Weinman design. A brilliant design for a new era. And that is the one thing that we have been talking about again and again. Let's depict -- let's figure out how we depict liberty in a new and modern contemporary way.

Anyway, I like these two images because at least I think we are moving in the right direction without the crown, without the shield, without the other trappings of the 19th Century. So I think we should keep going in that direction.

As a side, number eight, ever since I moved to Greenwich Village, I mean, without the sword, that looks perfectly normal to me. You see that every

day.

(Laughter.)

Member Scarinci: So -- but anyway, more seriously, I favor number four. I don't care for the shield designs. I actually collect this series, by the way. I disclosed that. It is one of my favorite series because I think the designs have been just really great on this series. And to me, you know, to my eye, these shields and things, you know, there is no point. Why are we doing this on a platinum coin? It is a collector coin. You know, so why are we doing it? In the approved version of it, which is where these coins will appear, they are all collector coins. They are not even bullion coins. They are bullion, but you know what I mean.

So I kind of like number four, and if John were here, you know, I could hear John saying to us, no, that is not an offensive position because the formation of our nation was a defensive action. And therefore, this is a defensive action, not an offensive action. I can hear John saying that as if he were sitting in the room.

So, you know, artistically I like the way the flag wraps. I think that playing with the flag that way I think is really neat. I like the space. I like the space and the openness opposite the flag. I like the juxtaposition of the lines that are there on the gun and on the flag.

So, you know, to my eye, number four does the trick with the theme of defense of our nation, without having to resort to 19th century imagery which -- anyway, enough said about it.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Donald.

Whenever we get into this kind of classical imaging, I struggle with my split personality when it comes to American numismatic art. There is a part of me that just loves the old allegorical, mythological portrayals and the symmetry and the artistry, just

the grand nature of what those images, how they impact me.

On the other hand, the other part of me wants to still stay with that kind of iconology but I would like to see it interpreted in a modern way. And probably the best example -- not probably. The best example of that is the 9/11 medal, where we have this new and interesting portrayal of Liberty holding the flame of remembrance. It is just beautiful. It sets it in our time. It is set off to the side, rather than perfect symmetry. There is a lot of interest in that. And then the portrayal, the symbolic portrayal of the Twin Towers and such, it is just a wonderful example of what I am talking about when I talk about the modern portrayal of Liberty and other figures that are common to us in American coinage.

So there is a few hints of modernism in what we have been given here but I am kind of falling back on my classical tradition here. You are all familiar with the term comfort food. To me this is comfort art and so I am going to kind of talk from that point of view.

The image of Athena on number one, while it is classical, I do see a hint of some modernism here. She is not exactly symmetrical on the palette and such. And it is interesting with the shield and so forth. So I like that image.

And I will back up here and just thank you artists for creating these images. This is wonderful stuff.

Number two, I really love this image. The image of Athena surrounded by the Executive and the Legislative. I even like the images that the Executive and the Legislative are casting at each other. You know, there is tension. There is tension in that relationship and we have all heard it. You know, the President shouldn't have gone and sent troops to here or there. You know, that is what the refrain of Congress is and the refrain back from the Executive is, you know, I am the Commander in Chief. I am supposed to defend the nation.

So this tells a story. Now true it is presented in a very classical way. This could have been produced in 1850 but I love this design and I will be supporting it.

Number four is interesting. With the flag in back and such, it suggests a modern application here. I guess my concern with this is that it isolates the idea of defense to the colonial period, whereas some of these other images are time enduring. I mean, it doesn't matter what time you are in, the iconology or the symbolism it portrays Athena or the Executive or the Legislative, what have you, those aren't necessarily isolated in a certain time.

So while I find some appeal in number four, I am concerned about isolating our message to a colonial period.

Five, I like five. I am trying to decide if the C in "defence" is really an issue. Part of me says this is a chance to educate, maybe get people to actually read the constitution. The other side of me knows that there will be people who look at this and because they are uneducated will scoff at it.

Member Jansen: Would you also go for potato there?

Chair Marks: Yes, okay. So you know, maybe it is an opportunity to educate. So I won't criticize that but I don't know. Maybe it should be there just as it is presented.

I will just say, there is a little bit of me that looks at these two images and I don't know what it is, maybe they are too short or they are too wide. I'm not certain. I think there may have been a little more appeal. I don't know.

Number eight already others have articulated some of the symbolic shortcomings, if you will. I think Heidi has pointed out some of those that I agree with her on.

Number nine, I am just, it is more of a modern idea. I am just not sure -- I don't know. There is something about this image that just -- I don't know. It just doesn't, it doesn't have the chemistry for me.

The shields, we have seen so many shields with an eagle over the top. I know it is an iconic image that has shown up on many of our coins. I guess I would just like something a little different than that. I'm hoping we don't go in that direction and that is just my own personal preference speaking there.

So my favorites would be one and two, with some support also for number five.

Mike.

Member Olson: All right. There is just a couple here that really struck me. I really, really like number two for the old style that it portrays and the completeness of what the subject matter is. We have got both branches there. We have got the shield. We have got the spear. It is just a really, really nice design, in my opinion, very well executed.

That being said, number four when we talk about the rifle being an offensive weapon, back in the early days our minutemen were getting on ships and going overseas to wage any war. Their sole and primary focus was to be ready at a minute's notice to defend our land. And they are the precursor to today's National Guard.

So the common defense for me when I look at that image of the minuteman, I think of the farmer, the shopkeeper, the average person who is not a professional soldier but is willing to take up arms at a moment's notice to defend his family and his way of life.

So this one will be getting strong support from me. I do also like the flag in the back, which does tie it in very nicely with the modern day.

The only other two that I have got any interest in at all would be number ten and number 11. I am somewhat more of a traditionalist. I do appreciate these older designs with the shield and the eagle. I think either one of those would work. My preference would be for number ten because I am familiar with that design of shield. I am not as familiar with the other design.

So those will be the four that will be getting support from me.

Chair Marks: Mike Bugeja.

Member Bugeja: I really would like to compliment the artists on this batch. I mean to have eight to consider is a compliment in and of itself but there are some brush strokes that really need to be complimented.

Take a look at number one and I know we are focusing on Athena but look at the shield. It is a modern design and it takes all of our, well the iconography of our coins that symbolize liberty and defense and it creates an eagle out of it. It is an absolutely wonderful design in itself.

And I am hoping that some of these designs, if not chosen, can be recycled elsewhere because this is a cache of riches and I mean that literally and figuratively. This is a stunning design.

I absolutely love number two as well. I think everything people have said before that is important. When we go into more of the classical figures, it might be important in future figures to experiment with the different ethnicities of hair, skin color. We have basic Northern European designs here.

I love this one. It is not a criticism of this one but it would be interesting to render a more classical design modern.

I actually love everything about number four as

well. However, we have seen images like this before. I'm not sure we have seen images like one and two before but I love the flag as a draping background.

Number five is also very appealing. And many of these should be not just discarded if not used because this has so much speaking. There is a confidence in the woman's, in Liberty's faces. That is what I really appreciate, the idea of character coming forth. I would like to see more of that character in the faces of the presidential spouses but here we have confidence and defense.

Number eight is very interesting to me. I think we have to really work on the image of light as Heidi has said, as opposed to the Viking helmet. It just doesn't work for me but we have seen these spikes before on other designs. I think we need to look at some classical pictures to see how that was portrayed.

On number nine, this is just an alluring picture full of motion and wind and texture and determination. I like the modernism of this. But again because one and two are so classically stunning, I have to favor that.

On ten and 11, we have seen these things before. I like the way it is balanced. I like how it is put together. It is fine symbolism. But again, I think that one and two will be collected by many hobbyists with pleasure.

Chair Marks: Thank you. Erik?

Member Jansen: Ron can you put up the obverse again that you put up during -- there you go.

First thing, Kaarina if it was you this time and maybe Cynthia later, thank you, thank you, thank you for the little backdrop piece from Chief Justice Roberts. We didn't get that in a lot of places so we were on our own. But just to read that tells me all right, here are the central issues that the artists

were chartered to. And that just really, really helps me.

All right. Okay, I want everybody to get a good picture of this in their mind. This is a fairly architecturally precise drawing. It is on all the different denominations, even though it may not produce the lower half quarter and tenth ounces. But the point I want to make here and carry into my comments on the other side is one, this is you can argue about the price of gold or the price of platinum and I would say it is a push more or less, this is the top end of this country's coinage. This is the finest we publish. This is the finest there is. And this drawing represents that level of fineness.

Now, I was a collector for the first ten or 11 years of this series when we were doing the eagle in 15 or 11 different natural situations. And I have to tell you, I am going to split with some of the opinions here on the panel. When it went to this kind of Venus and mars and angelic and other kind of symbolic representations of Liberty, I stopped collecting it because I just thought that was just getting a little bit -- It didn't bring anything new versus where the world was going with their new designs.

So with that, remember the precision and the sharpness of this drawing and let's go to the options here.

Now I think number one could be cast but not real easily. I think the shield is an innovative composite of older allegorical symbols that have been used in the past quite successfully. However, it doesn't exist -- It doesn't appeal to me personally. So I discount one on that basis.

If you go to number two, it is the kind of old world look. I would love to see that shield in stars and bars but it is not. So I am going to pass it up in this analysis.

So I would go to four. Don, you made a comment

which quite honestly I missed. And so thank you for making that, Donald. The flag and the stripes in the backdrop here is I think an artist trying to give us what we are asking for. And that is, kind of a new way of looking and merging and presenting the symbols in a way that is artistically sound.

I don't know what is going on at the end of the gun here. What is that? Is that a cap on the end? Am I missing something?

Member Moran: It's missing the ramrod, too.

Member Jansen: Okay, so I think there is some authenticity issues here which we might be missing that I think deserve being looked into if this is a design the group adopts. I am going to make similar comments on another diagram here in a moment.

I like the fact that this guy's defense is, it is a book. And you can call it whatever you want. You can call it a Bible. You could call it a ledger. You could call it the Book of Knowledge. You can call it anything you want. I happen to like that. It wasn't in the write-up but the flag in the backdrop shows the unity is strength message. And he is the vigilant defender. I like this one more than I thought I was going to. And largely on comments from Donald.

I am going to pass five, six, and seven. I want to go to eight. Yes, we can talk about the Norse horns and a number of things. Somewhere down the line, we are going to want this image again because this image is too strong, too simple, too direct, and so incredibly vertical. It is going to be just right somewhere. And then we are going to have talk about where are her feet. We are going to have to talk about things about her crown. We are going to have to talk about her hair, her dress, blah, blah, blah. But we are going to want to remember this image, I think. But I don't think it is for us today.

Number nine. Number nine is kind of cool. I mean the flag is all wrong, fine. The length is wrong. It is a little too angular. If her drapey-ness isn't as

angular as the flag is angular, then my eye just kind of wants to move one to the other and so forth.

But the cool thing here is her shield is the flag or the pole that it is on. It is all the same thing. And to me, that was Roberts' write-up. That was Roberts' write-up. Unity is strength.

And so the ten and 11 don't get my vote. For a penny, that is a great symbol with bars on a shield and so forth. For a hundred dollar as good as we can make it, I think you are dumbing down the imagery. I'm sorry. I just can't stand for ten or 11 on that basis alone.

At a two thousand dollar coin, it will be more than that in two or three years, I think the customer paid for more than that image.

So I end up supporting nine for the reasons I said. And supporting four for the reason that we have to make a decision.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you, Erik.

Okay, that brings us to the conclusion of our discussion. I'm going to look to Greg. Do we have any information on lunch, Andy?

Mr. Fishburn: We can do that but if you are completed with the platinum, you are well ahead of schedule.

Chair Marks: Right.

Mr. Fishburn: You would just be getting to that.

Chair Marks: Yes, I think we are going to be okay with the schedule. We still have to circle back and talk about America the Beautiful. We have to finish our discussion and any follow-ups on this one.

Was the intent that we were going to break for lunch?

Mr. Fishburn: The intent was to break for lunch.

Chair Marks: Okay. I think when we come back, we have only got two items. If we can wrap up the two programs we looked at this morning before we go to lunch, if we can wrap those up, when we come back after lunch all we need to do are the First Spouses and then probably what will be a fairly quick discussion, maybe half an hour on our recommendations for our next annual report.

We are not going to do the PowerPoint this time. And we have got all afternoon to do those two things.

Member Moran: Alice Paul?

Chair Marks: She is part of the First Spouse, although she is not a First Spouse but she is part of the First Spouse program.

And I am sensing from some of us, and myself included, that a break might be helpful. We have kind of been at this for about --

Member Scarinci: Definitely a break but I was kind of hoping if there was a way we could just use one of the rooms and have food brought in, like sandwiches or something, that would be helpful. I think we don't get enough time with each other. You know, we don't really get to spend time with each other. And going to a noisy restaurant --

Member Olson: We could go get something and bring it back for that matter. I think coordinating and bringing something in here is probably more time than it is worth.

Mr. Fishburn: Why don't we just adjourn and deal with --

Chair Marks: Yes, and we can adjourn as a group informally we can decide how we want to do that. I like the concept of what you are presenting. Maybe we can all go out and grab something and agree to meet back here at a certain time in another room or even in here.

Okay, so with that in mind, may I ask everyone to complete their scoring sheet for the Platinum Program. Let's get that down to Erik.

And then at this point, I have some results for our tallies on America the Beautiful. Okay, I will wait for Ron if he can get those images up so we can look at these when I announce them, so we can know exactly what I am talking about. And we are going to go to Fort -- Which one are we going to go to first, White Mountain?

Member Jansen: White Mountain.

Chair Marks: Okay, White Mountain. Image number two received ten, which is the high tally. And I will just note here that with seven members participating, the highest possible total is 21, which means I will remind everyone that we have a policy in place that we need to achieve a 50 percent threshold for a recommendation, which in this case would be ten and a half or 11.

Okay, so with ten technically we don't have a recommendation. We have a preference, I suppose you could frame it that way. And we will circle back and talk about these. I want to get these all out on the table first.

The next one in order was Perry's Victory, I believe. Perry's Victory highest tally was design number one with seven out 21. And just for the record, number two got one and number three had zero.

I'm sorry. I'll back up and do White Mountain more completely. Number one, design number one had one. Design number three had two. Designs four and five had seven each.

Okay, the next one in the order that we looked at them was that Great Basin? Yes, Great Basin. Great Basin we have a recommendation of design number one with 17 of the 21 possible. Design two had one. Design three had two. Design four had one. So a real clear indication there in support of number one.

After that we go to Fort McHenry. Again, we have a preference, not a recommendation with design number one with eight total out of 21. Design number two received three points. Design -- I'm sorry did I say -- Whatever I said, design number two had three points. Design number three had zero. Design number four had two.

Then moving to Mount Rushmore, we achieved a recommendation, just achieved it with 11 points assigned to design number one. So that would be our recommendation. And with the others with this tally, design number two had one. Design number three had five. Design number four had four.

So it looks like we have got two recommendations and three preferences. Minority preferences, I should probably frame it that way.

So I know that --

Member Wastweet: Wait. We are so close that I think I would be okay with us making a recommendation.

Chair Marks: Okay. Well yes, let me -- Let's look at these in the order that we looked at them. So let's go to White Mountain.

There is nothing wrong if someone here wants to step up and just say I am going to assign one more point to this.

Member Wastweet: I will do that.

Chair Marks: Will you? Okay. So Heidi your two becomes a three. Okay, so that would recommend design number two on White Mountain.

The next one we looked at was Perry's Victory. That is seven. I think at this point we probably want to talk about number one, what we want to do about that. So before I offer any motion because maybe you will beat me to the punch, I don't want the committee to sabotage it. What do you want to do

with one, if anything?

Member Scarinci: I would make a motion to just liberate the guy. Take him out of prison.

Member Bugeja: What was that, Don? I didn't hear it.

Member Scarinci: Motion to remove the bars.

Member Olson: Second.

Chair Marks: Just the bars? Can we clarify that motion? Is that what you want to do?

Member Scarinci: Yes, just take them out.

Chair Marks: So would the monument in the background remain as is?

Member Scarinci: I would say take him out and send it back to the artists to compose based on him being out.

Chair Marks: I just want to clarify. Do you want the monument still there?

Member Scarinci: I wouldn't have an opinion about that. I just want to remove the bars and let the artist take it from there.

Member Jansen: It is definitely going to take an artist's eye to --

Chair Marks: Okay, hold on a minute. Did we get a second on that?

Member Olson: Yes, I did.

Chair Marks: You seconded it. Okay. Go ahead.

Member Jansen: Yes, it is definitely going to take an artist's eye to rebalance that, otherwise it is going to look like a -- It is going to be bad. It is going to look like something is missing.

Chair Marks: Okay, would the motion then be to

remove the bars and recompose?

Member Scarinci: And send it back to the artist to recompose.

Chair Marks: Recommendation to recompose whatever the artist might decide to do with that.

Member Scarinci: Correct.

Mr. Everhart: One question, Don. You say remove the bars but what about the arc around the walls.

Chair Marks: Are you talking about all the devices that relate to an interior?

Member Scarinci: Correct, everything that puts him indoors.

Chair Marks: Everything that puts it indoors.

Member Bugeja: You know, I am going to have to counter that motion with another one to --

Chair Marks: We have a motion on the table.

Member Bugeja: And the discussion is that I am going to counter it with another one.

Chair Marks: We could have a motion to amend. You could have a motion to amend it, if you could get a second.

Member Scarinci: I shouldn't have made a motion so quickly. So why don't we table my motion?

Chair Marks: No, no. Motions are good because they focus us.

Member Scarinci: Okay.

Chair Marks: Thank you for making the motion.

Member Scarinci: Okay.

Chair Marks: Go ahead, Michael.

Member Bugeja: I'm uncomfortable with this. This is

not a slight variation of number one by removing the bars. You have got orientation. You have got space. It is going to be an entirely new design. I am uncomfortable giving any artist cart blanche with the problems of orientation, size, and others. It is going to be a completely new design to get it right. So I am uncomfortable with going forth with this motion.

Chair Marks: So do you have a motion to amend?

Member Bugeja: My motion is to affirm the CFA's in choosing none.

Chair Marks: Greg are you our parliamentarian? So would that be a situation where Michael's motion would need to have the agreement of the original motion maker and second?

Mr. Weinman: Actually I think in this case Michael made an entirely separate motion.

Chair Marks: Well that would be a motion to amend. And so he would have to have a second to amend --

Mr. Weinman: Yes.

Chair Marks: -- on a motion.

Mr. Weinman: Technically speaking, yes.

Chair Marks: I think according to Roberts Rule's that is what we would need to do.

Mr. Weinman: Right.

Chair Marks: So is there a second to the motion that Michael just put on the table?

Member Jansen: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay. Could you restate that Michael?

Member Bugeja: You know, it is called a hot house. In the legislature it is like strike everything after the enacting clause and add the following. And the following is to strike the main motion of amending

the current number one design and changing this to an affirmation of the CFA's -- affirming the CFA's no recommendation.

Chair Marks: Okay. So essentially your amending motion is no recommendation.

Member Bugeja: Yes, not recommendation.

Chair Marks: No recommendation. And was that your understanding, Erik?

Member Jansen: That wasn't quite my understanding. I really feel like we need to be helpful and sensitive and not just kind of fall in line behind CFA saying --

(Whereupon, a raspberry sound effect was made.)

Member Jansen: I don't know how you are going to transcribe that.

Chair Marks: Well we can make no recommendation free of whatever they do.

Member Jansen: Well that's my point, though. We could make a recommendation couched in the following committee thought.

Chair Marks: So are you withdrawing your second?

Member Jansen: It sounds like I should.

Chair Marks: But are you?

Member Jansen: I am.

Chair Marks: Okay, so is there another second for that motion for a no recommendation?

Okay, so I'm sorry, Michael --

Member Bugeja: That's okay. It's quite alright.

Chair Marks: -- your motion fails for lack of a second.

That brings us back to Donald's original motion to remove all the interior devices and then ask the artist to recompose. Okay, is there discussion on that motion?

Member Moran: Can we hear from either Don or Heidi on how that stuff works?

Chair Marks: Don, you have some comments about that motion?

Mr. Everhart: You mean specifically?

Chair Marks: Yes.

Mr. Everhart: I hate to dictate. I'm not going to comment on *Roberts Rules* but I can comment on the arch.

Chair Marks: Well that's exactly what you are here for.

Mr. Everhart: Okay.

Chair Marks: So you just tell us what you think about all that.

Mr. Everhart: Yes. What I would do is probably make the figure, the sculpture a little bit larger. That means moving it over to the left a bit. And also after removing all the lattice work, move the monument to the left of it and possibly increase the land area at the bottom to bring that up and to take up some of that negative space.

Chair Marks: Okay. Any questions about that input?

Member Olson: I just have a comment. As I stated in my initial comments on this, this is about two physical objects that are there, the statue and the monument. It also, choosing this one would honor the American hero who is the reason for the monument.

So I think if we can make suggestions that allow the Mint some latitude to modify that design, we would

end up with a design hopefully that the majority of us could live with.

Chair Marks: And I will just go on the record for myself saying that I do like the motion that Donald made. If this goes through, I want it to be a motion that the art staff will feel like they have some freedom and how they work with it. I think that is the intent of this motion. Correct?

So I don't want this motion to be taken as trying to micromanage what you are doing. We are uncomfortable with all the interior stuff. Let's free that image out of all of that and recompose it, whatever that means to the artist.

Mr. Everhart: I think the artist can work with that.

Chair Marks: I think we will get a very clean image this way. So any other --

Member Wastweet: Gary?

Chair Marks: Yes, Heidi, please.

Member Wastweet: If our recommendation is to send this back to the artist to rework it, how is that different than rejecting it and asking for new designs?

Chair Marks: Because we are isolating one design and saying go work on this. Rejecting all current designs would mean that they are going to go back and produce something new.

Member Wastweet: But new could be a rework of this plus something else.

Chair Marks: It could be but it is broader. It is a broader direction.

Member Wastweet: But we wouldn't have a chance to look at it again.

Member Bugeja: That's my point.

Chair Marks: With timelines, I don't know. We probably wouldn't see this again, would we? Andy would be the person to --

Member Wastweet: What would happen if we rejected this? What would happen?

Chair Marks: As far as the schedules go, Ron or I don't know who knows that information.

Mr. Harrigal: Well, it kind of puts us into something we would have to discuss internally. I don't think we can -- I mean we haven't been in this kind of position before where one committee came out and said none of the above and the second committee comes out and says none of the above and then we look at that. What can we do? I mean, we are looking to you for advice and recommendations.

On that, I think we can work with, I mean if that embodies the basis of what the CCAC wants to do, then recomposing with direction on one is good. The other opens up the flood gates to a lot of different designs, which we go through the whole process a few months from now.

Member Olson: I think is the sentiment of the committee that we sure as heck don't want to see flags of other countries. So to protect that position, really the only option is to go with --

Mr. Everhart: On number one, we are not going to redraw anything. We are going to move some things around and size them a little differently.

Member Bugeja: And that is my main concern. I mean while we are, well Gary you are deferring to the artists and I appreciate that. I think what is worse is coming up with a coin that criticizes it after the fact. And that is why I made the motion that I did. If we could at least come back and see something, I would feel more comfortable but we are actually only given one design here because even what you stated Mr. Chairman about the flags. And I agree with what you stated. We are just given

one design. And that just seems too narrow a focus for a U.S. coin.

Chair Marks: I understand. And I think if that is your position, and obviously it is, you would be a no vote. If this motion fails, then we would be open for another motion, perhaps to reject all designs and ask for new ones. And I think Heidi you may find yourself doing that.

Member Wastweet: I am very leery with us just giving them the directive to remove the architectural structure here. Because if you look at that and imagine what is going to happen, even with some resizing and shuffling around, you have two tall vertical elements in a circle. Not an exciting composition. I can't picture how that is going to be. I think it is too big of a change.

Chair Marks: All right. Okay, is there any further discussion? Good point. Any further discussion?

Member Olson: I seconded Donald's motion.

Chair Marks: You were the second? Okay. Hearing no further discussion, I will ask for a show of hands for those who support the motion to remove all of the interior elements and recompose the sculpture and monument for design number one. All those in favor of that motion, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

Chair Marks: We have one. We have two in favor. All those opposed?

(Show of hands.)

Chair Marks: Heidi you swayed me.

Member Jansen: You swayed me as well.

Chair Marks: Five against. So that motion fails.

So we are right now where we are, -- I just want to clarify it. Where we are is that we would go forward

with a non-recommendation having received seven points of support out of a possible 21. So we don't have a recommendation right now. We have, I don't know what you want to call it.

Member Wastweet: Preference.

Chair Marks: A minority preference. So are we comfortable with that or do you want a stronger motion?

Member Bugeja: I want a stronger motion. I am not comfortable with that because it is giving the impression that seven of us are for design number one, when clearly seven of us are not, based on the separate vote.

Chair Marks: Are you prepared to make a motion, then?

Member Bugeja: Yes, I would like reconsideration of no recommendation. Reconsideration would require a second and a majority vote.

Chair Marks: Reconsideration?

Member Bugeja: Reconsideration of my failed motion.

Chair Marks: Well why don't you just make a new one?

Member Bugeja: All right. A new one would be that we make no recommendation whatsoever on the Perry design.

Chair Marks: Is there a second on Michael's motion?

Member Wastweet: I will go ahead and second that.

Chair Marks: Okay, Heidi is the second. Okay, let's have some discussion on this, folks.

Member Olson: The danger we run into and I think there is strong sentiment on the committee that we don't want to wind up with something with the

Union Jack or Canadian flag on there. If we don't make any recommendation, then we throw it back in the Mint's lap to pick because they didn't get any direction from the CFA.

Member Wastweet: But we have already voiced that.

Chair Marks: Let me clarify. Your motion is to have new ones brought back to us?

Member Bugeja: You know, that is not my purview to do that. I think what we are actually sending a message that too few and too similar designs could actually lead to this outcome. And my role is I really respect what the artists have done. I made my comments constructively. But what I don't want to happen is a coin that is criticized after it is minted. And so I reluctantly make this motion. I don't do it enthusiastically. I just think that shifting some of the elements can create larger problems without our looking at that and other potential designs.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Jansen: Is it worth framing it kind of in a time urgency sense that if the Mint needs to move forward to hit their schedules, we would recommend a removal of blah, blah, rebalancing by the artist. If time is not so urgent, we would request new designs.

Chair Marks: Let me ask -- I want to ask the staff a question. Maybe you have already answered this. I apologize if you have.

But seeing that this is part of the 2013 edition of America the Beautiful, isn't there still time for new designs?

Mr. Harrigal: Well based on the schedule that we have from last year, to introduce coins in January we were reviewing these designs in October of last year. And that is how long it takes to get into production for us to do the pre-production and

everything on five designs and introduce our proof sets in January.

Obviously there will be an impact on the timeline. I don't know what it would be at this point on how we do it. We can't go forward with a proof set with only four quarters in it. We have to have all five.

Chair Marks: Right. Let me ask you this, then. Obviously, there was a culling process that went about before we got to three. I know some of those were probably ruled out for legal copyright reasons. I don't know.

Mr. Harrigal: There were a number of reasons. Kaarina is not here right now.

Chair Marks: Well were some of them strictly design preference?

Mr. Harrigal: A lot of it was historical accuracy issues, and things like that.

Chair Marks: Okay. Were there any that were just ruled out because it was thought not to be a good design?

Mr. Harrigal: I don't believe so. No, we didn't.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: All right. I mean it was controversy about the accuracy of some of the history on that. And the focus was Perry's Victory and the International Peace Memorial. It is the broader thing and as anyone that has been up there knows, you have got the memorial which is kind of simplistic in nature.

Chair Marks: Okay. Can I summarize? Do I get it right to say that your answer is no, there is no time because it will impinge on other programs?

Mr. Harrigal: I can't say that it is not. I can't say the answer is no. What I can say is it will take some pretty intense discussions internal to the Mint and

ultimately on whether we would go forward or not without a recommendation.

Chair Marks: Okay. So here is the way I sum this up and committee, tell me if you see it differently but right now, with seven votes supporting this thing, if we leave it there, this is probably we get. If we pass this motion, then we basically throw the whole thing back to the Mint and we will see what happens.

Mr. Fishburn: Mr. Chairman, I would just note that one of the issues that we are facing here is we tried to present things that are actually at the Park so you are not going to get images in the battle and you are also not guaranteed a review of these designs, if it does go back for new designs. You may get though.

Chair Marks: We could get a new perspective on the sculpture, a new perspective on the monument, or maybe both mixed together somehow.

Mr. Fishburn: That is correct.

Chair Marks: That's definitely possible. And I think that is probably what we would see. So understand that, that the imaging that we have is probably going to be the same but maybe different perspectives.

Member Jansen: Mr. Chairman, is it inappropriate we might put a proxy subset of us together to review that to let it go?

Chair Marks: I'm not understanding.

Member Jansen: It comes out with a new design relayed out, a subset of three of us, two of us, one of us, look at it and say go, go.

Chair Marks: I'm not sure that --

Mr. Fishburn: I think you would need a quorum.

Chair Marks: Yes, I think we would need a quorum.

Mr. Fishburn: Yes, and also new designs we would have to run through the CFA as well.

Chair Marks: Okay. Is there anything new to offer on this motion? I'm thinking we are all pretty clear what a no vote means and what a yes vote means. Okay?

Member Olson: Why don't you recap what we have talked so much about.

Chair Marks: Okay. Perry's Victory, design number one received seven votes in support out of 21. If we leave it there, that would mean a no vote on this motion, then I think we can expect that the Mint will go forward with number one because with the CFA weighing in with no recommendation and us at least coming forward with seven votes in support, they are probably going to go with that. That is an indication of some support somewhere.

Member Olson: As is.

Chair Marks: Right. If we vote yes on this motion, then we have duplicated what the CFA has done and the Mint has no indication of a recommendation. So from there, I would imagine the Director could make a recommendation.

Mr. Harrigal: That is correct.

Chair Marks: And the Director always does make a recommendation. So I would think that whatever he came up with, you know if you guys fall on the side that timelines are important, we will probably get whatever the Director decides.

Mr. Harrigal: We would consult with the Park after the recommendations from the two committees and get some feedback from them and take that data and go to the Director and say this is what we have to go forward with.

Chair Marks: So he might sort this out.

Mr. Harrigal: And the Director, Acting Director could

say we are going back to the drawing board or he could say we are going forward with one of these designs.

Chair Marks: So that is what happens if you vote yes on this.

Mr. Harrigal: And also that goes to the Department of Treasury and it would be vetted through the Department of Treasury.

Chair Marks: Okay. I was going to say or. That is not true.

So basically it goes to the Director. The Director is going to decide if there will be more designs or if he is going to let something go upstairs.

Mr. Harrigal: Correct.

Chair Marks: Okay. So we are basically giving it to the Acting Director. We might see it back again. We might not. So that is what your yes vote means.

So are we all clear on what is going to happen? Okay, so if there is no further discussion, I am going to get this vote on the record.

So all those in favor of rejecting all designs or the Perry's Victory America the Beautiful quarter, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

Chair Marks: We have got four in support. All those opposed, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

Chair Marks: Three. Okay, the motion carries four to three. So we have essentially gone on record having no recommendation.

So at this point, staff will take that to the Acting Director and we will see if we see that again. Okay.

Next design to look at, I believe it is, am I correct it

is Great Basin? Great Basin was -- Yes, I know but I want to make sure. Did we want to just go as is? Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: What was the outcome?

Chair Marks: Seventeen. It is the most lop-siding of the quarters today.

Okay, so that will take us to Fort McHenry. We have an indication not a recommendation with design number one with eight. So this is just like Perry's Victory in that we don't have a recommendation. If we just leave it where it is, there is an indication, at least, of support towards a certain design. So are we comfortable with that?

Member Wastweet: I am.

Chair Marks: I'm not hearing anything else. So I will move on and let that stand. Then that takes us to Mount Rushmore. We actually have a recommendation here with 11 votes for number one. Do we need to revisit that at all?

Okay. So we are done with America the Beautiful for 2013.

That brings us now back to the Platinum Program. Erik was good enough, thank you Erik, for doing the tally for us. Let's have this discussion and then we will break for lunch.

The 2012 American Eagle Platinum Coin we have a recommendation of design number four that received 13 of a possible 21. Second would be a recommendation without that one at 11 for number two.

So now I will just go down the whole row here. Number one received nine, number two received 11, three -- well actually we threw out three. That has no support. Four has 13, five has four, eight has one, nine has five, ten has three, and 11 has four.

So our recommendation as it stands right now

would be for the colonial figure in number four.

Mr. Weinman: Mr. Chairman, what was number five?

Chair Marks: Number five received four.

Mr. Weinman: Okay.

Chair Marks: So are we comfortable leaving as is? I'm not hearing anything. So we are going to leave that as it. So we have completed the Platinum Program.

We will go ahead and break for lunch now. When we come back, we will be focusing the first part of the afternoon on First Spouses, which will be an extensive endeavor with 59 designs. So let's go out and get something to eat, get refreshed.

And let's be back here -- We are breaking at 12:30. I am going to ask that we are all back here in our seats promptly at 1:30. We are recessed.

(Whereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the above-entitled matter went off the record and resumed at 1:44 p.m.)

#### Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2012 First Spouse Bullion Coin Program

Chair Marks: Okay. I'm going to bring this meeting back to order. Back on the record. The next item on the agenda is our 2012 First Spouse Coin and Medal Program. And I think we'll look to Ron to run us through --I guess it would be Alice Paul.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes.

Chair Marks: And before you do that, Ron, can we go through the obverse and reverse together, Committee? Do you want to do that? It could save us some time in our discussion.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, what we're going to do is, as I present them, you'll look at the obverse in coin and

medal format, and then we'll look at the reverses. We can run through the obverse and reverse in one shot and then we can take your feedback --

Chair Marks: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: -- if you'd like to do it that way.

Chair Marks: Okay. I guess what I'm getting at is let's look at this thing as a whole -- the whole sculpture, if you will, with both sides. Go ahead, Ron.

Mr. Harrigal: All right. 2012 First Spouse Gold Coin and Medal Program. Pursuant to Public Law 109-145, in 2012 the United States Mint will mint and issue four gold bullion coins emblematic of the spouse of each President to be honored on a Presidential dollar coin in the same year, on the same schedule as the Presidential One Dollar coin, and is issued with respect to that President.

If the President has served two or more non-consecutive periods of service Public Law 109-145 requires the Presidential One Dollar coin to be issued in such non-consecutive periods of service, and similarly for the spouse coin.

Okay. And also, as I said earlier, we do this in coin and medal format. And the medal format differences are we remove the required inscriptions that would make it a coin.

Okay. On the obverse, the obverse design requirements, the name and likeness of the person who was the spouse of the President during the President's period of service, the inscription of the years of service in such --- which such person was the spouse of the President during the President's period of service, a number indicating the order of the period of service in which such President served. And in the case of any President who served without a spouse, the image of the obverse of the bullion coin corresponds to the One Dollar coin relating to the President shall be the image emblematic of the

concept of Liberty as represented in the case of President Chester Allen Arthur by a design incorporating the name and likeness of Alice Paul, a leading strategist in the suffrage movement who was instrumental in gaining women's rights to vote upon the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment, and thus the ability to participate in the elections of the future Presidents. And who was born on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 1885 during the term of President Arthur.

Each bullion coin is issued to bear the inscriptions of the year of minting or issuance of the coin, and such other inscriptions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate. Additional obverse inscriptions include Liberty, In God We Trust, and the year of minting.

Reverse designs. The designs of the reverse of each coin shall bear the images emblematic of the life and work of the First Spouse whose image is borne on the obverse. In the case of Chester Allen Arthur, who served without a spouse, the reverse of such coin is to be represented -- excuse me, to be representative of the suffrage movement. Inscription of United States of America and inscription of the nominal denomination of the coin, which shall be \$10.

Additional reverse inscriptions include United States of America, E Pluribus Unum, \$10, one-half ounce, and .9999 Fine Gold.

Okay. As I said, we'll present the slides of both the - - on each slide the obverse and the reverse. I'm sorry, excuse me, the medal and the coin for that obverse. So, we have Alice Paul.

This is the first design that we have, the coin on the left, the medal, of course, on the right. Second image. Third image.

Member Jansen: Ron?

Mr. Harrigal: Yes?

Member Jansen: Do you have the original photo art that was provided to the artist, or anything like that, because I wasn't that familiar with her visage. The name, yes; the visage, no.

Mr. Harrigal: We do have those. I don't have them for display up here, but Leslie can provide you some of those materials.

Member Jansen: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Weinman: Do you want to clarify what these are that they're seeing? Where they came from?

Ms. Schlager: I'd have to go through my list. Do you want me to do that, or would you like to do that, the source documents, some of the talking points.

I'm sorry. Actually, I'm filling in for Betty Birdsong who is the program specialist. I worked on the second part, the Cleveland, so I came in sort of at the tail end. But these are source documents that we were -- we provided to the artist for inspiration.

Member Jansen: It would be incredibly helpful if those could be distributed to us with the drawings, just incredibly helpful.

Mr. Harrigal: Well, I think in the case of the Presidential Dollar Coin, we have three primary sources. On this, it's not quite as clear. We do use - - we do have sources from the -- whatever we can get clear from the -- is it the White House that we use, White House Historical Society?

Mr. Weinman: I want to just clarify. The images that you see here are not necessarily public domain images. These are -- in other words, they're for reference purposes, to create original work. So don't presume that when you look at these images these are, in fact, public domain images that can be utilized for derivative works that way.

Mr. Fishburn: But what I heard was that you would like source materials distributed with the packets,

and we can endeavor to do that?

Member Jansen: Yes, especially if you're going to distribute electronically, so that it wouldn't be any incremental cost.

Mr. Fishburn: We will try to do that as well as possible.

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Member Scarinci: Just a question. We're going with -- because I didn't see that before now, but we're going with the pictures of the spouse as they looked when they were the First Spouse. Right?

Mr. Harrigal: That is correct. And, of course, with Alice Paul, she was, of course, at a different time.

Member Scarinci: Right.

Mr. Harrigal: So, it would be whatever we can use in the way of a public image that was while she was active as a suffragette.

Member Scarinci: Right.

Mr. Weinman: But also to clarify, that's not a requirement of legislation.

Member Scarinci: No, no, no, no. That's a criteria that we've set --

Mr. Harrigal: It's sort of like a guideline that we try to follow.

Member Scarinci: Right. That was for consistency with the series, exactly like the Presidential Dollars. To this day, there remains just one exception that the Secretary chose the Jackson \$20 bill image instead of Jackson at the time he was President. That's the only exception so far to the Presidential series, and I just want to be sure we're keeping with that with the First Spouses, as well.

Mr. Harrigal: To the best we can, we do, because of

in the case of when you look at Frances Cleveland, we had two sets of coins that we have to make, and they're separated by four years. So, you could technically have anywhere from four to twelve years differences in age depending on whether it's the beginning of the first term to the last of the next term. But it's kind of hard to get photographs of -- obviously, when they are famous, when the President is in, that's where you get the photography. You don't typically see photography outside of those time frames.

And in this case, the official White House portraits were not used as primary materials. Alice Paul, Frances Cleveland, and Caroline Harrison designs are inspired by photographs from the Library of Congress, the Harris & Ewing Collection, First Ladies Library, the Alice Paul Institute, Sewall-Belmont House and Museum, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and Wells College. So, we do assemble quite a variety of materials for this. It's not quite as clear as like some of the other programs. But what we have to do is assure that we have rights on all these images for use. Okay?

Okay. So, here we have the third image of the obverse, the fourth, fifth, sixth image, seventh. So, we have the seven images there shown in coin and medal format.

Now, I assume we're going to go through the reverse, and then we can look to try and pare them back.

Okay. Let me go back to one here. This is just a suffragist voting, very generic in fashion. Number two, this is a design depicting the iconic image of Inez Milholland Boissevain, 1886 to 1916, dressed as Joan of Arc astride a horse leading the National American Women's Suffrage Association parade. Ms. Boissevain holds a banner with the inscription "Forward Into Light." The image is long associated with the suffragist movement.

Design Three. The design features two suffragists

wearing suffrage banners while holding a sign, "Votes For Women." Design four. This design depicts a participant in the 1912 suffrage parade held in New York City. She is holding the flag and wearing the banner, "Votes For Women." Design five depicts two suffragists picketing in front of the White House. Same thing on number six, slightly different composition. And design seven here is another design of Inez Milholland Boissevain inspired by the March 1913, suffrage movement parade held in Washington, D.C. So, these are reverse.

Chair Marks: Okay, Committee, do you have any questions?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: I guess not.

Mr. Harrigal: Gary, I'm sorry. When the -- CFA looked at this, they preferred design four on the reverse.

Chair Marks: Design four on the reverse would be the woman with the flag?

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, this one. The obverse was number five, which let me --

Chair Marks: Okay. Ron, if we could back to the -- let's start with the obverse. I want to go through our process where we see if we can identify some designs that we all have in common that we want to set aside, so we can better focus our discussion.

So, we have interest in image number one. I do. We'll keep that. Number two? No interest. Number three? Number four? Interested in that. Okay. Number five?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Number six? No on six. Number seven?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Yes? Okay. So, I've got images two, three and six that we set aside.

We've got four images left to look at, one, four, five, and seven. Okay? So, if we can focus our discussion on that. We can do our discussion one of two ways. We could go through and do these obverse ones first, or we could pair them up and pair our discussion at the same time.

Member Wastweet: Pair.

Chair Marks: Heidi is shaking her head to pair, so I think I'm leaning that way, too. Why don't we then - - let's work through the reverse designs and let's see which ones we want to --

Member Scarinci: There's usually more discussion about the reverse than the obverse.

Chair Marks: But in the vein of what you've always talked about coins should be about both faces.

Member Scarinci: Both faces.

Chair Marks: So, if we could go to number one, is there interest in looking at number one? I'm seeing no interest. Number two, any interest?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes. Interest in number three? No interest. Four?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Five? No on five. Number six? No on six. Stop me if I go too fast. Number seven? No interest in number seven. That leaves us -- well, this will make it simple, folks. We've got two images to consider on the reverse. We've got number two and number four. Okay? So, let's start our discussion. And I'm going to ask each member to pair up their conversations, not necessarily that you

need to say that the two match well, but give us at least your comments on both the obverse and the reverse.

And I'll just say this, that on the obverses, sometimes we get into a bit of subjectivity. And there are some images, for example, for myself, I can look at and I can say I like that one, and I don't like that. And I guess I don't have a real concrete reason, it's just my own sensibilities that I like one more than the other.

So, if that's the case, just go ahead and say what you like. If you have a concrete thought about why one is better than the other, why one should be picked, certainly vocalize that, but don't feel like you need to spend a lot of time on the obverses if you just have an intuitive desire for one over the other. Just tell us what that is, and then we can move the process maybe a little quicker.

So, with that, is there anyone who wants to start? Okay. Go ahead, Michael.

Member Bugeja: I'll make this short. What I looked for in the obverse was character. Number five has that character I was looking for. On all sorts of portraits I look mostly in the eyes, and what do the eyes convey. In 1805, we have conviction, a little weariness, but I think it really encapsulated her life. I also favor seven, but not to the extent of character that I find in five. And if I had to pair them up, interestingly, I would pair up five with two of the reverse, and I'd pair up seven with four of the reverse.

The reasons why, both two and four have that motion and movement that I have been looking for in coins. Two also has orientation coming out of that coin. The conviction of Alice Paul in five doesn't necessarily need to be echoed by the conviction in number four, but the conviction in -- the lesser conviction in number seven does need to be paired up with the reverse of number four. Those are my comments.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you, Michael. Let's go to Erik.

Member Jansen: On the obverses, I had the same intention to try to find the look, the feel, the character. Obviously, this woman fought an uphill battle for a long time, so I also did not want her to look opulent. By that I mean no pearls, no fancy earrings. I want this woman to look like a street fighter.

And my favorite is five. I think one could work. I think Item Seven has an element of youth which I'm not sure I want. I like the subtle way that the shoulder goes --on number five, that the shoulder goes over the letter T. There's something about it which it shows me -- just tells me that her shoulder is fighting it's way out of the circle it's supposed to be in. And it's a cue that my eye picks up on.

I would ask those that are into historical curation and so forth, her -- the neckline of whatever she's wearing is very, very simple. Too simple, too simple for the times? I don't know.

When I come to the reverses, it was interesting that we're down to two and four. And my number one thing here was what is the icon of the suffragette? And excuse me for not knowing that image number two was that. It looked very medieval to me, and I rejected it as that.

When you look at how they coin up, I think the proof version of number four will be striking, no pun intended, because of the contrast of the woman's profile with the flag. So, therefore, in the margin I go for number four.

Chair Marks: Okay, Heidi.

Member Wastweet: On the obverses, I don't have a strong preference between these. I think any of these would be fine. I kind of like the character of the hat. I think that is something that she wore a lot.

Member Jansen: If I may add one thing that I meant to. The best rendition from the photographs looked like it would be - excuse me - one or five. Those look like the best renditions.

Chair Marks: You know, I've noticed -- Erik, I'm not going to put you on the spot but I've noticed that we've done this a time or two today, various members. When one member is in the middle of their explanations, I'd ask that the rest of us hold our thoughts. And if you want to be recognized after that member is done, why don't you slip in at that point and let me know. But I'd like to give each member some uninterrupted time. So, Heidi, if you could continue.

Member Wastweet: Okay. So, even though I like the one with the hat, her nose seems too wide to me, and I don't know if that is something that the sculptors would correct, or if they are obligated to stay with the artwork. Don, how do you feel about that?

Mr. Everhart: It really depends on the individual drawing, and what reference we have. I would have to see the reference the artist used on this one to make a determination on that. But I can see a plain break coming down the right side of the nose there, which would indicate to me that it would be rounded off at that point. I'd have to see a picture of her at that time to really make a call on that.

Member Wastweet: Just a little wide at this point.

Mr. Everhart: At the bottom.

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Mr. Everhart: Oh, okay. Yes, I'd have to see -- I'm not that familiar with her.

Member Wastweet: Okay. Number five I think is a nice drawing and like Erik said, it gets the attitude across, or was that Michael? For coinability, though, I'm leaning towards seven. This one is going to

translate the best to medal, in my opinion. While five is a lovely drawing, I think seven would make a better medal, so I'm leaning toward there. But we're actually going to be fine with whichever one we choose. There's no bad choice here.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Wastweet: On the reverse, number two. It may have been iconic in its time, and that has some value. I'm inclined to agree it looks medieval and, of course, it was supposed to at the time. It could be misinterpreted. And the fourth woman in the background is very, very small, which I think we're always uncomfortable when people become too small with that much detail in it.

I like number four for its simplicity; not only simplicity, but it has a fluidness, it has a good composition sensibility. She's definitely got motion in her stride, a nice curl to the flag without being exaggerated. I think this is my top choice so far. That's it.

Chair Marks: Michael?

Member Moran: On the obverse, I went into Google Images and actually was able to date a couple of these, and that probably drove my choice. The one with her in the hat was 1914, which was early in the battle in terms of when it really got tough for her. And number seven was done in 1930 after it was over. And I like the comments everybody has made, but at the end of my thought process I came down to the fact that in 1930, here's an experienced woman who has seen it all, knew what it took in terms of dedication and sacrifice to make it happen. And I think that comes out in the drawing. And I like the way the face is turned, the position of the shoulders. That's my favorite.

On the reverse, I did not understand the allegory either, I do now. But still, number four is by far the better one. The design is simple, it's got motion, it's what we want.

Chair Marks: Reverse?

PARTICIPANT: He said four.

Chair Marks: Oh, four. Gotcha. Okay, go ahead.

Member Scarinci: I agree, number four is a no-brainer. I don't really see any other choice. It's got - - as was said before, it's got motion, it's got simplicity, it's got all the things we ask for.

In terms of the obverse, my only no would be number four because we're doing a hat on the reverse. I don't think we should be doing a hat on the obverse. And I also don't think we should have people focus their attention on a hat instead of the person. And I think you can't not look at this hat. I mean, it's a cool hat. So, I think anything but number four. And as between the anything, I think it's a tough call between five and seven.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thanks, Donald. I come down between five and seven, also. I'm not going to illuminate any of you on one or the other. And I just like those both, and we'll see which one prevails.

On the reverse, number two with the cape and the clothing that could possibly strike one as medieval, it just takes on the Joan of Arc look. So, I think for the person who might by chance look at this and not have a whole lot of knowledge about what they're looking at, I think it could be a somewhat confusing image for them. And I think it's important that since this was put in the legislation that the image that's picked really does convey the message that was intended in the legislation.

So, that's why I think number four is the best. Not only does it convey that image or that message, excuse me, of the suffragist, but it also, I think -- I was going to use that word "striking," a very striking image. Here again I'll go back to the proof, this figure being the raised object, I would think that that would be the frosted, and you're going to have a lot of mirror on the background. And I think

it's going to be very stunning because of that contrast, and it's going to have a lot of pop. So, I'm split between the two images for the obverse and definitely in favor of number four for the reverse. Michael?

Member Olson: Just real quick, five on the obverse, and four or two on the reverse. No further comment.

Chair Marks: Okay. That brings us to the end of Alice Paul. There were tally sheets, new ones passed out to you before the session started, so please feel free to go ahead and start marking those.

Member Jansen: Hey, Gary?

Chair Marks: Yes?

Member Jansen: I have a question for Don. Would it be possible in image four, this is the marching suffragette with the flag, to also give proof treatment to the "Votes For Women" on the banner? It's just a thought.

Mr. Everhart: Well, I'm afraid it would look like you'd be able to see through her.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Everhart: It would pop that out for sure, but I think it would still be legible if it was recessed and had texture in it, and it would still read pretty well.

Member Jansen: Okay. Yes, if you could recess it and --

Mr. Everhart: I mean, you could do that, what you're saying, polish it.

Member Jansen: But with Gary's comments that for reasons that this was specified out of the normal in the legislation, I think we would maybe do the process right by really making it blatant, just really make it very clear what this is about.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Jansen: Stunning. I think striking?

Mr. Everhart: Well, no, stunning. I mean put those letters in proof, or in --

Member Jansen: Something so that there's at least some contrast against the --

Mr. Harrigal: I mean, one thing that we have to watch here is when we typically infuse the lettering and polish on the banner, it's typically in a flat arrangement. And here you're following the contour of her body as you go around from one end to the other, so it's going to be a bit tricky. That whole -- the "Votes For Women" letters will not all be at field level so it's going to be tough to do that from a technical perspective because you're following a contour.

Member Jansen: How do you do a reverse proof which is nothing but that process?

Mr. Harrigal: That has to be done by hand.

Member Jansen: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: That's -- I mean, this program, technically we could do that by hand. It's something we have to consider.

Member Jansen: Yes, it's not that many working dies.

Mr. Harrigal: No, it is not.

Chair Marks: Okay. At this point, I think we're ready to go ahead and look at Frances Cleveland first term.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. There's seven obverse candidates to go through here, and I'll just go through these in general here.

Incidentally, the fact that she was the youngest

First Lady, age 21, and also the dates on the coin span three years instead of four, 1886-1889, because that's when she was spouse, at that point. That is design number two, three, four, five, six, and seven.

On to the reverses, we have 10 candidate reverse designs for term one. Designs one through six are based on the first narrative that we developed, the Saturday receptions and the working class, so we'll go through those first here.

This is design one on the reception, design two, three, four, five and six. And design seven is based on our second narrative, which was popularity with the public.

This design was inspired by Frances Cleveland's immense popularity, depicts a young woman having her hair styled in the same likeness as Frances Cleveland. In addition, the woman who is styling her hair sports a similar Frances Cleveland hairstyle.

Design eight is based on popularity with the public, narrative number two. Design depicts the First Lady joining the President in an unprecedented tour of the South and West in 1887. In this design, the First Lady is seen stepping out onto the platform of the Presidential private railway car at the train station. President Cleveland is obviously in the background.

Design nine is based on narrative number two, popularity with the public. This design shows Frances Cleveland waving to the crowd during one of the train stops in the 1887 grand tour. And number ten, also popularity with the public, narrative number two. This design was inspired by a photograph of Frances Cleveland posing for a bas relief sculpt by Augustus Saint-Gaudens.

Chair Marks: Is that supposed to be Saint-Gaudens?

Mr. Harrigal: Yes. And he's actually sculpting on that palette, and not painting. So, we have the reverse designs here.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you. Any questions before we jump in?

Member Wastweet: I have a question?

Chair Marks: Go ahead.

Member Wastweet: On the Frances Cleveland second term, we also have her on the railway car. And, Ron, you mentioned earlier, we may want to -- or we're free to swap first and second term.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes.

Member Wastweet: Shall we do them all at the same time?

Chair Marks: Committee, do you want to do all Frances Cleveland's together?

Member Jansen: It gets to be an awful lot.

Chair Marks: But maybe at least the reverses?

Member Jansen: We have to pick two. Right?

Chair Marks: What's that?

Member Wastweet: We could do the obverse --

Member Jansen: We have to select two.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Wastweet: Let's do the obverses together, and then the reverses together.

Chair Marks: I think they tried to do the obverses to reflect a different age period. Right?

Mr. Harrigal: Yes.

Chair Marks: The reverses we could mix up, however.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes. And there is overlap on the reverses.

Chair Marks: So, why don't we just look at the --

Mr. Weinman: The other thing to keep in mind it's possible there might be some time sensitive designs. In other words, if there's some event that happened the second term, and it's associated with the second term, it might be inappropriate to put it arbitrarily in the first term.

Chair Marks: If that's the case then we should --

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, the actual train scenes on popularity with the public on the second reverse was based on Mrs. Cleveland's Whistle Stop Tour of the second term, so that actual design was based in photography from something during the second term.

Member Wastweet: Okay, so that was a second trip. It's not the same train?

Mr. Harrigal: Correct.

Member Wastweet: Okay.

Chair Marks: Heidi, are you good with just looking at what we've got for the first term?

Member Wastweet: Yes, I'm good with that.

Chair Marks: All right. Okay, so -- Erik, did you have a question?

Member Jansen: No.

Chair Marks: Okay. Then let's go through our process, and we'll go through the obverses one at a time. And let's identify those that we would like to have further consideration.

Number one, is there interest in number one?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Yes. Interest in number two? Okay, no. Interest in number three?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Four? Okay, we'll put four aside. Number five?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Number six? Setting six aside. And number seven?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Mr. Harrigal: And, incidentally, the CFA preferred design number seven on the obverse, and number five on the reverse.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, we've set aside two, four, and six. We're left with one, three, five, and seven, all the odd numbers. So, now let's look at -- let's take up the reverses, same process.

Reverse number one, is there interest in that one?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Reverse number two? Hearing none. Number three?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes. Number four? Hearing none. Number five?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Six? Take that as a no. Number seven? That's a no. Number eight?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Number nine? That's a no. Number ten? No interest in number ten. Okay, so we're left with -- the ones we kept were one, three, five, and eight. So, if we could focus our discussions on those designs, that will help us move through this process in a thoughtful yet expeditious manner.

Is there anyone who wishes to start with Mrs. Cleveland? Erik, you want to go ahead.

Member Jansen: Yes. All right. So, I think the point has been made we're picking the younger of two instantiations of her. As I look at the seven here, the best rendition is number seven, number three, and that was kind of my take on them.

Number one is not too far off, and probably -- I felt like it might coin pretty well, simple neckline and all. But my favorite is seven. It is about the only one that's a good rendition that strikes me as fulfilling the description "young and popular."

On the reverse, when I first looked at these, I was taken with -- on number one -- I was taken with kind of the energy and the message, and it just looks like a social gathering with a leader even though she has her back to us, being involved. And, of course, that was one of the narratives.

As I went through this, I really, really liked the energy, even though it's static, Michael, not moving energy. I really like the energy in five. These are all very busy drawings, and it's going to be a challenge, I think.

I didn't like the portrait of her in number four. Just trying to find simplicity here, and I didn't know whether the historical appropriateness rule hats in or out, or arbitrary, but I'm kind of trying to understand four versus five, even though we ruled -  
-

Chair Marks: Tossed four out.

Member Jansen: Yes, I know we did, because I think I want to be on five. It's the better of the two. So, I'm between one and five.

Chair Marks: Are you done?

Member Jansen: Finis.

Chair Marks: Michael.

Member Bugeja: I'll be very quick. I just looked at the obverse, Gary, and I like the character in number five. My preference is for the youth and allure of number seven.

As for the reverses, I'm fine with any of the finalists, except I wanted to point out that on number eight on the train, I think I might be right in this. I haven't researched it, but it may be the first time we have a First Lady and the President on the same coin. Is there another one?

Mr. Harrigal: I think we've had them before.

Chair Marks: Yes, I think so.

Mr. Harrigal: I can't say for sure.

Member Bugeja: We had them both together, and did we have one in front of the other --

Chair Marks: Wasn't there a marriage scene?

Member Bugeja: It's very interesting to me -- this is a very interesting photograph for me from a journalist political perspective, because it kind of showed you that the First Lady was more popular than the President. And even the way it was drawn, it was to that effect.

I just wanted to point out that I guess from a journalist perspective, here you've got the hats of the journalists I think on the bottom there, and they're paying attention to Frances. I kind of like that. That's it.

Chair Marks: Okay. Michael?

Member Olson: Yes, real quick. Number seven I think depicts her in the best light, so that would be one I would support for the obverse.

On the reverse, I do not understand why we're still seeing pictures of the back of people. And it's especially glaring when the subject of the picture that we're looking at is the one with their back to us

in many of these designs. It's distracting enough when it's a supporting character, but when it's the main character, I just -- I do not understand why we'd want to see the back of that person. I would think we'd want to see their face.

That fact eliminates a lot of these designs in my view. That's the reason why I felt that number three should be considered. It does show, essentially, the same scene that we're looking at here, but we're not looking at the back of anybody, much less the subject that we're trying to honor. Number three gets my strongest interest for that fact.

Number eight, with the train scene, I looked at that and it just kind of appeared to me that the gentleman standing behind the lady there was sneaking up on her. So, I think there's probably some better choices than that, but those are my thoughts.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael.

On the obverse, I like the youth of number seven. For the reverse, I'll expand a little bit more. Number one is interesting, I think mainly because of the style in which it's rendered. It's got kind of a muted look which imparts to it more of an antique feel that maybe gives it a little more romanticism, but I don't think that when you transfer that onto a coin it's going to look the same way. It's going to look very different than what you're looking at here.

I agree with my friend, Michael, that we should be done with looking at backsides of people. I don't know if we want to render the backside of the First Lady, so that one I will encourage my colleagues to not support.

Number three doesn't have much energy in it. It just strikes me as a little plastic, and the figures are farther away than some of these other options we have, so we lose some of the -- there's nothing dramatic about it.

Five has that energy that I'm talking about. We're not really looking at the backside of the First Lady here, kind of somewhat getting to be a little bit of a severe profile, but from kind of the back of her shoulder, but I still think it works. The energy imparted in the faces of the young ladies that are meeting her is evident. The images are large enough that you can see it readily at a first glance and understand that this is a scene of some folks meeting someone. And I think in a proof version, this is going to be a real clean presentation with a lot of open field around it; yet, we've still filled up the palette in a very pleasant way. So, I strongly support number five.

Number eight, I like what Michael said about the journalistic point of view, and the politics involved here, but there's still just something -- it doesn't grab me for some reason. I'm sorry I can't articulate that any better. So, I'm with number seven on the obverse, number five on the reverse. Donald?

Member Scarinci: Yes, it's hard to get excited about this, so, I mean, I could go along with seven on the obverse, five on the reverse, no passion to my opinion. I'm easily swayed.

Chair Marks: Go ahead, Michael.

Member Moran: Number three is the photograph from her engagement. I think it's well done. I think that the sculptor designer got it right on number five in terms of the tilt of the head. I like it, as well. I do not like -- I know I'm swimming against the water here, but I do not like number seven for the simple fact that I felt like the tilt of the head was not what I saw in the photographs, and that was why I dismissed it. So, I'm between three and five, probably vote for three and lose my points.

On the back, I think it's clear that number five is it. I think that number eight deserves a little bit of criticism, constructive criticism, for the simple reason that you can't tell it's a pale car, and you

have four basically floating derby hats down at the bottom. And it just doesn't jump out and get the storyline right because of that. So my vote on the reverse is number five.

Chair Marks: Okay. Heidi?

Member Wastweet: For the obverse, I don't have a strong preference. I think one, and three, and seven would all be fine. Number five, I feel her facial features are not as accurate. I don't like number five. I'm sorry, Michael, so no strong preference between one, three, and seven.

On the reverse, number one, Gary is correct, this would not show up on the coin like it does on the drawing with fading curtains in the background, so there's no division between the polish and the frost. And that, of course, doesn't work. This is not a high relief metal that you could do that. This is intended to be a proof coin, so that's not going to work.

Number three, so much going on in the background. There's no designation for polish. She's known for meeting the young working girls, but the woman that she's shaking hands with -- which one is supposed to be the First Lady, the one on the left or the right?

Mr. Harrigal: The left.

Member Wastweet: Yes. And then the one on the right looks like a much older woman, not like a young working girl. And no energy. So, number five has a better composition than number four, which we already rejected.

The trouble here is some fuss was made about her hairstyle and how everyone copied it, but her hairstyle is not in this picture. And the girl that she's meeting is not sporting her hairstyle either, so that's some inaccuracies that I would hope could be corrected, because otherwise I think this is garnering a lot of support among the Committee members here. I would move to change that if we

adopt that one.

Number eight, I like the idea of this. It's drawn well. True, it doesn't look like the back of a train car. I'm not sure that's important or not. The hats are a bit obscure. I think for the subject matter, I think I prefer the one that we're going to see for the second term, so I'm going to pass this one for that reason. So, that leaves us back with five with the incorrect hairstyle, so I can't really approve it, but maybe with a motion to change that.

Chair Marks: Okay. That brings us to the end of Mrs. Cleveland first term. So, go ahead and when you're ready mark your preferences on the tally sheet. And let's have Ron walk us through the Caroline Harrison designs.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. I do want to mention that we did talk about the President and the spouse being on the coin in the past, that Julia Tyler coin when we did that has the President and the Spouse dancing. At least that one for sure. I can't tell on some of these others, but that's definitely one.

Okay, Caroline Harrison candidate obverse designs. Caroline Harrison was the spouse of President Benjamin Harrison who served as President from 1889 to 1893. Mrs. Harrison was born on October 1<sup>st</sup>, 1832 and died at the White House from tuberculosis complications on October 25<sup>th</sup>, 1892. Okay. As a result, the date range on her design ends one year before her husband's term of the office expired.

So, we have seven obverse designs, design one, two, three, four, five, six and seven.

Chair Marks: What was the CFA choice?

Mr. Harrigal: And CFA choice was design five.

Member Moran: Ron, did they do that because they decided everything is being profiled?

Mr. Harrigal: They did make a lot of comments about making sure that profiles -- at least in the portfolio, and in this case they did reference it being profile was stronger. Sometimes they don't. Sometimes we have profiles but they don't pick them, but they do generally make comments when we don't include a profile in the portfolio.

Okay, the reverse designs. Of the nine candidate reverse designs represented of Mrs. Harrison's love for china painting and her work organizing the White House china.

Okay. So, we have White House china featured on designs number one. This is our narrative number two. So, for designs one and two, this is design one showing the White House china from when Mrs. Harrison was there. We have the White House china from Harrison on the front, Monroe in the back on the right, and Lincoln center left of the design. So, those are the three that are -- White House china is represented there.

This is design two. The design depicts Mrs. Harrison identifying china from past administrations. Design three is based on narrative number one, china painting. This design depicts Mrs. Harrison's painting an orchid china pattern. Design four, again based on narrative number one, this design depicts a closeup of Mrs. Harrison carefully painting an orchid on the china. Design five depicts a closeup of the orchid and paintbrushes. Design six, this design depicts a closeup of Harrison's hand as she paints a pansy on china. Design seven, again based on narrative number one, this design features First Lady showing her students how to paint using china. Design eight, based on narrative number one, this design depicts a closeup of Mrs. Harrison's hand carefully painting an orchid on the surface of the china. Design nine, again based on narrative number one, this design depicts Mrs. Harrison explaining the china painting to her students. In the background is a prominent natural design motif that visually defines the time period that Harrison lived

in the White House. So, there you have it, nine designs.

Chair Marks: Okay, let's start with the obverse, and let's identify those that we want to consider further. Obverse number one, is there interest in one?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Number two?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes. Number three? No on three. And four? No on four. Number five?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Six? Nothing on six. And on seven? Okay. So, we've just eliminated three, four, six, and seven, leaving us with three images, one, two, and five for the obverse.

So, now we will move to the reverse. Number one?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Two? I hear nothing on two. Number three? None on three. Four?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Five?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes, for me. Six?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Seven? No on seven. I will say yes on eight. Nine?

PARTICIPANT: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, we've just set aside two, three, and seven. And we will be looking at one, four, five, six, eight, and nine. Okay. So, at this point I'll circle back to the obverses, and I'll take the liberty of starting this discussion.

Of the three images that we're left with here for the obverse, I simply like number one. I know that doesn't contribute a lot, but I like number one.

The reverses are interesting. I guess the first thing I want to know, maybe the staff can enlighten us, is the china theme the only one that you have?

Mr. Harrigal: We had the two themes here that were based on china, the White House china, and also the painting of china.

Chair Marks: But it's all about china.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes.

Chair Marks: Is there anything else in her history? I'm not a historian. If there's not, there's not, but I'm just curious.

Mr. Harrigal: I mean, she was only there for three years, of course. No, those are the only narratives we have for her.

Chair Marks: All right.

Mr. Harrigal: I know we reviewed these, and we vetted these narratives at least once.

Chair Marks: Okay. I want to talk a little bit about -- this is a word I've used often here, "story board." And we've tossed out some of the story board ones where we've got -- like number seven that we tossed out was kind of a story board where we're looking at a moment in the life of. Same with number two, checking out the china, that sort of thing. And I've never felt that those were the best ways to honor a First Spouse and their contributions. And I much prefer, if we can find some sort of symbolism or some simple device that

relays the idea of whatever the subject was that was important to that First Spouse, First Lady, while she was in the White House.

So, we're giving the china theme, and I think, first of all, I asked for number eight to be included because this one just kind of -- it struck me a little -- I mean, it's getting to what I'm talking about, but I don't know why, but when I saw this I thought of painting the roses red. You're familiar with that in Alice in Wonderland? So, I don't know. That's the only reason I put that in there. I wanted to just bring that out, compared to number five.

Number five, I really, really like this. It shows the orchid that she would have painted, perhaps, on a piece of china, and it gives you the symbolism of the paintbrushes without giving you a frame from a comic strip or some sort of story, picture story series of pictures that you might see. So, I am throwing, I think, all of my support behind number five.

The others are interesting illustrations, but I'm not really sure that they really do a whole lot for me. So, with that, who's -- do you want to go, Mike? Go ahead.

Member Olson: Yes, I want to echo what Gary has just said, but I'm going to make one minor suggestion as an addition. I think number one will get my support for the obverse. Number five is a very excellent choice for a reverse, in my view. But in reading the narrative, I'd suggest maybe the Mint make one small addition to that. It says here that her signature was a tiny four-leaf clover. What a great way to personalize that design if that is her work, put a little privy mark, a little four-leaf clover in there, and you'd have something that was very unique, and would mean something not only to her family, but to collectors. They would wonder what that was, and maybe be compelled to do a little research. I think that would be a nice gesture if the design selected is one that depicts her artwork.

That's all my comments.

Chair Marks: Michael?

Member Bugeja: I'll be brief again, one or five for the obverse were my first choices. Either one would work for me. I was much more inclined to look at the reverses. And what I considered was the canvas of the coin itself being almost the plate that she wrote on, so we don't get plays within plays, or dishes within disks. And in that regard number five, by far, was my first choice because it really not only symbolizes what she -- I really like your idea, Mike, about the clover. But, I mean, it is the dish itself. I just find it alluring and beautiful.

Chair Marks: Okay, Erik?

Member Jansen: On the observe, I'm okay with one or five. There is one issue I have with five, however, and that is the way the hair braid, or a band, or something gives her a bit of the look of a horn out the back of her head. And I just would want to be careful on how that coins up and renders. So, when you look at the 05 rendering, it kind of looks like a horn coming out of the back of her head.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, I believe that's a comb in her hair.

Member Jansen: I think that's a better choice of words than I had. It looks like a horn to me. So, I prefer one or five with that proviso.

On the reverse, you guys have really got my head going differently here. I have not come with that thought, Gary. And I'm sure that's probably why the CFA chose number one. I find that kind of without much -- I don't know. It doesn't do much for me, when I look at five, and it does.

Eight, it's a little bit more contrived. Five is pretty abstract. You kind of may have to know the story. Quite honestly, I could live with five, or six, or nine. That's all.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Erik. Heidi?

Member Wastweet: While it may seem to us a bit trivial to memorialize china, nonetheless, china painting was her passion, and I respect that. And I think it is important because she created instead of just -- I think the cataloguing of the china was a bit secretarial, but her painting of the china was her creating, and it was her passion, and I can get behind that.

What baffles me here is this woman practically designed her own medal, and we didn't use it. She was known for a particular plate with an orchid on it, and it's not here. It would have been so simple to take that plate and put it in this circle. And I have it on my phone if you want to pass this around and look. This is her orchid, this is her plate, put in this circle. It's the simplest thing in the world, and we're not seeing it, and I don't understand that.

So, number five, while it's close, it is not her orchid. It's an orchid, but it's not her orchid. Number one is the china that she picked out, but it's not the china she created. And number eight is not her orchid.

Mr. Weinman: This is a point of clarification. I believe it actually is her orchid, just not from a plate. It's from a postcard she did, I believe.

Member Wastweet: But it's not her orchid plate.

Mr. Weinman: And you've had that, and you just let us all sit here and make fools of ourselves.

(Laughter.)

Mr. Weinman: This is the reverse.

Member Jansen: That's gorgeous. It's gorgeous.

Chair Marks: Are you done?

Member Wastweet: Would you like me to repeat that?

Chair Marks: Are you done?

Member Wastweet: I mean, I could comment on the others. I think as a second choice, I like number one, which is the CFA choice. It's interesting, but yes, I've spoken my piece.

Chair Marks: Okay. I'm going to explore this just a little bit. Is there any way that can become an option?

Mr. Harrigal: Well, I think if it's the recommendation of the Committee, they would consider it.

Chair Marks: It seems very simple, it's a straightforward --

Mr. Harrigal: We'd have to check and make sure there aren't any rights --

Chair Marks: Yes, this is the first this has ever come to my attention, or our attention, which means yes, the question is who owns the rights on this? Does anybody own rights on this? Is it protected in some way? Who has possession of it? These are all things that I can't give you an answer sitting here at the table.

(Background noise.)

Mr. Weinman: This is a good reason not to --

Mr. Harrigal: Late in the afternoon is --

Member Wastweet: I think the meeting just fell apart.

Mr. Weinman: It's the dramatic hamster.

Chair Marks: Yes, I think we have to ban iPads in a meeting.

Mr. Weinman: Let the record reflect -- no.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Mr. Weinman: The bottom line is, if this is

something that if requested we're happy to look into. I just can't give you -- obviously, I can't give you an answer sitting here today.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, there's nothing stopping us as a Committee to say we're going to add to the reverse choices a number ten.

Mr. Fishburn: That would require - since that design has not been reviewed by the Commission on Fine Arts, it would require a submission of that design to them.

Mr. Harrigal: I think the other thing we could look at it is, perhaps, is there one of these designs where we could insert that image into it?

Member Scarinci: Oh, yes, that's a good way.

Mr. Harrigal: Like this design here, you could insert that image into it.

Chair Marks: You could do it with number five.

Member Scarinci: Just correct the orchid, just correct it. That's all.

Mr. Harrigal: So, if the Committee so choose to recommend this design, substituting the orchid from the plate on it.

Member Wastweet: That's possible you wouldn't have her decorative border around it.

Mr. Harrigal: You could also put that in there, too, if you wanted to.

Member Wastweet: Okay.

Chair Marks: Yes. I think what we're suggesting is that the plate as she has rendered it on her phone there be inserted in where the orchid is now. Correct?

Member Wastweet: I'd be fine with that motion, yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, for all of us who might be inclined that way, maybe I should suggest that we do not add a number ten, but that we would support number five knowing that we would have a motion subsequent to the tally to support that idea. Thank you, Heidi.

So, I think we're ready to move to Mike.

Member Wastweet: Would we have trouble with -- what's the word -- crediting the artist who drew this, and then telling them to draw this? Is that a problem? I don't have a problem with it. I'm just asking legal.

Mr. Weinman: I mean, do we have --- we always have the right to move designs around. We own the designs; therefore, we can move them in and out. It doesn't mean that it's necessarily appropriate. And, once again, make whatever recommendations keeping in mind that if we're creating a new design, that could create issues for us that we need to examine. And you're right, even if we fundamentally change this design in a way that's so different, it might need to be represented to CFA another time. But I don't -- if I could recommend, I have no -- obviously, I have no issue with making any motion or giving any recommendations that you have. And we promise to look into them, but you may also want to examine the designs that are on the table right now.

And I'll just mention, keep in mind this is a 2012 program, and there is more of a time concern in this one, even more so than some of the other programs.

Chair Marks: Okay. All right. Mike?

Member Moran: Okay. On the obverse, bless her heart, she sure is -- I would -- number five presents her in the best light because she just is not a very handsome lady to me. And that's the only reason I would choose five in profile over the other two, matter of personal taste.

Turning to the reverse, Heidi has already destroyed that discussion. I have a couple of comments to make on it. First, assuming we -- you basically won me over. My first choice when I looked at these was number one because it wasn't a story board, and yet it covered the history of the key changes in the china service for the White House, really important ones, and I like that.

But then listening to the discussion, I certainly can go with five. I would suggest one change in it, because you've got the paintbrush underneath the petal of the lily. If it's going to be an actual design from a plate, that paintbrush is laying on the plate, so it would be over that lily petal. So, that needs to be changed.

And the last suggestion I have is if we all have our way and we redesign this, I think Heidi should take it to CFA and present it.

(Laughter.)

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you, Mike. Donald?

Member Scarinci: I yielded my time to the dramatic hamster, but in response to Heidi's presentation and discovery, I think we should do something to modify five to accommodate it. I would vote for that. I was going with five anyway, even before that, so five as modified.

On the obverse, I could go with either one or two. And I think -- I know CFA likes profiles. They've made that as clear as we have made that we like facing front or side faces in these coins. The series is mostly --- is almost all facing front or three-quarters left, three-quarters right, it's not profile. So, I think we should stick with that, and choose either one or two, and go with five as modified.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Donald. Okay. I believe that brings us to conclusion of the Harrison designs. Mark your sheets, please, and we'll now move on Frances Cleveland, second term.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. Frances Cleveland, second term designs. Frances Cleveland reentered the White House in 1893. Her husband was elected a second non-consecutive term. We have five candidate obverse designs for term two. Design one, two, design three, design four, design five.

On the reverse, design one is based on narrative number two, popularity with the public, second term. Frances Cleveland's popularity created many opportunities for her to be photographed by both professional photographers and the public. This design is inspired by the many photographs taken of Frances Cleveland.

Design two, popularity with the public, second term. This design is inspired by President and Mrs. Cleveland's Whistle Stop Tour during the second term. Mrs. Cleveland looks out into the crowd of well-wishers and supporters.

Design three is based on narrative number two, popularity with the public, second term. This design is a stylized rendering of Frances Cleveland's meeting with admirers at a public event.

Design four, based on narrative number three, educating women, second term. This design was inspired by Frances Cleveland's creation of a kindergarten program in the White House.

This is design five, based on narrative number three, educating women, second term. In this design, Frances Cleveland's passion for women's education is alluded to by depicting her in a conversation with two female students on the day of their graduation. The location is not meant to be a specific university campus.

Chair Marks: Okay. But we should understand that this sort of scene actually happened?

Mr. Harrigal: This is representative of education.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: Design number six is based on narrative number three, educating women, second term. This design depicts Mrs. Cleveland visiting a classroom of children.

And design seven, this design depicts Frances Cleveland's returning to Wells College to support and congratulate graduates between 1897 and 1899.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you. Any questions before we go forward? Okay, we're not all jumping.

Okay, let's go to the obverses, and let's determine what we want to continue to look at. Number one, is there interest in number one?

(Chorus of yeses.)

Chair Marks: Number two? No on two. Number three?

Number four? No on four. Number five? Okay. We've got two images to look at, one and three.

Mr. Harrigal: Gary, I'd like to submit that the CFA did not choose either obverse or reverse on this design.

Chair Marks: Okay, thank you. All right.

So, let's move now to the reverse. Starting with number one? Not hearing anything for one. Number two?

Number three? Nothing for number three? Number four? No on four. Number five?

Number six? Pass number six up. And number seven?

Okay. We are left with consideration of two, five, and seven. The others set aside.

So, this should be pretty simple. We've got two images for the obverse, and three for the reverse.

Is there someone who would like to start this discussion? Heidi, do you have any surprises for us?

Member Wastweet: No surprises.

Chair Marks: Because if you do, I'm going to start with you. Go ahead, anyway.

Member Wastweet: All right, I'll go ahead. I think obverse one and three are both quite nice. I have no preference between the two. Either one I think would be lovely.

On the reverses, I like the concept of number two. Again, it's so story board like we've been asking not to see, or not -- we haven't been fans of this style. We've got a lot of little people there, so I like the idea of it, but I can't fully support it for that reason.

Number five, we don't really need her to tell the story of women graduating. We have her portrait on the other side. It's a little repetitive. Number seven, we've got a schoolhouse in the background with a tree in front of it. The tree, especially, is not necessary. It obscures the building and serves no purpose.

I don't see any particular coining problems. I'm not real excited about this design. Nothing more to say.

Chair Marks: Okay. Michael?

Member Moran: I kind of feel like Heidi, I've got no choice. If I have to choose one on the obverse, it would be number one over number three, just personal preference.

The reverse I'm cold on all of them. I guess I don't like number seven because of the background clutter. I don't think number two would coin particularly well, which leaves number five on process of elimination. It's hardly a ringing endorsement.

Chair Marks: Donald?

Member Scarinci: One and two.

Chair Marks: That's it?

Member Scarinci: That's it.

Chair Marks: Okay. On the obverse, I'll go with number one. Does anyone know how old she would have been at this time period?

Member Moran: Twenty-one plus eight, 29.

Chair Marks: Twenty-nine?

Member Moran: She was 21 in 1886, so do my math, '93.

Chair Marks: Late 20s.

Member Moran: Late 20s.

Mr. Harrigal: Twenty-nine, 30 time frame, age.

Chair Marks: Okay. I guess number three looks a little old to me, but I like number one as far as the obverse goes. Number two, I'll preface this by saying all we have are story boards here, so I'm going to pick a story board. And I'll go with number two, however, with the reservation that maybe this is just me, but her face looks a little too old. I don't know if I'm looking at that right, but she looks a little --

Member Wastweet: It probably doesn't matter at that --

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Wastweet: It probably doesn't matter at that scale.

Chair Marks: Well, that's probably a good point. But, anyway -- so, I'll support number two. Donald, or Michael?

Member Olson: I can't believe you got the two of us mixed up.

(Laughter.)

Chair Marks: Yes, I can't either. It's been a long day. I'm not going to live that one down.

(Laughter.)

Member Olson: All right. Number one and number three, either one I could support for the obverse, leaning more towards number one.

On the reverses, they're all very cluttered, and nothing there really jumps out. I'm going to throw some points toward one of these designs and most likely it's going to be design number two, not because I particularly care for it, but I think out of what's offered it's probably the best of what's offered. That's it.

Chair Marks: Michael?

Member Bugeja: I can go with one or three on the obverse. I thought three had a little bit more character, but you're right, it's a little older. I like two because on those hats there should be a little press card. It's the popularity that outshone the President. I kind of like that motif. And the education ones I'm all for. Number seven has a building that could be any campus. I'm sure this is Iowa State College, but I won't --

The University of Northern Iowa, it's Iowa State College, or is my alma mater, Oklahoma State. But no, I actually do like the train image because it shows a little bit of her popularity, and that's what I really wanted to get.

Chair Marks: Erik?

Member Jansen: I'm going to favor on the obverse number one. Three was actually I think a more provocative picture, but I'm not sure it's appropriate.

On the reverse, I'm going to go with number two, and also going to cast a vote for number five, and

number seven. I think the narrative of popularity on a trip with the President is a much easier narrative to do a graphic on. At the same time, the education element is important, so I don't want two to win it by default. I'd encourage everyone to think about five or seven. Pick one.

Chair Marks: Okay. All right. At this point, I think we're finished with our First Spouses. I'll ask you to complete your tally sheets and get those in to Erik.

The next thing that we need to do is to talk about our annual report, but before we do that, I want to give Erik a chance to tally. I think I'm going to give us a break here, maybe a 10-minute break. I think we're doing well on the time right now, only because we don't have the 4:00 item that was previously scheduled. So, if we could please be back at 3:20, we'll get going with our discussion on the annual report. I want us to get a little bit of a break so we can clear our minds, and come back and focus on the annual report. And by then, maybe we'll have a tally to share, and we can make any final motions that might be needed on First Spouses. So, we're in recess.

(Whereupon, at 3:09 p.m., the above-entitled matter went off the record and resumed at 3:20 p.m.)

Chair Marks: Okay, we're back on the record, and we have some results for -- which ones do we have here? The first two -- oh, Erik, I'm sorry. Are we still working on the --

Member Jansen: Yes, give me a couple of minutes, and I'll give you the rest -- the last four.

#### Annual Report Discussion

Chair Marks: Okay. You know what, let's set the First Spouse aside for now and let's start our discussion on the annual report.

By way of reminder, our last meeting which was

back in September, we identified some potential recommendations for our FY '11 annual report. We had two years to make recommendations for, and for one of those was 2015. And for 2015, we discussed a recommendation for the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution. That was the only recommendation for that year we had on the table.

We already have another recommendation, either that or it's an active program. But suffice it to say that the two commemoratives for that year we needed to fill one slot. And then for 2016 we had a short list of some potential recommendations on which we needed to find two. And those recommendations that we had on the table in September were the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the National Park Service, the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the ASPCA, which is the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and we also had the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Transatlantic Cable. Then we had a none date-specific recommendation to honor Highway Route 66. As I recall there wasn't any hook there for any round number as far as the commemoration in years, but there was the discussion that I Mike kind of led on Route 66.

So, at this point, what I'd like to take out of this meeting are some concrete recommendations that could be dropped into our report. Based on our earlier discussions, these are the last three items that we need to identify, and we can get a draft of that report completed and to the staff for legal review, and whatever approvals they need to get.

So, I'll open up the floor now. And why don't we, so we can do this in an orderly fashion, are we all good with the Thirteenth Amendment for 2015, or do we want to talk about anything else? Are we good for that? Could I have a motion?

Member Jansen: What is the Thirteenth Amendment? Sorry to be ignorant.

Chair Marks: That's the one right after the Civil War

that deals with the whole slavery issue.

Member Jansen: The whole?

Chair Marks: Slavery.

Member Jansen: Oh, slavery. I'm sorry. Yes, I'll make the motion.

Chair Marks: Okay, go ahead.

Member Jansen: I move that we advance the idea of a commemorative to mark the anniversary of the Thirteenth Amendment.

Chair Marks: Okay, that would be the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary.

Member Jansen: It would be.

Chair Marks: Yes. Okay. Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: Okay. All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Opposed? Motion carried unanimously.

Okay, that narrows it down to 2016. I'll just open the floor up. Jump in there guys. What do you want to do?

Two slots, and we have one, two, three, I think we've got four. That doesn't preclude some other idea coming up, but those are the four we've got on the table right now.

Member Olson: I'll just make a pitch again for the Route 66 commemoration. It would be the 90<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the origination of that highway, which is very important to the country for the past 90 years. It served as a migration route for those fleeing the Depression and the Dust Bowl in the Midwest to get them to the land of promise in California. It served our country well during World

War II as a major supply route, a lot of military bases and a lot of factories along that route right through the heart of the country.

It spans approximately, I believe it's 2,500 miles from Chicago to Los Angeles. Upon the cessation of World War II, many returning veterans and other folks that now had some freedom and time to roam the country took that route on vacation. It goes through eight different states. And many iconic images are associated with Route 66.

We've got all kinds of interesting architecture that could be depicted on a series of coins. The drive-in movie theater, the drive-in restaurant, several different classic cars, Thunderbirds, Corvettes. It's really America.

Route 66 is very important not only to people here in the U.S., but it's also very important to folks that live outside of the U.S. They come here, and this is -- this may be hard for some people to believe, but that road is, for the most part, still there and marked. It's not an official highway any more, but it's a collection of state highways and county highways that are connected with signs that depict the route. And many people, not only our U.S. citizens, but folks from other countries come here specifically to drive that route or a portion of it to get to the heart of America. They don't want to take a look -- they want to see more than what's on the coasts. And that road runs Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. And it truly is a cross section of the country.

I think a program based on that, a three-coin program, however many coins you could get out of it would provide us with a lot of good designs to take a look at, that I believe would be a commercially viable option for the Mint. I believe something along those lines with the architecture and the iconic images that I described would be popular not only with coin collectors, but also a

broad section of the public.

Chair Marks: Thank you. Very well stated as far as the pitch goes.

Member Jansen: Don't forget Winona.

Member Olson: And the song, yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. We've got one pitch in there. Someone else, please, what are your preferences?

Member Bugeja: I think Michael Ross' ASPCA is a good choice. I think it is an organization worthy of commemorative coins. In many ways that's what we try to do, is commemorate societies. And he's not here today, and I'd like to maybe endorse his idea in his absence.

Mr. Weinman: What is the event?

Chair Marks: The 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the formation of the ASPCA.

Member Bugeja: Of the ASPCA.

Member Jansen: I'd like to kind of have his idea remembered, as well. It's been a while since I've seen kind of some consumer centric commemoratives come out. It seems to be we do a lot of military work, we do a lot of other kind of government-related stuff. You do a Route 66, and that may bring out some really nice fanaticism. And the ASP -- the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals brings out a different set. I mean, let's call it the road killers and the anti-road killers.

(Laughter.)

Member Jansen: Well, they could be marketed together that way. Of course, I'm kidding. But I do think it actually would be refreshing. We've got baseball coming up here. Right? We've got a baseball commemorative --

Mr. Fishburn: It has not passed yet.

Member Jansen: Okay, so it's out there being put into the loop. So, nonetheless, I would support the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I think it's a social issue that will get some more traction.

Chair Marks: Okay. You know, on that one, is there any contrary idea about ASPCA? Any reason we don't want to do it? Is that one we're comfortable moving on?

Member Wastweet: From an artistic standpoint, I think it has wide open possibilities of imagery. It's not as difficult to depict as some other topics.

Member Scarinci: And it'll sell. People love animals.

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Member Jansen: Has anyone approached that organization to see if they want to sponsor this, i.e., would they accept the funds from it?

Chair Marks: Generally, we've not approached organizations. We have a recommendation right now that used to be associated with a group, and that's the National Fallen Firefighters. We kind of detached it from their organization this last time, so I think that's -- that's up to anybody. It's up to the folks here at the Mint to make contact if it's going to be made. I don't think that's our proper role to be contacting organizations.

Member Jansen: Well, we know that they exist, at least, so there's --

Chair Marks: Oh, yes.

Member Jansen: -- potential for friction or opportunity depending on how it's looked at. Is there a similar organization, the Society for Prevention of Abuse to Route 66?

Member Olson: There is a -- the National Park Service actually does have a --

Member Jansen: The National Park Service.

Member Olson: I believe. There's a historic preservation group. I can't give you the specifics on it, but there is a group that promotes and preserves the remaining landmarks along Route 66.

Chair Marks: Okay. I'm going to just -- my sense of what I'm hearing, it sounds like we have support to move on the ASPCA theme. And if that's so, I would like to accept a motion.

Member Bugeja: I move that we accept the ASPCA as one of our commemorative issues.

Member Jansen: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay, it's been moved and seconded for the ASPCA commemoration. Is there any further discussion before we vote?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: Okay. All those in favor please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Opposed? Motion carries unanimously. That narrows it down for us to one. Mike has made a impassioned plea for - I hope that's accurate - for Route 66. Did I understand you to say that we attach it to a 90<sup>th</sup> anniversary?

Member Olson: I don't really think -- everybody is really focused on anniversaries and hard dates. There's really nothing that says that a coin has to be --

Chair Marks: We don't need to.

Member Olson: But I really think a coin like that would be a winner for the Mint. I think there's a broad cross section of not only our citizens, but people around the world that would look at those coins.

And the other thing, too, is you've got eight states.

I don't think you'd probably have a whole lot of problem getting Senators and Representatives to back something like that. It's a big tourism boom, and I was going to bring some books, but my luggage was full. There's all kinds of books that show what's out there. And it's a resurgent movement. The last part of Route 66 as an official U.S. highway, was bypassed in 1984. But since then, as I stated before, the patchwork of the road is still there, 90 percent of it's still there. It's being marked, and it's being promoted as a tourist destination.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Olson: I make a motion that we recommend a coin series depicting the art and images that could be found along Route 66.

Chair Marks: Okay. When you say a series, are you speaking of a half dollar, silver dollar, and a five-dollar gold, which would be the traditional assemblage?

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Moran: You might want to consider that we've got eight states, you do eight different reverse designs or something on a half dollar, because you'll get better Congressional support --

Member Olson: That would be --

Member Moran: Heidi is over here. I'm just repeating what she told me.

Member Olson: And give each state a shot at --

Chair Marks: Common obverse?

Member Olson: It wouldn't necessarily need to be.

Chair Marks: Well, what I'm saying is it simplifies the program if we have a common obverse. And it

also lends to collector mentality that they all belong to each other.

Member Olson: People are going to want -- everyone -- so, yes, I think that's a great idea. If you buy one, you're going to want them all. And I think that would be an awesome idea.

Chair Marks: So, we're talking about a series of eight half dollars?

Member Moran: You could do the dollar and you --

Chair Marks: What's that?

Member Moran: If do you a dollar, the dollar size, you've got a bigger --

Member Olson: Yes, that would be a great idea. So, we want to make it specific?

Chair Marks: Your motion for Route 66 is an eight silver dollar series, common obverse, and one reverse for each state.

Member Olson: Yes, that would be awesome.

Member Bugeja: Just as a point of order, Gary. Should we not discuss Michael Ross' Transatlantic Cable, as well, before we vote on it, because you're looking for two programs. Is that right?

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Bugeja: He's not here, so I am going to voice -- I know he did some preliminary work for you, and I added to that. And I wondered whether you wanted to go directly to a vote, or did you want to out of deference to him consider that, as well?

Chair Marks: We've got a motion on the table here. I hear what you're saying. I think our vote is going to reveal what we want to do. Correct?

Mr. Fishburn: I ask for clarification of the --

Chair Marks: Could we --

Mr. Fishburn: Is your motion to do a circulating commemorative, or a commemorative of half dollars?

Chair Marks: I think we have switched to silver dollars, but I think it's just a commemorative.

Member Olson: The Congressional --- we're looking for recommendations for the two slots for the Congressional --

Chair Marks: Yes. So, we're not talking about half dollars circulate anyway, but --

Mr. Fishburn: You may want to be cognizant of the Committee's predecessor's recommendations on mintage levels and number of coins.

Chair Marks: Translate.

Mr. Fishburn: The 500,000 silver limitation that's in law, and came out of this Committee's predecessor, the CCCAC.

Member Olson: How does that impact what we're talking about here?

Mr. Fishburn: Well, if you get eight silver dollars, if you -- you would severely be limiting the issue, the mintages, or you would be breaking the mintage limits.

Member Olson: Right, because that 750 is it, or is it 500?

Mr. Fishburn: It's 750 for the clad, 500 for the silver, and 100,000 for the gold.

Chair Marks: Yes, you would be limiting yourself to about 62,000.

Member Olson: Well, I'll tell you what, what did we sell of the Army and -- about 100 of each this year? Is that right?

Mr. Fishburn: I'm not sure, but I think it's a little

higher than that, though.

Member Olson: Okay. But it would certainly be a highly desirable set if that's -- if 60,000 of each were made. Is it within our purview to recommend something other than a precious metal issuance? Because I think there could be some good support for this, if we included one for each state.

Mr. Fishburn: You could recommend it.

Member Jansen: What if you did half dollars for the -- per state, because here's where my head is going on this. It would also be an interesting breath of fresh air to put these out at a lower price than normal. So, in order to make that happen use a base metal product, and half dollars is what comes to my mind, larger coin and have more fun with it.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes. Typically, the commemorative coin program would be the one dollar silver coin 90/10 composition. It could be a five or ten dollar gold coin depending on -- they go back and forth on the gold coin. And then it may or may not have the half dollar. Those are generally the three denominations that are used within the programs.

Member Bugeja: I have a question for Michael. Michael, do they have a Route 66 Historical Society? Is there anything with Route 66 that the commemorative actually would generate funds for? Because as I understand it, it doesn't exist.

Member Olson: No, it does. There is. And I -- if somebody could do a little searching on the internet here, there is -- I believe they're affiliated with the National Park Service. There is an organization that is doing something to preserve and promote Route 66. But I can't tell you what that is.

Member Bugeja: That would be key.

Chair Marks: So, we're talking about half dollars? Does the half dollars really limit us to 500,000 on it?

Mr. Fishburn: The issue is 750.

Chair Marks: 750.

Mr. Fishburn: But the surcharge would be less. I don't recall exactly what it is, but there's a different surcharge for each level of coin.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Olson: Can you imagine what the packaging would be if you had all eight of those in some kind of map, or something to depict the Route.

Member Jansen: You could hit the web, again. Yes, that would work.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Wastweet: Mike, there's a Route 66 Preservation Foundation and a Route 66 Association.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, at least a couple of -- okay. So, we have a motion on the table. I'm feeling a little bit funny about Transatlantic Cable. But I have no idea where the Committee is on supporting the Route 66 idea, so parliamentary process would require me to go ahead and let's have the question on Route 66. Depending on the outcome of that, then we would consider other options.

Member Moran: Have we decided on whether we're going to move for a dollar or a half?

Chair Marks: I'm understanding it's a half dollar. The motion maker?

Member Olson: Andy, how hard would that be to get it switched if we were going to do something like that, the mintage levels?

Mr. Fishburn: No Congress can restrict a future Congress' actions, so you could theoretically override the law.

Member Olson: We'd be close to 100,000.

Mr. Fishburn: We'd be going with the Committee's previous recommendations. That would be the larger precedent.

Member Olson: If we made a recommendation and it did catch fire with several of the states' delegations, I think they would probably be amenable to change that, or not? And if not, then I would recommend we go with 750 on the half dollar, and see where that --

Chair Marks: That's my suggestion. Let's work within the confines that we know work, and then if Congress wants to do what Congress wants to do different, but we've got to work within the framework that we've got.

Mr. Fishburn: You could theoretically recommend a program and discuss the concept in the recommendation, and then leave it to the Congress to decide how they wanted to deal with the mintage level issue.

Member Olson: Yes, if we did make such a recommendation then would that be within your area to work with Congress to explain what our proposal is, and try to gain support?

Mr. Fishburn: The annual report should stand on its own.

Member Olson: Okay.

Mr. Fishburn: And it is up to Congress to work Congress' will.

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: That would give us just over 94,000 each. We could make that recommendation, 94,000 each of these eight.

Member Olson: I think they'd sell every one of them. I really do.

Chair Marks: Okay. All right. So, we're all clear on the motion I hope. Are we?

Member Jansen: Restate it if you would, please.

Member Olson: I make a motion that 2016 we recommend a half dollar themed commemorative program that will allow each state to have one half dollar with a common obverse and a state-specific reverse that commemorates the history and importance of Route 66 to the development of the country, and its contributions to our culture.

Chair Marks: Okay, that's the motion. Who is the second on it? Do we have a second?

Member Jansen: I'll second it.

Chair Marks: Okay, Erik is the second. Okay. So, we're -- everyone is clear on the motion. Is there any further discussion?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: Okay. All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Raise hands. One, two, three, four, five. Opposed? Did you vote?

Member Bugeja: I'm going to abstain.

Chair Marks: You were six. Okay. Six with one abstention. Okay, six. Motion carries. Okay, so our - - we're good with what we've got. Right? Okay.

One thing I want to circle back on that came out of this last discussion, and that is when we talk about ASPCA, are we talking about just a standalone silver dollar? And I'll just say, I would suggest if we're looking at an ambitious eight-coin -- pairing this with an eight-coin program in the same year, that maybe -- I don't know, ASPCA could either be just a silver dollar or maybe a silver dollar and a half dollar. I wouldn't go more than --

Member Bugeja: I'd like to see the ASPCA put forth as a program, as well. But the chips fall where they may. I think that's a much more viable series than Route 66.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, define that as far as a series. What denominations are you thinking?

Member Bugeja: I was thinking basically of half dollars. I think that's appropriate. It's a big enough canvas for the different animals that we could have on there. And it's really going to help the cause. I mean, there are -- the abandoned -- I can only speak at university towns alone, but the number of abandoned animals has risen tremendously with the economic downturn. And I just think that this is a program that could actually do some humanitarian good.

Chair Marks: Others? I need to know what to write in the report about the program itself, what are we talking about?

Member Bugeja: I'd like to have half dollars, a series of half dollars.

Chair Marks: How many?

Member Bugeja: Eight. I mean, four.

Member Jansen: How about one for each leg, they're four-legged animals.

Member Bugeja: Four-legged animals. We'll take Erik's advice.

Member Olson: One for each breed of dog, and --

Chair Marks: Guys, you know what, I'll just put this on the record. I think we're overreaching in the one year.

Mr. Fishburn: The standard --

Chair Marks: I'm not sure what to do with it, but I kind of feel like if we go more than two, we're just -

- we're out there.

Mr. Fishburn: The standard commemorative profile is a clad silver gold providing options --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Fishburn: So, you've got an obverse and reverse for each coin.

Member Bugeja: You know, I'm only interested in how much -- the funding that it could generate for a needy cause. So, whatever the -- I'm less interested in how to achieve that than to defer to the Mint on what would be the best combination. It could be the 90 percent silver dollar.

Chair Marks: Precious metal is going to give you --

Member Bugeja: If that's going to give more funds to the ASPCA, then that's what I want to do.

Chair Marks: Okay, so we're talking silver dollar.

Member Bugeja: Yes, and I think it would make it more viable, so I'm going to go backtrack on my recommendation and take yours.

Chair Marks: The three?

Member Bugeja: Standard commemorative of silver dollar, half dollar.

Member Jansen: With the gold on the top or not?

Member Bugeja: No.

Member Jansen: Okay.

Member Bugeja: No, because I want it to be affordable.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay, so half dollar, one dollar.

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chair Marks: Do we need a motion on that, or do we consider that part of what we already did? I think that's what we already did. I'm not hearing objections. Okay.

And then back to the Thirteenth Amendment. We're just talking about silver dollars.

Member Jansen: Well, there's two ways to go in my view, either a silver dollar or the standard kind of compliant gold-silver clad layer.

Chair Marks: I don't know, for some reason it's just hitting me just a silver dollar. I don't know. Anyone else? How much can you do with the Thirteenth Amendment? Maybe a lot, maybe that was an ignorant comment, but --

Member Jansen: I'm fine with it. I'm fine with it. I think as Michael just said, the bulk of the work is done by the silver dollar.

For your information, Gary, the Transatlantic Cable, 1858. It was laid in 1858.

Chair Marks: So, are we in the wrong year?

Member Jansen: 1858, do the math.

Chair Marks: Okay, we're in the wrong year.

Member Jansen: We're in the wrong year.

Chair Marks: Okay. You know what, I'm going to move us forward. Let's talk about the outcome of our First Spouses.

We can -- well, you're right on top of it. Can someone bring up the images as we talk about them here, please.

Okay. For Alice Paul on the obverse, we're clearly coming -- we clearly support five. Five had 16 of the 21 possible, the other scores were number one had four votes, two and three were zero, four had two, six had one, seven had ten. So, our

recommendation would go to number five.

For the reverse, nearly a perfect score for number four, 20 out of 21, with design number two picking up three votes, all others zero. So, number four would be our clear recommendation for Alice Paul on the reverse.

Moving on Cleveland first term, design number seven received 16, and we therefore get our recommendation. Other designs receiving votes were number one at four votes, number two at five, design number three at five, four received zero, five two, and design number six zero.

Cleveland reverse term number one, 13 of the 21 possible number five. So, that would be our choice. The only other two designs that received any support were number three received two points, and number eight received three. All the others were zero, so pretty -- although, it's a low -- the 13 that's low, but it's clear and away the choice.

Okay. Moving on the Harrison obverse, design number one received 15, so that would be our recommendation. Designs two and five received seven each, the others zero. Harrison reverse, another far and away 18 of 21 to design five on the reverse. And others receiving support were number one received three, number four received two, number eight received five, all others zero. And I'll remind us all, we probably want to revisit number five because I know that was heavily -- that point score was heavily influenced by Heidi's introduction of the china issue.

Let's move on to Cleveland term two. Design number one received 19. Design number three received 12, and the other three zero. So, one would be our recommendation.

On the reverse our recommendation goes to two, design two with 14. Designs five and seven each received five, all others zero. So, at this point I would entertain any motions that need to be

considered to round out our business on the First Spouses.

Member Olson: I make a motion on Harrison number five reverse that we encourage the use of the design that Heidi showed us, but barring that, if we do either that or the one that's been selected, I also further make a motion that we add her personal mark onto the coin.

Chair Marks: Can we take those one at a time?

Member Olson: Okay.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, we've got the first motion to recommend substituting the china image provided or introduced to us through Heidi in place of the orchid that currently exists on the design. Do I have a second?

Member Wastweet: I should second that.

Chair Marks: You should second it. Okay. So, it's been moved and seconded. What discussion, if any, do we have?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: I don't hear any, so those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Opposed? That sounds unanimous to me. So, that will be our recommendation on reverse number five for Harrison. Did you want to follow through, Mike?

Member Olson: Second motion, that her mark, the four-leaf clover, be added in a small way to whichever design is selected.

Member Bugeja: I second that.

Chair Marks: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Opposed? That sounds unanimous, too.

Member Moran: I'm going to stick one more motion in there, Gary.

Chair Marks: Go for it.

Member Moran: I move that if we accept or end up with number five as depicted, that we move the paintbrush to be over the lily petal, not under.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, if five remains as five is, then what do we want to do with the paintbrush? I'm sorry.

Member Moran: Place it over the lily petal, not under.

Chair Marks: Say again.

Member Moran: Place it over the lily petal, not under.

Chair Marks: Paintbrush over the lily petal. Okay.

Member Bugeja: Otherwise it's not a design, it's just a flower with some brushes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Can I have a second on that.

Member Olson: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay. Some discussion? All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Opposed? That also sounds unanimous to me. Is there anything else we need to consider, Committee?

Member Wastweet: I have a motion on the Frances Cleveland reverse five first term. I motion that the hairstyle be corrected to reflect her iconic style.

Member Jansen: Do we have a template of what that should look like?

Member Wastweet: It's on the obverse, all of the obverses.

Member Jansen: So, which of the obverses would be the quintessential coif?

Member Wastweet: All of the obverses reflect the fringe hair at the nape of the neck.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, we want to alter the hairstyle to reflect?

Member Wastweet: Fringe hair at the nape of the neck.

Chair Marks: What is it?

Member Wastweet: The fringe hair at the nape of the neck.

Chair Marks: Fringe?

Member Wastweet: Fringed.

Member Jansen: It's kind of blocked hair, Gary. That's what they call it in Montana.

Chair Marks: Blocked hair?

Member Jansen: Blocked hair, yes.

Chair Marks: Fringed hairstyle. Okay. Is there a discussion on that?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: All those in favor?

Member Wastweet: Do we have a second?

Chair Marks: Oh, I'm sorry. Second?

Member Moran: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay, Michael Moran seconds. All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

Chair Marks: Opposed? Unanimous. Anything else, Committee?

Okay. Now I'll look to staff, is there anything else we need to cover before we adjourn?

(No response.)

### Conclude Meeting

Chair Marks: Okay. You know what, I want to thank everyone who took part in all this today, staff, Committees, and thank you for your total attention and dedication to the process today.

I think it was a good process. We made a lot of progress in a lot of areas. We got the work done, and I appreciate all of you, and all of you contributed today.

We'll be in touch. I guess at this point our next meeting is a little uncertain, but we're probably looking at February.

Mr. Fishburn: Next in-person meeting is likely to be February.

Chair Marks: Is what?

Mr. Fishburn: Next in-person meeting is likely to be February.

Chair Marks: Likely to be February.

Member Jansen: Can we shoot for the fourth Thursday just nominally?

Mr. Fishburn: If there is a fourth Thursday. I think there has to be -- always at the end of February.

Chair Marks: The Mint will be in touch with all of us concerning that matter. And is there anything else before we adjourn?

(No response.)

Chair Marks: Okay, we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 3:56 p.m.)