

United States Mint
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee
Meeting

Friday, November 22, 2013

The Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee met in Conference Room A, 2nd Floor, at 801 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., Gary B. Marks, Chair, presiding.

CCAC Members Present:

Gary B. Marks, Chair
Michael Bugeja
Erik Jansen
Michael Moran
Michael Olson*
Michael A. Ross
Donald Scarinci
Jeanne Stevens-Sollman
Thomas J. Uram
Heidi Wastweet

United States Mint Staff Present:

Steve Antonucci
Tom Bernardi*
Betty Birdsong
Don Everhart
Michael Gaudio*
Joe Menna
Bill Norton
April Stafford
Megan Sullivan
Greg Weinman

Contents

2014 American Eagle Coin Program	4
2014 First Spouse Coin Program	35
Tally of First Spouse 2014	74
2015 March of Dimes Coin Program	76
2015/2016 First Spouse Themes	92
Visual Definition of Design Excellence	107

Proceedings

(10:10 a.m.)

2014 American Eagle Coin Program

Chair Marks: Calling this Friday, November 22nd, 2013 meeting of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee to order.

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here.

Michael Olson, are you on the line?

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. So Michael is joining us via telephone.

The first item on our agenda is the discussion of letter and minutes from the previous meeting. You were just handed the minutes from the October 18th meeting. So I would suggest that later in our day, we circle back and take a motion to approve the minutes. I won't ask you to do it on this short of order. And we'll just approve the letter at the same time.

So with that, we can move down to review and discussion of candidate designs for the 2014 American Eagle Platinum Coin Program.

And, April Stafford, can you give us your report, please?

Ms. Stafford: Yes, sir. Before we do that, if I could just ask whoever is, has called in to the meeting, can you identify yourselves, please, for the record?

Mr. Gaudio: Hi. This is Mike Gaudio, sculptor/engraver in Philadelphia.

Mr. Menna: Joe Menna, Philadelphia, sculptor/engraver.

Mr. Bernardi: And Tom Bernardi, lead acting sculptor/engraver.

Member Olson: This is Mike Olson, CCAC member.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. Thank you. It is 31 USC 5112(k) that grants the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to mint and issue platinum bullion coins and proof platinum coins. The specifications and designs are left to the Secretary's discretion.

Beginning with the coin's debut in 1997, American Eagle platinum proof coin designs have depicted the Statue of Liberty on the obverse. The reverse designs of the platinum proof coins change from year to year.

In 2009, the United States Mint introduced a six year platinum proof coin series that explores the core concepts of American democracy by highlighting the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

This program examines the six principles of the preamble: 2009, to form a more perfect union; 2010, to establish justice; 2011, to ensure domestic tranquility; 2012, to provide for the common defense; and in 2013, to promote the general welfare.

The 2014 designs which we're considering today are based on a narrative by Chief Justice Roberts on the meaning of the sixth principle, to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

The reverse designs in previous series have featured eagles supporting the American Eagle Brand. So to balance the goals of brand identity and artistic freedom an American Eagle privy mark appears on the reverse design of these coins.

Required inscriptions are United States of America, .9995 platinum, \$100, and one ounce.

So today we have a total of 12 reverse designs for your consideration.

In designs 1 and 2, liberty releases a dove, giving it

the greatest blessing, the freedom to become independent. I'm sorry. We'll have to pause for a second. Okay.

So I know that all of the Committee members have the correct designs in their binders. Shall I continue while we're sorting out, making sure we have the right slide presentation or shall we pause to see how long this might take?

Chair Marks: Yes, I think keep going.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. And so if you would like me to pause so that you can reference the larger designs that you've printed out in your binders, I can do that. So again, in designs 1 and 2, liberty releases a dove, giving it the greatest blessing, the freedom to become independent. So we have designs 1 and designs 2.

And if you can refer to design 3 in your binder, it depicts the blessings of knowledge, plenty, peace, and freedom surrounding the central figure of liberty. The lamp of learning is held in the hands of posterity. And again, that was design 3. Will you reference design 4 in your binder, please? This design depicts the blessings of liberty being freedom and prosperity represented here in design 4 by a dove alighting on a young girl's hands and a swag of fruit and grain. Again, that was design 4.

If you could reference designs 5 and 6? Okay. Designs 5 and 6 depict a granite monument inscribed with the Latin phrase *Libertas Perpetua* and United States of America, symbolizing the permanence of liberty as one of our nation's ideals. The blessings of liberty are represented by the shade of the liberty tree elm. Lady liberty harbors a young boy and girl who represents America's posterity. So here is design 5 and 6.

In design 7, liberty holds a child representing our posterity. The child reaches for the torch of liberty aspiring to hold it.

In design 8, America, a young nation stands on high ground with the Constitution held in her extended hand. The Constitution is surrounded by 13 stars symbolizing the beginning of our nation. She cradles an olive sprig in her left arm. Design 9 shows America striding confidently into the future guided by an eagle of freedom and protected by the Constitution.

In design 10, lady liberty passes her torch to two contemporary American children. The children firmly grasp the torch with both hands, securing it for the future.

Design 11 depicts a young liberty carrying her torch high. Her youth symbolizes the hope and promise of the new America, while the gentle landscape symbolizes harmony, pleasure, and sociability, blessings that flow from a government that ensures freedom passes from one generation to the next.

And in design 12 -- which was the CFA's preference -- the hands of liberty plant a sprouting acorn into fertile soil as a symbol of securing the blessing of liberty. As the tree matures, it will produce its own acorns ensuring that these blessings are secured for years to come. The preamble to the Constitution was also planted, so to speak, with this last phrase and allowed our nation to sprout from the 13 original colonies to a strong nation of 50 states.

So if it's okay, I'll just ask that we go back and we can just flip through those one more time so that the members can see them on the screen.

Starting with design 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

Chair Marks: Thank you, April.

A technical question. On the descriptives of each of the designs, for number 9, it reads "Guided by a dove of freedom." I just noticed you called it an eagle.

Ms. Stafford: I did.

Chair Marks: I didn't think it looked like a dove. But is it intended to be an eagle?

Ms. Stafford: Yes, sir. We had fun with that yesterday at the CFA meeting and it is, indeed, an eagle.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Ms. Stafford: Not a fierce dove. Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you. Are there other technical questions before we do our artistic review?

Member Jansen: Is there a requirement to have an eagle on this coin? And is that satisfied on the other side?

Ms. Stafford: I mentioned in the introduction the use of the privy mark, American Eagle privy mark. So that would satisfy the tradition of having --

Member Jansen: And the privy mark is on the obverse? Because I don't see a privy mark on --

Ms. Weinman: It's added in.

Member Jansen: It's added in? In a particular place, way, or --

Mr. Bernardi: This is Tom. The privy mark is always on the reverse.

Member Jansen: Okay. So we don't see in these designs where the privy mark would be applied?

Ms. Stafford: It's added in after.

Ms. Weinman: It's a very small privy mark.

Member Jansen: I --

Ms. Weinman: And number two, it's not a legal requirement, it's a traditional requirement. It's just because the American Eagle series -- Member

Jansen: Is that anything that was discussed at the CFA as to where a privy mark might be put on this? So that's just at the discretion of the sculptor?

Ms. Stafford: Correct. Similar to the initials, the placement of the initials, yes, sir.

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Chair Marks: Other technical questions? Any?

Okay. Since there aren't any more then we'll begin our review process. And I've asked Michael Bugeja to begin.

Michael.

Member Bugeja: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Chair Marks: Oh, excuse me, Michael. I need to do something first. Usually, we go through a process when we have a dozen or so designs and then we go to the initial cullings. And I wanted to do that, first. I apologize, Michael, for the false start there.

I think we're all familiar with this process. I'm going to hold up each design and, hopefully, they can coordinate up on the screen. And if we want to review a design then we only need one member to indicate that they wish to have it reviewed. But if I hear no interest then we'll set those particular designs aside. And we'll focus our time on those designs that we have interest in.

So beginning with number 1. Okay. There's interest in that. So we'll consider number 1.

Number 2. No interest in that one. We'll set that one aside.

Number 3. Setting 3 aside. Number 4.

Yes. We'll consider that one further.

Five.

Considering 5. Number 6?

Member Jansen: Similar, yes. Chair Marks: Seven? Eight?

Nine. Nine? Setting nine aside. Ten? Setting 10 aside.

I will say yes to 11.

Twelve.

Okay. We'll consider number 12. Okay.

So for the record, we have remaining for consideration 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, and 12. And I'll ask the members to make note of that. And let's focus our energies there.

So with that, I will recognize Michael.

Member Bugeja: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In going through designs, what I look for are ample fields, movement, and orientation.

And this particular design has it, the free dove, a more multi-cultural look. We'll see even more multi-cultural looks, which I approve of, as an icon of liberty a little bit later.

There's ample fields. Coming from Iowa, I would say that when you've been living next to 31 acres of a county park and water, be careful about eagles and doves. Okay. Be real careful. Use a privy mark and but make sure it's an iconic privy mark. Enough said on that score.

But I thought this had clear fields, the mottos are balanced, there's movement, there's flight, and a nice iconic liberty-like woman.

Going to number 4, I thought a lot of the bounty was ornate, perhaps too ornate, and took up too much of the field. I, you know, a lot of the fields here are -- have fillers. And if you're going to put a privy mark somewhere here, again, it's going to be even hard to find where to place it.

Though one thing that I wanted to bring attention to was Morgan's design of the Morgan dollar, where he has so many different symbols and devices. But they are not as large as this to make such an impact. And they are woven into lady liberty's cap there. They are small. You can be ornate but when you expand the ornateness of something like this, it's taking away from the dove. It's getting busy with the iconic liberty. The mottos are large. The whole effect, to me, is unappealing.

The next one, I really liked because it had some, a more modern stylistic design to it, combined with ethnic faces, which we seldom see in our coinage and which now are the majority of citizens of the United States.

I liked it for a lot of other reasons too. There are some fields in here. I'm not, you know -- the tree does give a little depth and satisfies as a tree of liberty as well.

I would be open to perhaps reducing the monument a little bit and the fonts a little bit to see if that helps.

I think the United States of America legend is too large and detracts from the other devices that have more symbolic appeal.

So in other words, there are things that I like here but I think it can be improved. Perpetual liberty is very nice.

I have the same comments on the next design.

The number 7, we are considering and I did not -- this did not appeal to me. It didn't appeal to me for a couple of reasons.

One, I've seen this before. We have the waving flag, we have, you know, the newborn, with what looks like laurels in his hair.

There are a lot of -- I can't remember the medal but

maybe Heidi or Mike will remember it. It came out right after the Revolutionary War. And it depicted a lady liberty striking down British rule and the, kind of a baby portraying the United States. Do you remember that particular medal? I wish I had it, I wish I could remember the name of it. It came out right after the Revolutionary War.

And so actually the baby does represent -- doesn't necessarily represent future generations, in my mind.

Now the next one is 8, is -- my first impression was wow. I really like it. And then I backed away. It's kind of a liberty as super hero. And then it approaches the glitchy. But then I'm thinking, well you know what? Liberty probably is the ultimate super hero. And so I went back and forth on it. And I just decided to go with my gut feeling. When I saw it, it just was striking to me.

The movements, the striding, the 13 stars. And there's an example of devices used economically which is, you know, everything at about what she's carrying and what she's wearing, it looks like a superwoman cape. You know what? It pushes the edge but I think it made an impact because it pushed the edge.

The number 11, you know, the first thing I thought of was the Olympic torch. I didn't think of anything else. I don't -- this is unappealing. Sun rising, we've seen all that before. There's a road. It must be the yellow brick road. I'm not sure what that is.

And you know, I'm going to hear it from others on this but I absolutely thought 12 was the worst of all the designs.

And I want to say why from a numismatic perspective. It's bad. The stars, you don't need to do that. You put them on the edge or you don't make it a rim. They have two rims, two borders. If you look at the hands and the borders that go there. And from a numismatic perspective, this is

just filler.

And the idea of planting an oak tree for future generations on a \$100 coin, you know, it looks something out of a gardening manual. It's a magazine design.

I can see why the CFA picked it but from a numismatic perspective, I have absolutely no liking for it. Sorry.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. We'll go to Donald.

Member Scarinci: You know, I think, I wish the CFA, you know, would really take a little more time and explain why they pick what they pick. And I think, you know -- and I want to talk about this for a minute. You know, and I think we have to ask ourselves why did they pick this one? You know, it's obviously not good. You know, it's not obviously not something, you know --

Ms. Stafford: Mr. Scarinci, we actually do have feedback specifically about why they chose this or recommended this design.

Member Scarinci: Oh, go ahead.

Ms. Stafford: Sure.

Member Scarinci: I'd love to hear it.

Ms. Sullivan: It's just the notes that I took in the meeting. So, they thought it was powerful. Then I also have, it's precise and straight -- concise and straightforward. It's a strong statement. They think that the figurative can be problematic. They liked the symmetry in the image and they said it was a poetic and simple idea.

Member Scarinci: And they think the imagery of the others would be problematic?

Ms. Sullivan: They just said that the figurative images --

Member Scarinci: The figurative images. Okay.

Ms. Sullivan: -- could be problematic.

Member Scarinci: I suspect -- and that's what, that was my thought -- I suspect that the reason they chose this one is because it's the only one that's not a figurative image.

And I think the problem with all of the others, you know, and you know, is that we, you know, we seem to want to, we seem to want to keep redoing, you know -- we all love Saint-Gaudens. And we all love Weinman. And we all love these classic designs. We love them. Right? They are, you know, as kids, we loved them, we collect them, you know, we grew up with them, we adore them. You know, but, you know, at some point, you know, we really all have to acknowledge that Adolph Weinman is dead. Right. You know, you know, like, it's over. So you know, so we really have to move on.

You know, and you know, and I think, and I think, you know, the problem with all the others is they just, you know, they're never going to, you know -- it is as impossible today to duplicate Weinman and Saint-Gaudens as it would be if Weinman and Saint-Gaudens were alive today to produce something that any art gallery in New York would show. I mean, that's reality. I mean, the aesthetic, you know, the what is art? It's absolutely different.

And so I think, you know, I think until we get that, until we get, accept this, all right, you know, that if you want to depict liberty, you know, depict liberty, you know, attempt to depict liberty in a new and modern way. And you know, and the icons of the torch, you know, and all of these classic elements, you know, they had their place, they had their time.

And you know, we're, you know, I mean, we dress liberty. I mean, if we're going to take a woman and, you know, dress her like this, at least put her in designer clothes. I mean, put her in something that you're going to see a contemporary woman wear. I

mean, I don't know what this even is. It's not a, it's not -- I don't know what it is. You know, it's Greek? It's ancient Roman? I don't know.

I mean, I just don't think we should be going there. So you know, I'm actually going to vote for the ugly one because, you know, I just can't see -- I just don't want to give you any more encouragement to do this kind of stuff. I mean, it's got to stop.

I mean, so that's my comment.

Chair Marks: Heidi.

Member Wastweet: That's a tough one to follow, Don.

Before I talk about the individual pieces, I want to make two comments about the artwork overall. Two trends that I'm seeing here. We've been asking over and over to see symbolism and now we are seeing symbolism. And I want to thank the artists for giving us more symbolic images. Now, we need to use the correct symbols.

The United States coinage has a very specific language of symbols. The lady liberty, the olive branches of peace, the oak leaves of strength, the victory cap, the arrows, the bundle of unity, these are -- it's a language that's been established. So let's not mix up our symbols.

The theme here is the blessings of liberty. But we have symbols of prosperity, doves of peace, eagles of -- and the oak leaves which are supposed to be strength, not liberty. So let's think a little, and like Don said, let's come up with some new symbols that are speaking to a contemporary nation. The second trend that I'm seeing overall is these designs look like they were drawn and then put in the computer and then, oh, yes, we got to put some words around it. The word is -- if you look at the historic coins, the words were part of the design. Let's think a little more strategically about where the words go, how they incorporate into the design. They are design

elements. It's not just a picture with words put in afterwards and around it.

On design number 1, as I said earlier, we've got a dove that stands for peace, not liberty. And we're sending mixed messages.

The same with 4. We're talking about peace and prosperity in our symbols here, not blessings of liberty. In fact, we have to use the words blessing of liberty because the image is not speaking for itself. It's a nice drawing if we were talking about peace, and bounty, and prosperity. I don't think it's speaking to the subject that we're looking for.

Designs 5 and 6, I like that the words here are incorporated into the design. I think that's a plus. The composition is nice. The flow of characters. But I cannot get past the awkward physiques of the characters. They're just, I'm sorry, they're ugly. And I can't get past that. There is no grace, there's no -- even though we have some ethnic representation -- it's not enough to reach our bar of excellence.

Design number 7, I hesitate to say this because it's a bit crude, but I'm afraid people are going to look at this and think the Statue of Liberty got knocked up. Somebody had to say it.

Member Ross: Not that there's anything wrong with that.

Member Wastweet: Not that there's anything wrong with that. Does she have a ring on her finger? I don't see a ring on her finger. We're in trouble with the church.

I'm sorry. We got off track. Let's go on to design number 8, please.

Member Ross: Please, let's go on.

Member Wastweet: I think this is a beautiful design. We have the forward movement, we have the wind, these are all great elements. And it does speak to

our subject which is the blessings of liberty. It is in the form of a document really. It comes from the government's writing of our stated liberties in this country. And so it is on topic with the symbolism.

It's not necessary that we have a branch of olives which represents peace. That's getting off topic a little bit.

It is very classic looking. It's not modern. It's not daring at all. It's very safe. It would be okay. It's not very encouraging though. We're looking for a little more innovation here.

So going onto 11, this was actually the one that stood out to me. I like this design. This is my favorite.

We don't see a lot of children on our coins. So it is a little different. Symbolically, I think this hits the mark, the blessings of prosperity. It's talking about leaving this for our children to ensure that this gets carried on beyond us. And this girl, to me, looks like the torch has been handed to her and now she's bearing the weight of it. There's gravity in this picture, there's wind, there's motion, she's moving. It's got all the elements there.

The sun speaks of hope for a new day. It's a classic symbol. It's on target. It's not necessarily needed. I think it speaks enough without the sun. But I'm okay with it.

I like this design. I think it's drawn very well. It fits well in the series. If we look at what we've done so far in this platinum series, I think this fits in well with the whole series. It's not too far away but it's unique enough.

Design number 12, I, too, did not like this design. The oak leaves are symbols of strength and it makes me think of military strength. It doesn't make me think of liberty at all. I think it's completely off-topic symbolically.

That concludes my remarks.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Heidi. Just a word on mixed messages. You know, I'll cut the artists a little bit of slack here. I think what they're trying to do with some of these messages is they're trying to portray what those blessings of liberty are. And peace is one of those. And I think it's how we get a dove.

I think the problem is that we're getting a little extended out there a little far. And it creates designs that I think they're hard to readily interpret.

So look at 1, I don't suppose I have a whole lot to say with that. It doesn't move me. And I also want to be careful as we think about the fact that we've got five other prior-year designs that all come out of the preamble to the Constitution. And we'd like this last coin to be one that fits well into that set. A number of these, I don't feel like they would.

Number 1, I just can't find a lot to be excited about. It's not particularly bad but I don't -- I just don't like it. Number 4, I think it's interesting but I think there's too much going on. There's not a central focus to it.

And I've said this before many times. To me, it's all about the art. And when we start relying on text to convey our message, it signals, to me, that there might be a weakness. There are exceptions to that but I'd prefer we didn't have the words blessings of liberty in there and trust in our artwork to convey the message. I'm not going to support number 4.

Number 5 and 6 are interesting. They look like they come out of the Art Deco period. However, Art Deco would not have had figures like this. So it's like we're trying to put modern ethnic images into an Art Deco piece. And to me, it just doesn't, it doesn't gel. So I can't support 5 and 6.

And it would be kind of a, very much a design departure from what we've seen the other five

images from the five prior years.

Number 7, I just struggle with this one. It just -- the word cliché comes to mind with this. I have a hard time wrapping my mind around liking this. I don't know.

Putting the flag in the back, I think it clutters the field. If you had to go with this design, I'd rather just clear the field and just focus on the human figures and the torch. I can't support that one.

Eight is interesting. I don't know it for a fact, but I'm guessing, and because I'm guessing I'm probably wrong, but I'm guessing that this is the same artist who did the 2013 Platinum that's now being sold. This one is dramatically classical.

And while I appreciate the art, it's beautiful, I'm not sure it's the direction we want to go. Last year's, I really liked it. But it was, it was very classical, yes, but it was presented in a modern way with the gears and the composition in its totality.

But 8 is not one that I can support.

I'll go to number 12 and come back to number 11.

Number 12, for the reasons stated by the others for not liking this, I'll ditto all of those ideas. I simply don't like this one.

I'm not sure what that conveys to someone who doesn't have a little cheat sheet to read about. It looks like Earth Day to me, a coin commemorating Earth Day. I don't think it commemorates the blessings of liberty to us and our posterity.

Now on the other hand, number 11, I really like this one, like Heidi stated. I, too, like this one. If we're going to do liberty in a female form, it's wonderful to portray a young child as liberty. We've never seen that before in American coinage. The torch to me, as was said earlier, the torch didn't look like anything in particular. I know immediately that's the

torch from the Statue of Liberty. That's the torch of freedom. Obviously, it's been passed to her as the next generation.

There's some traditional icons in there with the rising sun, relating a bright future under freedom.

Perhaps that road is -- I don't think that's the yellow brick road and thank God we don't do color. Perhaps that's the road to freedom. I don't know. But the landscape is something reminiscent of the Midwest, I think, which is nice.

I think this would coin up early nicely as a proof with a lot of the negative field in the background on the upper portion of the coin. I think, especially with some of our frosting technology that Steve and his crew developed, I think they could do some wonderful things with this design.

So I believe this is the gem and, yes, Donald, it's not as modern as some of us would like, I'll admit that. I would like to see even, you know, something more imaginative. But given the set that we have here, Donald, I'll ask you to, if you're going to vote for, if you're going to give three to number 12, could you pitch me a vote or two on 11? Because I think I think this one is worthy and I truly hope that this is the one that we see our way to approve.

And then just hopping to 12 very quickly, I neglected to say this before. I hope the message is coming through clearly and I hope it can be conveyed to Treasury who makes the ultimate decision on this. At the very least, this is controversial. I think with one group really liking it, thinking it's wonderful, and our group panning it, and our group being more representative of the collector community, I think you're headed for danger with this one. I don't think this one will sell well, at all. Particularly, if you're not just buying platinum. I'm sure platinum people, some of them don't care. They just want to buy the metal. But for those of us who would buy this because of its art and its collectible value, it's not here. It's ugly.

So with that, I'm going to recognize Michael Olson if he's on the phone still.

Member Scarinci: Before Michael, can I --

Member Olson: Yes, I certainly am. Good morning.

Chair Marks: Michael, hold on just a minute. Just a minute. Donald wanted to interject something.

Member Scarinci: A technical request. Is it possible -- you made an excellent point about -- and I hadn't really thought of that. The rest of the coins on the series. Is it possible to put the slide you have of all the other coins on the other screen while we're -- is that -- --

Chair Marks: It's right there.

Member Scarinci: Oh, no, yes. Is it possible to keep this one up while we display another one?

Ms. Sullivan: I can --

Member Scarinci: If it's possible --

Ms. Sullivan: -- well, I can check.

Member Scarinci: -- if it's possible. If it's not, it's okay.

I mean, I think, if we can keep coming back to this. I think that was a really really really important point, you know, that this is a series of six and it does kind of need to go with this.

Chair Marks: Yes. And that tree has nothing to do with that.

Member Scarinci: Right. The tree would absolutely not work. Okay.

Chair Marks: Okay. That's one of those intellectual tests where they give you six images. Which one doesn't belong? I think it would be the tree.

Member Scarinci: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Anyone who has the average IQ, it would be the tree, it doesn't belong.

Member Scarinci: Right.

Ms. Sullivan: He cannot do that. He's --

Member Scarinci: Okay.

Chair Marks: Okay. Are you done, Donald?

Member Scarinci: I'm done.

Chair Marks: Okay. Michael Olson.

Member Olson: All right. Good morning. I want to reiterate a couple of comments that I've already heard. I like Heidi's comment regarding the fact that it looks like some artwork was done and, oh, hey, wait, we've got some texts we need to put in here, let's find a place to jam it in.

That seems to be fairly prevalent in this design. And I will not comment on all of the ones that are up for consideration. I'm going to reserve my comments for only three designs.

I'll start with number 8. Number 8 does have some appeal for me. The thing that I really liked on 8 was the stars surrounding the declaration. And I think there's a lot of symbolism there. That is a beautiful design. However, it is very classical.

Onto number 12, Gary hit the nail on the head. I happen to collect these. And if my choice next year is dirt, hands, and a weed, I'm not buying it. As you stated, there's a -- without a crib sheet, you don't know what's going on there. And we can do much better than that. And we have.

I'm looking at the sheet that has all 12 designs on it, in our binder. And when I opened to this page, number 11 took command and literally leapt to my attention immediately. There's a lot of good in number 11. It's a vibrant fresh design. It symbolizes youth. And in my opinion, can properly convey the

theme that we're here today to discuss.

There's no better depiction of a young liberty then it's shown on that coin, which we've really not I can't recall ever seeing before. When I look at that coin, I see my two young daughters in that image. It really is depicting liberty as well as youth, at the same time, it's looking forward to a hopeful and prosperous future.

So number 11 will be the only design that will get any votes from me. And I will give be giving it the full amount of votes.

That's all I've got.

Member Jansen: Three on 11.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. We go to Erik.

Member Jansen: When I go through these, before the meeting, I try to get a visual picture on my own of what I expect, or hope, or believe might be in the images. And when I went through these 12 images, having done that, I kind of came up with what my teenage kids would say, "Seriously?" Blessings of liberty was a hard charge here. And I think, in general, was, is totally missed. Blessings of liberty is a really really hard charge. And so, I think the artists fell back on the second half of that phrase and use prosperity, our prosperity, as the anchor here.

I am appreciative of Heidi's moving up the bar here from, okay, symbols, we've got symbols. That's good. Right symbols. And the dove is the wrong symbol here.

And so out go number 1 and number 4.

I spoke to keep 5 and 6 in. It is highly reminiscent, these two designs are highly reminiscent of the liberty quarter from 16 to 30; is that right? When it was made? Which I happen to like it.

And I also liked and agree completely with Heidi's

comments about this design has integrated text with the design. And it has an Art Deco feel.

I wasn't pleased with the ethnicity or the stature of the individuals, the young boy is acceptable. They lack elegance to me. And I think liberty must convey elegance because I think the concept of liberty is the ultimate elegance in the truth of life.

And so, unfortunately, whereas I like 5 and 6, for all those integrated, and iconic, and reminiscent, and classic, and -- Weinman didn't do that quarter, Donald. Who did that quarter?

Member Scarinci: MacNeil.

Member Jansen: Okay. I think he's dead too, I guess. So I wanted to like 5 and 6 but I can't get there.

I will let Heidi's description of 7 just remain in infamy.

Number 8, to me, is -- and with all due respect I think I know who the artist is here, and I spoke with that artist recently, and that artist has some strong feelings that I'm about to oppose. I think this design is the absolute worst product of computer aided design that we could possibly produce. I think this design number 8 tells us exactly why we need to be afraid, very afraid of computer aided design on our designs. This looks to me like a -- this is a pay stub. This is not a piece of art.

The body is out of proportion. Those silks don't look like silks. They look like rags to me. The flag is lost. The face is so flat as to convey -- actually destroy emotion.

Obviously, number 8 will not get any support from me.

So I come down to, seriously? Number 12 is a -- I mean, Earth Day, that's the best description I get of it. Earth Day. The plant is not attractive. It doesn't

look like it's anything in particular. The acorn is totally lost in the ir-resolve-ability of the detail on a coin this size. The stars are a bizarre noise. They just contribute noise to the design. Seriously?

And so I end up on 11. And I like the idea. The icons are right. There's one thing on 11, I mean, it's actually, like, this is, this could almost be like wow, 1897, flowing hair, it's back.

The one thing that concerns me is her expression. What is she? Is she afraid? Is she -- what is she? I mean, has she never seen fire before?

I'm going to support number 11, but, I mean, seriously?

Member Ross: I thought the aliens had arrived and we were about to give up all our freedom.

Member Jansen: Yes, yes, yes. It's like, okay, here's our fire, leave us the wheel. Okay.

So I'm going to support 11 because I don't dare go out with no support and let history deliver us a platinum coin with a tree on it.

And the last comment I will make is, if you pop up the last five years again -- can we do that? Now, this is the first time I've actually gotten some mental emotional traction here. If I drop a design into that lower right-hand corner, number 6, design number 11 works. It flat out works. Design number 12 is like an IQ test. And, no. So I'm going to support design number 13 -- or design number -- there's a Freudian slip. Design number 11 solely and completely, and be done with this.

Chair Marks: Erik, I thank you for your genteel remarks.

Member Jansen: Genteel, you can count on.

Chair Marks: We'll go to Michael Moran.

Member Moran: I think that the first problem I had

as I started to review these was just what are the blessings of liberty. And I believe, as I went through them, I got mixed messages across the board. I'm not sure that anybody exactly got the blessings of liberty right

The first one that you see up there is definitely, it's the dove of peace, the bird of peace. And is that the blessing of liberty? The sole blessing of liberty? So, the answer to that was no.

Going to number 4, I guess after listening to everybody here, I always wondered if I was just stupid or low IQ. I like this one. Now that I've listened to everybody critique it, I know that I'm missing some IQ points here. I like the wreath. And we'll move on. My vote's not going to count on that. I'm going to throw my vote away there.

The next one, I find the fonts here, the mixed fonts jarring. It bothers me. The other thing that I don't like on both of these, this one and on the next one, and I really don't understand why we actually got this, look at her foot. It's not anchored. It is not on the steps. And to me, that's a basic error. You don't see any lines of the leg underneath the gown. That leg is just thrown out there. It's just like a straight arrow. So they're just, there's too many flaws in that model. I just dismissed them out of hand, right there.

Eight -- 7, we'll just go on by 8. I felt, when I looked at the this, I needed to go out, it's 1917, it's a time warp, and I've got a go buy war bonds. And it's Weinman's walking liberty all over again. Very close to it. And we can do better. That one needs to go away.

I'll skip to 12. You don't need to put it up there. I mean, it's awful.

Eleven. The first thing I thought of was sarcasm, that's the yellow brick road et cetera. And I couldn't get past that in terms of my selection of that one. If we've got the amber waves of grain that might have gotten it a lot better. I know the road to the sun but I hope to God it's not a setting sun.

And this one, I think, there's some flaws with the background there. I don't have Erik's asked problem with the expression. I think the torch is iconic and it's going to get my vote. I think the -- for the simple reason when you put it in with the others, it fits and none of these others do. So there you have it. Eleven.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael.

Go to Tom.

Member Uram: Thank you, Gary. Just make a couple comments. Number 7 -- first of all, that one you just had there, number 1, I do like it. I'm not sure about where it is with the arms but I did like the comments made regarding the movement and so forth on it, and the simplicity of it. But I don't think the message will get out.

Number 7, though, I kind of like as it relates to the others because I think actually that background, if it was frosted properly and done right, I think that the actual point itself could be a real popping liberty from being able to do some things with the flag in the background actually. I think it could pop.

Number 8 was my first look at. And basically if you took last year's coin, this is the left version versus the right version of the one of progress from last year. Very traditional and so forth. But once again, I think since we used it last time, I'll take a pass.

The design 11, I've listened to everyone's comments so far. And I agree, there are certain things in there you like, there's certain things you don't like, does it fit in with the whole series, I think it does. It's not as popping as I think that number 7

would be when it comes to a coin. That's where I am on that.

And just to make a comment so that -- on number 12, well, I think when it came to a coin, I heard the Earth Day comment and I would have just -- I don't mind a rim in a rim but I would just use 13 stars and squared it off and so forth. But what I was -- I don't know what those leaves are really going to look like when they end up on a coin. You could end up with marijuana on the coin here before this is over.

Member Moran: That's what it does look like.

Member Uram: You know, when it struck, it's going to be dangerous. So I'm totally off the chart on 12.

So my leanings are for number 11 and number 7.

Chair Marks: Thank you Tom. Jeanne.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Thank you, Gary.

I liked Michael's interpretation of this and having an open field. I think it's a beautiful use of devices.

However, I don't understand it in terms of being blessings of liberty. This is like just freeing the dove and I'm not convinced that this is what we want to do in terms of representing liberty and its blessings.

I have to agree with my colleagues about, just about everything.

And I want to make one statement about 5 and 6. And that's the text, United States of America. In my own work, I think text is very very important. And I don't feel like the R in this font is correct. It's like the smallest thing in America, to squeeze it in there, I think, I just think that it's nice that we have text in this field but it's so, in my opinion, awfully poorly represented. So that's my opinion of that coin.

And I have to go to number 8. It seems to have -- you know, when I first saw this I thought wow, oh,

this is great, you know. I liked the division of a lot of information on the right side and an open field on the left side. However, it is, it's old. It's just an old image. And I like the fact, in a sense, that it would maybe work with the rest of the platinum coins. But it's just not, I think, modern enough, contemporary enough.

So to go to number 11, I liked Michael's idea that it would be great to have waves of grain in the back instead of the yellow brick road. I don't know if we can make a suggestion or if we choose this, this is the one we get.

I like the fact that there is an incredible seriousness about this young girl in that, yes, she has the weight of this torch. I think it's exciting that she has -- she could be, you know, the one that's going to be bearing this for the future.

So in regard to having the oak leaves on number 12, I have to go to number 11 and support that because it's probably the clearest, most exciting piece that we have. And I'd like to think that less is more. I would like to see less with the yellow brick road.

Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Jeanne. Mike.

Member Ross: I think I'm going to reveal why you really don't want a historian on this Committee. Particularly --

Member Moran: I've already taken that.

Member Ross: -- with my sarcastic world view. But if that is supposed to be liberty, liberty is never represented as a child. Libertas is the God of liberty from the Roman era. And the framers looked back to the Roman Republic because it was the only democracy in the world. When liberty is portrayed, it's always portrayed with a stern face or a face that inspires people to come to liberty. And in this case,

we have liberty deferring to some higher power. And I think a lot of portion of liberty is not deferring to some sort of higher power. She looks like she's seen a dinosaur in Jurassic Park, or the aliens have arrived, and we're about to give up all of our liberty.

But it's a, it would be, I think -- maybe I'm wrong -- but the first depiction of liberty as a child in the depiction of liberty. And I know Donald once addressed liberty as Miley Cyrus, and that would be completely modern. But I think there's a reason why American iconography is you stick with tradition because tradition matters. So I can't support the coin.

Particularly, these are kind of important coins. These aren't ones that are just going to go off into the distance. I think you've got to stick with tradition on liberty.

And with that said, I don't know where I'd go from there.

But I just want, I want to be the fly in the ointment. On 11, I think it would be a travesty. Travesty is a strong word --

Chair Marks: Thank you.

Member Ross: -- but I think it would be a problem.

Chair Marks: So we are running about a half-hour behind. So I'm going to ask us to be efficient in wrapping this up. We always have some follow-up comments and I'll ask if we keep those brief.

I'm going to start one, which made to be just completely politically gratuitous but the writeup on 11 speaks of a blessing, a blessing that flows from a government that ensures that freedom passes from one generation to the next." I'd suggest that if we're trusting in government to pass our freedom from one generation to the next, we're in trouble. And that should read, a Constitution.

So with that, are there any other quick remarks?

Member Scarinci: I have one more. And if you could put the screen up again, the one with the others.

You know, I think that was an excellent, that was a comment. And as I heard Erik, even further, but I think by the time we got to Mike, I think Mike, you know, through me over the top. And I have to go with number 11. I have to go with number 11.

You know, I think number 11 fits there. And you know, I kind of like the, you know -- it probably would be the first depiction --

Member Ross: You're speaking from an era where we're used to seeing like Superman as a kid. But this is liberty. Liberty isn't a kid.

Member Scarinci: Well, why does it have to -- why can't it be?

Ms. Stafford: Well, then we can do all the founding fathers as children. Let's do George Washington as a kid on the next drawing. We could do --

Chair Marks: Let's move this on.

Member Scarinci: Anyway, I think I'm going to go with, I'm going to go with 11 because I think it fits best there, in that series. I think it was a good point.

Member Bugeja: On number 11, which is gaining lots of traction, I just want to say that, you know, what is the, number one, what is the need for the road? Okay. Is it essential to have that road?

And number two, she's running away from the road. And this is what I mean about orientation. If you're going to keep the road, what if you started turning her toward the road. And a road and a sun, the iconic, the iconography of a sun, whether it's rising or setting, this looks like a rising sun because the rays are so large, and then a road to it or a pass to it is, like a river, it's a symbol of not quite being

there and getting there. So the road, to me, is a small distraction because she's running parallel to the road. And that road, as you see, goes right by her knee.

And concerning orientation, I wanted to just give an artistic comment. Earlier today, Mike showed us some, Mike Moran, showed us some high relief. And the artistic nature of our coins, with the flatness that's there, is just so that they could stack them. Because 1921, they couldn't stack the peace dollar. And we're not stacking coins anymore. We're selling commemoratives. And much of the art that I'm seeing is almost two-dimensional. You know, it's not Caravaggio, it's more mediaeval. So let's have some orientation in that coin, and think about what that road is.

And when you put that privy, if you're going to put that privy mark, figure out a place where it would best be. So I'm thinking in the classic sense of numismatics, that privy mark would go on that torch. Not -- if you put a bird in a field with a sun, the privy marks are small, but smallness doesn't mean that it's not going to detract. If that privy mark is on the torch, suddenly it doesn't matter where she -- it's something that we already own.

So that's what I -- just some comments because this looks like it's got a lot of traction.

Chair Marks: Michael, I completely agree with you about the road. I don't believe it's an essential fixture on that design. In fact, you're probably correct, it probably detracts.

Member Bugeja: It distracts.

Chair Marks: Because she's going perpendicular to the road actually.

Member Bugeja: Exactly. Exactly.

Chair Marks: And she's not moving towards the future of the sun.

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chair Marks: So if this is our recommendation, and I believe it will be, we may want to consider a motion to suggest that the road be removed.

So that Greg wanted to make --

Ms. Weinman: Actually, the folks in Philadelphia want to make a couple of comments.

Joe.

Mr. Menna: Yes. You guys are onto something. Talking about historical depictions of liberty, one thing that, you know, I went to a very classical Academy in Russia. One thing my teachers always told me, it's not important what you sculpt, it's important how. So when you're talking about repeating certain types of iconography and symbols, you're talking about them from a literal perspective. What maybe could be considered is, you know, maybe we can still have these iconic traditional images but concentrate less on, you know, the hat, the drapery, this, that, as literal devices and think more about how they're treated plastically, how they're treated sculpturally. This type of imagery whether on American coins, or in classical sculpture, in modernist sculpture, they've existed for centuries. But there's a difference between the way Phidias treated a draped woman, from the way Michelangelo treated, from the way Lehmbruck treated the same type of figure.

So maybe if we concentrate on artistically designing these figures with the same types of symbols, but designing them in a way that it is necessarily contemporary, just by not trying to copy classical sculptures but drawing in our own unique styles, which will necessary place them in our time.

I mean, Michelangelo wasn't consciously trying to be a 15th century sculptor but when you look at his work and the work of his contemporaries, it just is what it is. They actually -- we call it classical but if

you look at a 15th century Renaissance painting of a biblical theme, they actually painted and drew themselves in very contemporary clothing intermingled with the more traditional Greco-Roman imagery.

So I don't know. Maybe it's how we draw and how we sculpt these images rather than specifically what, that will make them more contemporary.

And I thank you for your time.

Chair Marks: Thank you very much. I truly appreciate those comments. And I would welcome more in the future from you folks.

Heidi.

Member Wastweet: Thank you. I wanted to just respond to the fly in the ointment.

When I -- I know in the writeup it says that this is a young liberty. But when I saw this, I had a different interpretation. That's one of the reasons I like this design is, I think it is open to different interpretations including her expression could be interpreted differently. I interpret her expression as being very serious and trusted. So I saw this, not as a young liberty, but I saw this as just a young person representing the next generation receiving the blessings from lady liberty. I pictured lady liberty handing her the torch, not her being a young liberty trying to grow up, but receiving the blessing of liberty. That's how I interpreted it.

Member Ross: Then I might take her out of what seems to be some sort of suggestion of a Roman robe. Because then you're tying it to Libertas. And -
-

Participant: Yes.

Member Ross: -- if she's receiving the torch from the Statue of Liberty, and I don't know why the Statue of Liberty is putting the torch down, but if

she's receiving the torch from the statue -- maybe she's pregnant -- if she's putting the torch down, it would not be to someone in a Roman robe.

Member Wastweet: I don't see it as a strictly Roman robe. I think that the drapery is trying to be non-time oriented. It's not Roman, it's not modern, it's trying to be something in between.

Member Scarinci: Got you, Mike. In the words of straight --

Chair Marks: Folks, we are seriously behind schedule here. So unless you have a burning desire to need to say more, I'll suggest that we have plenty here.

And I'm going to ask you all to fill out your ballots. By now, we should all have a very clear idea what we'd like to do. If we need to revisit this later in the meeting to have any additional recommending motions, let's do that. But if you could fill out your ballot now, pass that into Erik, that would allow us to move forward.

And if staff is ready, I would like to present the First Spouse Program to us.

April.

2014 First Spouse Coin Program

Ms. Stafford: Yes.

Chair Marks: In the interest of time and being efficient, I'd like to go through all of the obverse and reverse designs. We're going to have one stab at this for each Committee member to make comments on the totality of the designs presented.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. All right. So, background information, if it's agreeable, in the interest of time, everyone is very familiar with the legislating authority for this program. So --

Chair Marks: Very familiar.

Ms. Stafford: -- I won't repeat that.

You're aware of the required inscriptions for both the obverse and the reverse. And the fact that the same device will be used for both the gold coins and the bronze medals.

I'll just remind the Committee that all of these designs have been reviewed for historical accuracy by scholars recommended by the White House Historical Association. Okay.

And for the record, these are the designs for the 2014 First Spouse Program Gold and Medal Designs.

So we'll start with Florence Harding. She was -- served as First Lady from 1921 until her husband's death in 1923.

We have three obverse candidate designs. Obverse 1, 2, and 3. Obverse 3 was the CFA's recommendation.

Moving on to the reverse candidate designs there are six to review.

A brief background for designs reverses 1 and 2, when the Harding's married, Warren Harding was the owner of *The Marion Star*. And when her husband fell ill, Mrs. Harding took over some of the duties and continued her work at the newspaper following his recovery. She is credited with the inventing idea of paper routes for young boys. So here in reverse 1 and 2, Mrs. Harding is depicted with the group of newsboys. Okay.

Moving on, Mrs. Harding was the first First Lady to cast a vote for her husband for president. She also realized the power of the women's vote and strongly encouraged women to register.

In reverse 3 and reverse 4, Mrs. Harding casts the vote for Warren Harding for president. So reverses 3 and 4. Reverse 4 is the CFA's reference. Okay.

Here in reverse 5, Mrs. Harding visits with a

wounded World War I soldier. Her appointment book shows that she often visited wounded soldiers and sailors who she referred to as "my boys."

Reverse 6 is done in the Art Deco style popular during Mrs. Harding's tenure as First Lady. As she championed the causes of veterans, the letters WWV form the torch she carried for the world war veterans. It's transformed into a pen at the base representing her extensive correspondence with veterans, their spouses, and widows.

The camera represents her orchestration of photo opportunities and newspaper articles that supported her husband's campaign.

And the ballot box represents her distinction of being the first First Lady to cast the vote for her presidential candidate husband.

Moving on to Grace Coolidge. Grace Coolidge served as First Lady from 1923 until 1929.

And we have six obverse candidate designs for your consideration. Obverse 1, 2, 3. This was the CFA's recommended design. 4, 5, and 6.

Moving on to the reverse designs. Reverse 1, as Mrs. Coolidge was the first First Lady to be depicted in a talking newsreel, this design depicts the camera and the inscription, "First in a talking newsreel."

Reverse 2, Mrs. Coolidge devoted her time to numerous civic causes including working with the sick, with children, and with war veterans.

Next, Mrs. Coolidge advocated for the deaf and hard of hearing.

Reverse 3, which is the recommended design from the CFA, depicts three hands finger-spelling the letters U.S.A. in American sign language against the backdrop of a White House.

Next, inspired by Mrs. Coolidge's work with Helen Keller, reverse4 depicts Mrs. Coolidge meeting with

a young visually impaired girl.

Next, Mrs. Coolidge promoted many groups including leadership and community service activities for boys and girls. Here in reverse 5, Mrs. Coolidge and their family, and their family dog greet young girls visiting the White House.

Next is Lou Henry Hoover who served as First Lady from 1929 until 1933. We have four obverse candidate designs. Obverse 1, 2 -- which was the CFA's preference -- 3, and 4.

There are five reverse candidate designs for your consideration. In reverse 1, President and Mrs. Hoover relax at Camp Rapidan, the presidential retreat in Virginia and precursor to Camp David.

Reverses 2 through 4 feature late 1920s microphones and a radio representing Mrs. Hoover's first public radio address as First Lady, the first First Lady to do so. Reverse 2, 3, and 4 -- reverse 4 being the CFA's recommended design.

Although she did not have her own radio show, Mrs. Hoover was a frequent guest speaker on radio programs. And here in reverse 5, Mrs. Hoover is depicted in front of a microphone.

Eleanor Roosevelt served as First Lady from 1933 until her husband's death in 1945. We have seven obverse candidate designs. Obverse 1, 2, 3, 4 - which was the CFA's recommended design -- 5, 6, and 7.

For reverse designs, we have six. In reverse 1, a microphone book and newspaper clipping represent Mrs. Roosevelt's popular radio addresses and newspaper column.

Depicted here in reverse 2, Val-Kill Cottage was Mrs. -- sorry, cottage was Mrs. Roosevelt's family home. Along with her friend, Mrs. Roosevelt started a business at Val-Kill that manufactured furniture in order to provide jobs during the depression.

Reverse 3 symbolizes Mrs. Roosevelt life's work and the global impact of her humanitarian initiatives. Specifically,

it shows Mrs. Roosevelt's right hand lighting a candle with the glowing light rising over a stylized Earth's horizon. Adlai Stevenson said of her after her death, "She would rather light a candle than curse the darkness and her glow has warmed the world."

In reverse 4, Mrs. Roosevelt reviews paperwork with her husband. She was considered the eyes, ears, and feet for her partially paralyzed husband.

In reverse 5, Mrs. Roosevelt serves a meal at a soup kitchen during the Christmas season.

And lastly, reverse 6 -- which was the recommended design by the CFA -- it depicts Mrs. Roosevelt as the United States delegate to the United Nations and she chaired the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

That's it, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you very much, April.

Are there any quick technical questions?

(No audible response.)

Okay. With that, I want to go through our process of culling out some of the designs. We can get this down to the ones we would like to focus on. Okay.

We have a technical question.

Member Jansen: It's less of a technical question as it is a formatting question. Having this notebook come to us is fabulous. This particular organization in the notebook kind of required a complete reshuffling. Because the monographs on the background were back in section A or something, and they weren't near the actual artwork and so forth. And the descriptions of the various, in this

case, the first spouses notable achievements were a continuous stream. So if you want to kind of put the comments about a given first spouse with the drawings in order to digest it as a unit, you kind of couldn't.

So I would just ask in future organization -- the organization is getting better every time, so that is not my issue is. My issue is, in order to get it even better yet, would be to kind of unitize.

Thank you.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you, Erik. Okay.

Just as a little pretext to our culling out. I want to remind the Committee what the legislation says about this program. It says, for the reverse, "Images should be emblematic of the lifework of the first spouse whose image is born on the obverse." Okay. Think about that. Emblematic. So we have a really, a wonderful opportunity today with what the artists have provided us with. You are all very familiar with the fact that we, as a group, as a committee, have, for years, called for our artwork on United States coins, as much as possible, to move towards the emblematic. The use of symbols. Those sorts of approaches to design.

Today, what we have on the reverses of this next year's issue of first spouses are some story boards, which are the things that we wanted to gravitate away from and we've talked a lot about not wanting the story boards. And we've talked about a lot about the symbolic.

For each of these first spouses, we have been provided at least one, of what I think, are symbolic images that I think are a good first step in the direction we want to go.

So I think, when we think about images that are emblematic of the first spouse's life, I don't think about a first spouse on the White House lawn with her dog. I don't think about her sitting in a chair at

the precursor to Camp David. And I don't think she would want to be remembered for sitting on the porch as emblematic of her life's work.

So with that, when we go through this culling process, I'm going to ask us, as much as possible, yet still honoring each member's right to review whatever they wish to, I'm going to ask you to think seriously as I hold up each of the reverse designs, if this is, if this is a story board, do we truly want to spend the time looking at that today or do we want to seize an opportunity here for the 2014 first spouse coins to be presented with a set of emblematic symbolic reverse designs? So with that, we're going to start with Florence Harding on the obverses. Interest in obverse 1.

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Interest in 2.

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Three. What did you say?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: CFA picked this one. Okay. In honor of them, we continue that one. Moving to reverse designs for Florence Harding.

Number one.

Participant: Throw it in.

Chair Marks: Number two. Okay. Putting two aside.

Number 3. This is what I would call a story board. Putting it aside.

Number 4, another story board. Putting it aside. Does it matter?

Participant: No.

Chair Marks: Okay. If you want it to, okay.

Five? Setting it aside.

Six?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Jansen: Recap those six for me, would you, please?

Chair Marks: I will recap them all when I'm done.

Going on to Grace Coolidge, number 1 obverse. Setting it aside.

Number 2 obverse.

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Three obverse -- that's CFA right?

Number 4. Setting 4 aside. Number 5. Setting 5 aside.

Six. Setting 6 aside.

Moving on to reverse designs for Grace Coolidge.

Number 1. Setting it aside. Number 2. Setting it aside. Number 3.

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: We're keeping?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Number 4?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Number 5? Thank you.

Number -- excuse me -- moving on to obverses for

Lou Hoover.

Obverse 1.

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Obverse 2.

Participant: Yes.

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Obverse 3. Setting 3 aside.

Four?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Going to reverses for Lou Hoover.

Reverse 1. Setting aside.

Two? Setting that aside.

Three?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Four?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Story board number 5?

Member Jansen: Yes.

Any other comments?

Chair Marks: You didn't go for my bait. Okay.

Member Jansen: I took your bait. Yes.

Chair Marks: Eleanor Roosevelt. Obverses number 1. Set aside. Number 2? Setting aside.

Number 3?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Number 4? I'll say yes.

Chair Marks: Five?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Six?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Seven?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Going on to Eleanor Roosevelt reverses.

One? Setting aside 1.

Two? Setting aside 2.

Three?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Absolutely, yes.

Four? Setting aside.

Five?

Participant: Yes.

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Six?

Participant: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. That takes us through the process and I will now, for the record, indicate the totality of what remains. For Florence Harding, we have obverse 1, obverse 2, obverse 3.

For Harding reverses, we have reverse 1, reverse 4, reverse 6.

Going on to Grace Coolidge obverse, we have obverse 2, 3. That's all for Coolidge.

Going on to Grace Coolidge reverses, we have reverse 3, and reverse 4. Just those two for her reverse.

Going on to Lou Hoover, on the obverse, we have 1, 2, 4, which remain.

And then on her reverses. Again, for Lou Hoover, we have reverse 3, reverse 4, and reverse 5.

Going on to Eleanor Roosevelt obverses, we have 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Going onto the Roosevelt reverses, we have 3, 5, 6.

And that is what we have to look at for our discussion.

So with that, I'm going to start with -- let's start with Erik.

Member Jansen: No.

Chair Marks: No? Okay.

Let's start with Mike Ross.

Member Ross: All right. I'm going to save time and just briefly mention -- I would hope everyone will consider these within the context of what has come before in this series.

And before, what has come in the series are a lot of images of first ladies greeting their spouse, receiving babies from carriages, or rolling Easter eggs on lawns, those kinds of things. And we are finally hitting first ladies who were titanic figures. Eleanor Roosevelt is a titanic figure in American history. In which history departments assign a whole book on Eleanor Roosevelt that in a way that maybe you didn't do on Lucy Hayes.

And I recognize the interests here in having -- in

moving to symbolism over story boards. And I see the value in that.

But when you look at this whole series, we're going to have all these domestic images and then we get to the folks who really did big things and we have a candle that is undermining our one chance to say these first ladies who really changed American history. So I'm a little concerned that the symbolism comes in this series at exactly the wrong time when we have all the story boards. So with that said, I do think there's been an effort made here that I respect not to have -- Gary, you're dead on on that German Shepherd on the lawn and the repose at the Val-Kill cottage.

In most of these, there's an effort to say, well, here's some things that first ladies did that were important and active. And even if they were the first ladies who were trying to be respectful of their husband's position and not make waves, nevertheless, did important things, I applaud the fact that some of this is changing. I'm a little worried that the move to symbolism will come at a time where we actually can show historical real significance and we'll switch to symbolism, and then the other images will all be these domestic scenes. Okay. Done.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you, Michael.

Oh, I'm going to make sure Michael Olson gets on here early. So Michael, are you ready to go?

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Go for it.

Member Olson: Okay. All right. Let's see. Starting off with the Harding obverse, actually, I'm going to start off with a comment, maybe to the artist maybe to the men, I do not recall seeing headgear or hats on any of the first spouse designs before. I may be missing one. Not opposed to the hats but I guess for a hat to be included, I would ask that in

these particular first spouses, and maybe this was more of a question for Mike Ross, were any of these ladies known for wearing of hats on a regular basis?

Member Ross: I think for a good portion of American history, everyone was known for wearing hats on a regular basis. You know, I think in the '20s, everybody's wearing hats on a regular basis. The Victorian period, everybody's in a hat.

But that doesn't mean you represent them, if that's how they want to be represented in a portrait --

Ms. Weinman: Mr. Chairman?

Chair Marks: Yes.

Ms. Weinman: Just a point of clarification, we have featured first ladies wearing hats before in this series.

Chair Marks: Okay. We've established that first ladies wear hats.

So, Michael, continue.

Member Olson: All right. When I look at the Harding obverses, the one that I'm drawn most to is number 2. I think that one portrays her in a very favorable fashion. And then, the one that I would agree with.

The reverses, we didn't get a whole lot to pick from here. Gary, as you have indicated, it looks like there's possibly a little bit of recycling of some old designs here. Replace it with some objects.

So really the only choice, in my mind, would be number 6. It's certainly an Art Deco piece but it has a lot of things going on within a small sized coin.

But none of the other designs really make it. And it's too bad because I think there were some things there that may have worked if depicted in a more artistic fashion.

Coolidge obverse, the two that we're considering

were number 2 and number 3. In looking at all six, number 2 was my preferred design.

Number 3 is more of a portrait which I don't really favor. Some of these other ones, especially number 4, I don't believe, you know, I'm not a Grace Coolidge junkie, but I was looking at that portrait, I can't believe that would be a very favorable depiction of her.

So number 2 would be the one that gained most of my support.

On the reverses, number 3 is the most interesting to me. Not only for the theme but also for the execution. I think that is definitely something that will get some attention if that is the chosen reverse. Number 4, also has some interest but strongly preferring number 3.

Onto Lou Hoover, I just want to mention that Lou Hoover was born in my hometown. We both come from Waterloo, Iowa. And there's a school named for her there.

I will expound on the obverse up here first. I think number 2, is would be my preference with a little bit of preference towards number 4 but stronger to number 2.

I do want to make a comment on the reverses. When we looked at these themes, proposed themes earlier this year, the Mint came up of several worthy themes. And I provided the Mint with several themes that, I, myself, came up with and also in conjunction with the Hoover Library. And I was somewhat dismayed and disappointed to see that what we have to pick from here is a story board of one worthy controversy of Mrs. Hoover with Rapidan Camp, and four other choices with just one of the themes.

As a reminder, Mrs. Hoover was very engaged with the Girl Scouts. I believe she was the first First Lady that was the honorary president of the Girl Scouts.

And that tradition continues to this day. Very, very involved with the historic preservation of the White House and its furnishing.

A lot of good themes were missed here and a lot of effort was placed on four designs that pretty much all cover the same one theme.

I did have a question on number, I guess, number 2 is not in consideration so I'll direct a question to number 3. That appears to be a microphone but it has rays emanating from the microphone. Could someone explain that to me, please? Anyone?

Ms. Stafford: It's just a representation of the communication that came through her radio addresses and was the artist's intend to use that to represent that.

Member Olson: Okay. Well, typically a microphone, you're talking into the microphone and on the speaker on the other end, you've got communication coming out. So I'm not sure those rays really work going into the microphone. They certainly would work on the radio on number 4, which is an appealing design.

You know, given the fact that we've really got one theme to choose from here and that's the radio, my support would probably be going to number 4 because that is a well-done design.

And moving on to Hoover -- or excuse me, to Roosevelt. A lot of choices here.

My preference, when I look at these, in any real portrait or depiction of a person, I think we have discussion on the Committee before about teeth or no teeth. There seems to be a lot of them here. For that reason, the choices that we culled the Committee down to, 6 would probably be my preference because it shows less teeth. And it does show her in what, I believe, is a very favorable portrait or picture.

On the reverses, we've got 3, 5, and 6 that we've culled it down to. I believe I agree with the prior comment on the candle. I kind of like the platinum design we just looked at. That's really hard to interpret having a cheat sheet. But I don't really know if I can support that one or not.

Number -- let's see. The next one is number 5. That one, while it is a story board, it speaks to the times that she was serving as First Lady. That possibly could have been depicted in a more artistic format or allegorical format. However, that one is going to get some votes from me just based on the fact that that was a pretty significant, the depression was very significant during the Roosevelt presidency.

When we get to the United Nations, number 6, very important contribution by her. I wish there was a way that that could have been depicted without putting it right there in writing off of her right shoulder. So I guess on this one, I'm a little conflicted. I will hear what the rest of the Committee has to say before I really put some votes towards that.

That's all.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. Jeanne, are you ready?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay. On Florence Harding, I'm going to take her hat off even though I know hats were very common. I wore one myself. There's something quite calming about number 1. I just think she has a lot of confidence, a lot of presence here. And I know the artists are going to be maybe a little nervous about doing glasses. But I think that she's just depicted quite lovely here.

So my -- I'm going to look at number 1.

And on the reverse, I did think that number 2 was important for the times. However, I think we have a story board here and number 6 it's just outrageously wonderful. It's powerful. I think this is

something that the Committee has been looking for, it's symbolic. And I have my vote on this one.

Grace Coolidge. I'm sorry that on number 3 is too wispy for me. I think, I'm going to go with number 2 because she, again, has confidence. She has a straightforward presence. So I'm forgoing anything else but number 2.

And number 1 on the reverse, I like the fact that we have a very simple camera. But again, I think we're not going to understand that. And so I have to look, again, at number 3 and number 4. I like number 3 but, you know, U.S.A. on their wrists are kind of, to me, like a tattoo. I don't like that so much as I like the symbolism of what it says. Maybe we can put U.S.A. someplace else. I know you want to say that that's what those, the signage is. But I wish we could do it a different way.

Ms. Stafford: May I interrupt?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes, please.

Ms. Stafford: Actually, the CFA, when they did recommend this, they actually said the exact same thing.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Good.

Ms. Stafford: Referring to the letters as tattoos.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Ms. Stafford: So their recommendation would -- if this design were to go forward would be to remove the letters U.S.A.

Member Stevens-Sollman: We have an empty field below there. Would U.S.A. maybe be there, if you wanted to make people understand what it was saying. I just think it is more like a tattoo.

And number 4 is, although it's a story board, it's quite lovely and I commend the artist for the sensitivity to help us to understand that this is a

blind child. I thought it was very well done.

Going on to Lou Hoover, I think we have a -- I think I'm going to only address number 4. And I believe that was a CFA choice.

Member Jansen: I think their's was 2, wasn't it?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Was it 2? Well, I'm still going to go with number 4.

Ms. Stafford: Yes.

Member Jansen: I think --

Member Stevens-Sollman: She looks rather wise here.

And on the reverse, again, I'm going to go with my colleagues that number 4 is the preference.

Eleanor Roosevelt, could you go -- could you -- I'm going to go to --

Participant: Where do you want me to go?

Member Stevens-Sollman: -- yes, I wanted to go to number 4, please.

In all of my -- the context that I have always seen Eleanor Roosevelt, this seems to be the most, to me, recognizable. She's -- I know it has teeth and people don't necessarily like that. But I think this is a quite convincing portrait of Eleanor Roosevelt.

And then going on to the reverse, number 3 is truly what we're looking for in terms of symbology. I have to say it says everything. I'm not quite sure if the horizon behind the candle says it's the edge of the world but I do like the candle.

Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you Jeanne. Tom?

Member Uram: Thank you, Gary.

I, on Florence Harding, I do like number 1. I think that it does depict a person who is determined. And I like the style. And I kind of do not care for that side view of the hat as it relates to that. Going to the reverse for Florence Harding, I thought that the paper boys were a nice idea.

However, number 6 is just, I think, I think that's a home run in my opinion because it puts together a whole lot. And to put together a whole lot, I think that we've been trying to do some things with World War I and the veterans and so forth, and all of that. And I think that it really, it really, really is a home run. And I would have loved to have seen something like that as determined on the last topic that we discussed. So of all these designs, I really really think that this strikes home.

If the -- I just thought of something and if the Chairman would allow -- going on to Grace Coolidge, I think the number 2 obverse, I like the stylistic of that and the modernism of that -- and if this Chairman would allow, I'd like to make a comment on number 2. And I know it's not one of the ones under consideration, although I'd like a point to be made on the reverse number 2.

And that is committed to civic causes, next year, 2014, obviously it's the 50th anniversary of the Kennedy half-dollar, and so forth, and the assassination. And this coin might fit well into that, in regards to the civic causes that we are going to be looking at as it relates to that commemorative events.

And I think you're going to see a lot of coins or a lot of promotions with the John F. Kennedy as it relates to giving back to the community and doing things. And this might be one to bring back to the table to think about as it relates to civic causes for that purpose. So if the Chairman allows, I'd like that to be --

Chair Marks: I allowed it.

Member Uram: -- consideration.

Chair Marks: I allowed it.

Member Uram: Thank you.

And then the other one that -- I do like reverse number 4 as well in regards to that.

Going on to Lou Hoover, obverse number 2 or 4, I think are stylistic and have great depiction there for Lou Hoover. Going to the reverse, I kind of lean towards number 3. Let me find it here. I like the idea of the older looking versus the radio of number 4. I kind of like the idea of the what it might have looked like in the depiction.

Moving on to Eleanor Roosevelt, design number -- let's see here -- I like number 3 as it relates to the style. And number 4 in particular. In this case, I do like the hat because you saw her in so many depictions with the hat. So I kind of lean towards the image here with the hat. I think it's appropriate.

And then on the reverse, I'm leaning towards number 6 because it does say exactly that one of her main contributions to the presidency and to being First Lady in that, that she was that delegate to the United Nations. I do like the symbolism of the light and the candle, but I think if we're going to portray something that she actually accomplished, I think that number 6 is the way I have to go with that. As much as I like the candle, and the symbolism, and all of that, I think depicting exactly her contribution, and a major contribution, as there were numerous ones, but certainly the United Nations makes a point.

Thank you, Gary, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Tom.

Michael Moran.

Member Moran: Yes. For Florence Harding, I would support number 1. I think it's got the right look to

it.

Number 2, I can't get past the fact that in the eye expression, she's looking at Warren, you did what and with whom?

Member Ross: Which is the appropriate one, actually.

Member Moran: Yes. I'm not into hats at all and it colors my thinking on all of these in terms of my choices. For the reverse, 6 is excellent. I wish we had one as good as that for Eleanor Roosevelt but I'll get to that. Moving to Grace Coolidge, I think number 2 strikes the right balance in terms of the age that she was and the look when she was in the White House as First Lady.

On the reverse, I would have a suggestion on number 3. I think 3 is one that is not the story board but the White House does nothing for that. You don't need it there. You had the opportunity, if you dropped the White House out of there and change that background a little bit, you can move the tattoos up there and put it into the field. Just a suggestion there. But my vote is going to go to number 3.

Lou Hoover's, I did not like the hair arrangement in number 2. I thought it was a bit off from the historical pictures. My vote is going for number 4. It's a good, dignified look. I think it's a, I think it will coin well. I think it will look good.

I am, on number 4, for the reverse. The radio waves, I think they need to come out of the radio and not into the microphone.

Finally, we get to Eleanor. And Eleanor, she had bucked teeth, she had a receding chin -- bless her heart she was no Bo Derek. And a result of that, I threw out any of them that had profiles of her. And that got me to number 6. I think that gives her the right dignity and that's where I went with that one. I understand where you're going with 5, but I'm not

a hat man.

Member Ross: Bo Derek, really?

Chair Marks: He's showing his age.

Member Moran: Yes, I know.

On the reverse, I think we could do better. With the ones that I have here, I'm going to vote number 3. But it's not apparent that that's the earth. I don't like the idea of the hand coming down with the match. Again, it's a personal preference. I think you could have done so much more with the symbolism. You could have taken the United Nations' symbol and put a lighted candle next to it for hope. There was just so much more on Eleanor Roosevelt than what we've got here on these reverses. But it is what it is and I'll vote for 3.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. We'll move to Erik.

Member Jansen: Briefly, Florence Harding illustration number 3 is a fun, fun picture. But it would be interesting to have a little photo support on this so that we could, at least, have a little easier link to authenticity. Otherwise, we're kind of defaulting into the kind of comments I'm hearing such as, well, that one looks like she's in charge or that one looks like she's making charges or something. So a little photo support on these more modern ones would be helpful in the information package.

I am going to go with the flow on this one and probably go with number 1. Although number 2 is not bad as well. When we go to the Florence Harding reverses, number 6 is a geewhiz wow. Two thoughts here. The sculptor is going to have an interesting challenge here because there is so much three-dimensionality to where the victory and -- or excuse me, where the veterans in the world war, the WW comes up. That's just going to become a jumble. And, so I'm not sure how the sculptor

actually makes this one happen the way it can happen.

Don, as always, the optimistic Don saying worry not my friend. So 6 gets my support.

I will say the following: to the artist who chose to focus on that newspaper item, a newspaper is an iconic symbol. And a newspaper could have been shown on a doorstep being delivered. We could have followed the newspaper thread here with a symbol. And so I want to stand up and say no to storylines. And I'll vote for 6.

When it comes to Grace Coolidge, these are some pretty cool images. Photo support would have been interesting to know where 4 and 6 came from. I just love to see those original photos. Lady Gaga would appreciate number 4, I think.

Member Ross: Except it would be made out of meat.

Member Jansen: It would be what? Pardon me?

Member Ross: Nothing.

Member Jansen: Okay. That's what I thought you said.

So I'm probably going to go for number 2. I like the full on as opposed to the side portraits. I think the CFA defaults to side portraits and throws the rest of the bath water out sometimes. And so I'm going to go with number 2.

On the Grace Coolidge reverse, I love the three hands. I don't see a tattoo. I like the White House. If you want to drop U.S.A. down into and create a bit more activity down into that blank field below there, maybe if -- and I suspect that image number 3 will be chosen -- we want to make a motion to modify that, I think to remove those three letters is kind of a, seriously? I mean, you take those three letters out of there and unless you're part of the deaf community, I'm not sure you're going to figure

this isn't a, you know, the Cub Scout sign, the fist of anguish, and then I don't know. I don't know what you're going to make of it.

Participant: Part --

Member Jansen: Yes. It's Rochambeau coin. I'm not sure. So I think U.S.A. needs to be preserved but if we want to move them because people feel they are tattoo-ey , so be it.

I like number 4 as an emoting image. I don't like the excessive use of grayscale in the artwork because I think it puts a challenge in front of us to select a piece of artwork that may not get sculpted the way the artist is showing it to us. So I would say to the artist, back off on the grayscales, please, and give us more line art in a symbol.

Lou Hoover, I'm torn between which of the three pictures of a woman do I like better, because I have no photo support for this. And that makes it a very difficult choice, because I don't know which one of these authentically carries the woman's sense of presence. I feel blind.

Lou Hoover reverse, I love the artist who stepped forward and used the technique to show the sound emanating or going into the microphone. I'm probably going to vote for number 4 just because I like the symbology, sound coming out of the speaker makes more sense than the other way. And I get that. I think it was Michael who made that first comment. Number 5 would work. Although number 5 would carry, I think, less social involvement over the radio than perhaps the impression that she's stumping for her husband over the radio.

On Eleanor Roosevelt, I am torn here. And I wasn't torn until I heard Mike Moran speak because when it comes to the Roosevelt issues, Mike knows this like nobody else in this room. And I was an advocate for image number 4. The fact that he likes image number 6, you know, I got to stand up and say, "Mike, I'm voting for number 6." Reverse on Eleanor

Roosevelt, you know, Mike Ross, other than your sense of humor which is totally lacking, which is of course what I'm saying --

Member Ross: You remind me of Bo Derek, by the way.

Member Jansen: I took the mustache off, that must have been what happened.

Member Moran: That's what happened when you went through menopause.

Member Jansen: Let's leave those comments to Heidi.

I think we could have done a lot more with the symbol here. Someone --

Member Ross: She's most important First Lady in the 20th century, and we're going to have a candle.

Member Jansen: And we're going to have an unlit candle. Yes. And so I am, I'm kind of, I'm kind of sad here. And in that sense, I'm probably going to vote for number 3.

Number 6 would work. I think the little microphone things coming out of the desk are highly distracting. And as this coin shrinks down, they're going to become even more distracting. And the United States placard will disappear into the physical dimensions of the planchet. So number 6 kind of comes apart on me. Although, it could have worked.

But a UN kind of backdrop on image number 3 could really pop that thing up. And to that end, I think image number 3 is going to get chosen here, just from the feel of it. And I'm going to probably -- if someone else does not -- move to suggest, modify, put emotion in to somehow put a little more power there. So Mike Ross get your humor mojo going here and give us some guidance, if this gets selected because I'm going to ask you for it.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Erik. I'll just preface my

remarks first by saying as far as the obverses go, I look for designs that have presence and have dignity. And I think if you have both of those qualities you also have confidence. And so that's what's kind of guided me here. I know some of you will disagree with some of these choices but on Florence -- oh, and then let me say on the reverses, I'm really hoping for a quadruple play here for symbology and I'm going to make my case on each vote.

So on the obverse for Florence Harding, 2, I think best fits the criteria that I used. Not a lot needs to be said about reverse 6. I think that has solid support from the Committee and it will have mine also. Grace Coolidge on the obverse, I think 2 is a very dignified look for the First Lady. And I think that's what our first ladies would want. They would want dignified images that show them with presence and confidence. On reverse number 3, which I'm supporting, my suggestion there, first of all, I'll say with the younger generation, if were trying to entice them into collecting, they are all into body art, folks. I say that kind of jokingly but --

Participant: Not when your son comes home.

Chair Marks: -- I don't know if it's all that much of a problem. However, I don't think it would be too difficult to adjust this design around a little bit. You could move the hands up a little bit. They would overlap on the White House slightly more than they do now. You would create more space below the hands. And you could put U.S.A. in that blank field and justify the fact that you have a blank field there. That's just a suggestion. Or you could totally remove them. And I'm sure the Committee will resolve that as we go through the process as far as a recommendation.

On Lou Hoover, I believe number 1 would be the right choice. I think she looks very dignified there, very much the First Lady. On the reverse, I like both 3 and 4. Like someone else has said, I like the

bravery and showing the idea of sound going out from both of these devices. I'm thinking that maybe 4 might be a little more in the category of being able to be interpreted by folks. Because I think, intuitively, we think about sound coming out of something not sound going out -- or coming at you rather than the device conveying it to the radio. I hope that makes sense. Anyway, but I'd be happy with either of those preference going to number 4. On Eleanor Roosevelt, I like number 4. And I think it would be a novel one, just the fact that she's wearing a hat. I think it casts a very pleasant light on her. I believe she'd be pleased with it too, but I can't really say. Now on the reverse, I'm going to take a little different tack than the rest of you. And I'm going to make a strong case for number 3. So please hear me out.

I hope you've read the little narrative. If you haven't, I'm going to read it to you. It says, "Mrs. Roosevelt's right hand lighting a candle, a glowing light rises over stylized graphic of the Earth's curved horizon." Now why would that be? UN. Do you remember there was the talk about, well, it would be nice to commemorate her service to the UN and therefore to the world. That's what the artist is trying to tell us here. But doing it at a very symbolic way, which is what we've been telling everybody that's what we want. Okay. So then it goes on and it says, "Adlai Stevenson said of her after her death, 'She would rather light a candle that curse the darkness, and her glow has warmed the world.'" It's a wonderful statement about her, which I think justifies where the artist was going with this.

The design symbolizes her life's work and the global impact of her humanity or her humanitarian initiatives. I submit to you that number 6, I think it is, with her at the UN, that doesn't really say much more than she's sitting at the UN. And it's a so what? It's a so what? I mean, we've seen images like this of first ladies on the other issues that have come out, where, you know, like we had one sitting in the gallery of the Senate and, you know, we

know from history that the first spouse she was there to keep track of what was going on in the Senate, I suppose, for her husband. But she's just sitting in the UN. Why not -- a coin is a work of art, folks. It's not a photograph. It's a work of art. And that's what they're giving us here with this candle.

I think this is one of, probably the best of the reverses that we've been given today. And it's so much, it's so much, goes right to what we've been asking our artists to do. I think we err seriously if we pass this one by and we send a mixed message if we send them a story board. So with that --

Member Ross: Gary, can I ask you a question?

Chair Marks: If you must.

Member Ross: That candle, could it be used for any of the first ladies in the series for their life's work? That can only be used for Eleanor Roosevelt?

Chair Marks: That's not the question. That's not the question. I mean --

Member Ross: If we are missing --

Chair Marks: No, no, no. That's not the question. The question is, is it relevant --

Member Ross: -- all have --

Chair Marks: No, wait a minute. We're trying to be emblematic of the life of Eleanor Roosevelt. The other first spouses don't matter in this case. It's Eleanor Roosevelt. And she lit a candle for the globe, let's say. That's what the artist is trying to tell us here. And if it causes numismatists or others in the public when they view this to want to investigate American history and find out more about Eleanor Roosevelt, great. Maybe they'll go to school and be your student. That would be a wonderful thing for the University of Maryland.

Member Ross: Inspired by that candle.

Chair Marks: Yes.

But I think that's a wonderful image. It's something we haven't seen before. I think it's absolutely, absolutely a home run. It's what we've asked the artist to do. And even if we don't pick it, I hope the artist understands, this is really, this would be a missed thing for our Committee, that this is what we want to do. So with that, I will recognize Heidi.

Member Wastweet: Back to the beginning.

For Florence Harding, I'm not opposed to the use of hats. First ladies are often looked to for their fashion. But I don't think it's emblematic of the way she looked while she was the First Lady. I think 1 and 2 do that beautifully. On the reverse, I want to say briefly on number 1, with the newsboys, I think this would have worked if we didn't have her in the background. If we had just this nice arrangement of newsboys, that would have been symbolic of her contribution to the paperboy routes. I think that's really a nice symbolism but we missed the boat here because we have her here in the background. It becomes a story board. It becomes a double portrait. We've been asking, let's stay away from double portraits. So that misses the boat.

CFA pick number 4, I think, on the pallet of a coin, physical gesture is really important. And this physical gesture, it may be accurate to some historic code, I don't know. But what it says to me is, she doesn't really care. She's just flopping the ballot into the box. And she has no enthusiasm. It doesn't say anything to me. And number 6, I think it's got a lot going on but it still hits the mark. Grace Coolidge, I really like obverse number 3. I think it's just elegant and graceful. And we like to see profiles. This is a really great profile. It's emblematic of the way she looked as she was the First Lady. This is really nice. Reverse, I'm fine with the letters being on the wrist. I'm fine with them being down in the field. But it is, it's a good symbol for her contribution. Kudos to the artist on number

4, but I do prefer number 3.

Lou Hoover, observes, I'm actually fine with any of the three. They're all very nice. I am leaning toward number 2. On the reverse, I think that the microphone here is not immediately recognizable as a microphone as much as the radio. It really is immediately recognizable and gets the point across very well. So I like number 4.

Eleanor Roosevelt seems to be our controversial one. I, as a sculptor, looking at these designs, I say, which one of these would I want to sculpt? And I go to number 3. I think number 3 is a really lovely portrait. It would coin very well. It would be nice to sculpt. She may not have been a classic beauty but she was still an incredibly beautiful human being. And I think this puts her in a nice light. It's a nice facial expression, soft eyes but confident and strong and sweet. I like this one very, very much. I absolutely hate teeth on coins. As a sculptor, it just drives me nuts. I cannot stand them, and so I'm vehemently against 4 and 5. On number 6, I think this drawing is very very nice. It shows a very realistic depiction of the way she looked. It's not something I would want to sculpt. There's a lot of emphasis on the wrinkles on her face. And the way metal reflects light on a coin, I don't know that that's going to come across as well on a coin as it does in this drawing. So I am going to stand against the tide here and be in support of obverse number 3.

On the reverses, I am in strong support of what Gary said about this. Of all of the designs that we are looking at today, this is the one I was most excited about. And I am disappointed that we don't have a greater support among the Committee for this design. We've been asking for symbolism and this is symbolic.

When we go with story boards, we actually limit what we are saying about her. If we show her serving soup in a soup kitchen, to me, it says that's

the only thing she did, that's the most important thing she did. If we see her sitting at the UN desk, it just shows her sitting there. And it's so lacking in symbolism that the artist needed to put the words, "Delegate to you the United Nations." That tells us that the image itself is not even necessary. We could take the image off and just have the words, "Delegate to the United Nations." The image itself isn't adding anything to the design.

Eleanor Roosevelt was a spectacularly complex and intellectual person. In the language of coins, lamps represent knowledge and education. Light represents wisdom. And she empowered women by showing what an intellectual woman can do in this world. And I think number 3 hits all of those points with her. She was an incredible light on this world. And I strongly support number 3. And I hope that I have swayed some other opinions to go in that direction, because I think this is a beautiful coin that says more about her than any of these story boards.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you, Heidi.

Donald.

Member Scarinci: You know, it was, I think you definitely, you know, made me step back, you know, and look at, you know, the question that Mike had asked earlier, Mike Ross had asked earlier which is, in the series, we're now going to make a dramatic jump to symbolism, just as the first ladies really become important. And you know, I kind of, you know -- and I thought about, I've been thinking about what you said.

And I kind of think that maybe that's exactly why we should move to symbolism now. Because the first ladies do become important. And maybe what our charge to the artist should be for the rest of this series, because for the rest of the series, the first ladies, you know, are significant. And maybe our charge then should be give us symbolism now. And let's symbolize why they're important.

And I also think when you, you know -- the reason for the candle, you know, and, you know -- I think in the series the candle on the rounded Earth is profound. And I think, you know, if I were to ask you, who do you think was the most important First Lady? I think I know the answer to that, right? It's Eleanor Roosevelt.

Member Ross: Yes, it's Eleanor Roosevelt.

Member Scarinci: So, you know, she should stand out among the first ladies. And standing out with the depiction of a candle, of a symbol, of a candle on the Earth certainly makes her stand out among the first ladies.

So I think that it's, and I think it is exactly -- and for all the reasons other people said -- you know, you know, I think that the story board, you know, and I think in general, I think the message, you know, that I want to certainly convey to the artist, I think that they're hearing from all of us today is, you know, we're just going to -- you can submit us all the story boards you want, we're going to delete them.

So you know, give us -- and I really think that's part of the problem you're having with the CFA, even if they didn't articulate it quite that way. I think, you know, keep it simple, keep it symbolic, make it powerful. And some of the images here are powerful. I, you know, so I mean, in general terms, I just wanted to say that.

In specifics as to Florence Harding, with the specifics, as to Florence Harding and Grace Coolidge, you know, over the years I've come to, I've come to learn that, you know, that, you know, the two people on this Committee who, you know, Mike Olson and I live in different Americas. And when we agree, you know, you know it's the right thing. So I, you know -- and I'm sitting here and I'm reminded to take more time with Florence Harding and Grace Coolidge. You know, Mike and I, if Mike I agree that Florence Harding observe 2,

Florence Harding reverse 6, you know that's right.

Grace Coolidge, you know, obverse 2 and Grace Coolidge's reverse 3, you know, and then hopefully the Chair will entertain a motion to consider conforming, you know, our recommendation with the CFA on this one by removing U.S.A., but that's for later. You know, but so on those two I think we're there. In fact, I think on Lou Hoover, you know, Mike's alternative position. I hope you're on, Mike -- Mike's alternative position --

Member Olson: I'm on.

Member Scarinci: Okay. -- Mike's alternative is obverse 4. I think his first choice, if I recall, was zero. Because I was just mesmerized by his picks on this one. And I picked the obverse 4 as a Lou Hoover. I also picked, you know, reverse 4 as a, as I think we're all kind of gravitating to for the reverse for Lou Hoover.

On Eleanor Roosevelt, you know, I generally don't, you know, I generally don't go for the images that are -- for these coins and for the president series -- I generally don't go for the images that everyone knows is the person. I mean, the most common image of the person that you think of when you think of the person, you know, and in the president series, you know, I think I was really -- I think it's a very significant thing what we're doing there. And but for Andrew Jackson, who the Secretary personally, you know, picked that one because that is the image of Andrew Jackson that you know, that's commonly known. And that's the only image of Andrew Jackson in the entire series that's not of Andrew Jackson at the time he was the president. It's a portrait that everybody knows, but it's not of the time he was the president.

You know, with Eleanor Roosevelt that's never a problem because, you know, because the president was a president for four terms. So, and this is the common image that you see. But I think because the Eleanor Roosevelt, because Eleanor Roosevelt, I

think, is the turning point, probably the role model of future first ladies, I think --

Member Ross: Some of the first ladies.

Member Scarinci: Some. And you know, and I think because of that, let's give the people the image they know. And I think obverse 4 is that image. That's the image in all the pictures. And I, of course, you know, for the all the reasons I said, you know, the candle and the Earth, you know, reverse 3 is my preference on that.

Chair Marks: Okay. Michael.

Member Bugeja: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We'll start with Florence Harding obverse 1. I wanted to comment on this, even though it's my favorite and it's the favorite of many others. Every now and then it's important to have the portrait look straight in the eye of the viewer. And this one does that and it's elegant. I totally embrace this. If you go to number 2, she's, you know, looking beyond you. It really looks like an academic supervisor ready to give an annual review. Let's go to 3. You know, the hat, the hat and the side view in the portrait, it makes the person an icon rather than a person. And I really dislike that it's a figure in stones.

Then we go to Florence Harding reverse number 6. I think that's very beautiful. The only comment I have on this is to make sure the, that the shades of the, the shades of all the devices here are relatively the same. It gets lighter naturally as it goes up towards the torch. But I'd like to see maybe some different background, not background, some different texture on the voting ballot and the camera and all just to make the images pop. I like this design, but there's a flatness to it. And if you just consider small technical devices, you have a torch that's light, that's going to naturally be darker towards the bottom, but you also have wood versus leather or plastic. And if you could just bring out the

textures a little bit more, I think it will give a little depth to it.

These are fine touches. Nobody needs to -- I mean the artist or Don would know far better than I how to do that. But we have several devices of different materials. And if we could just think about that to distinguish them a little bit more from each other, we would add some depth.

Can we go to Grace Coolidge number 2 obverse? I think it's another one looking right at you, very pleasant. That's all I wanted to say on that. If we can go to reverse 3 on Grace Coolidge. Now, I don't have any problem with U.S.A. The problem that I have is numismatic. In this particular design, we have, "The legend" stated 3 times. All right. We have the legend above, we have the legend in symbol, and then we have the abbreviation of the legend. That, to me, is sometimes a little much. If you remove the U.S.A., which I prefer, from the hands, and you moved the legend to the bottom of the coin, and the other -- I know that we're violating symbols -- it would actually reflect a little bit more.

It looks like it's going to be the design. So I just have trouble with the legion repeated three times. I would prefer the U.S.A. not be there.

If we could go to number 4. Number 4 is very intriguing to me, and the reason why it's intriguing is: very very seldom in our coins do we have the sense of touch. And coins are all about the sense of touch. It is, it's beautiful. I have somewhat of a problem with an obverse and a reverse having the same type of portrait. But I wanted to speak in favor of them number 4 because of the numismatic dearth of images that reflect touch. I thought that was quite beautiful. If we could go to Lou Hoover obverse 1, she's looking askance, but I think it's a nice, it's a nice portrait. If we could go to Lou Hoover reverse 3, reverse 3. The thing that bothers me about 3 is that we look like we're

commemorating April the 19th, 1929. And from a numismatic perspective, again, you're having two dates compete with each other, heads and tails.

If we can go to number 4. You know, I'm wondering if there's something that can be said under that that doesn't have to say, "First public address," but it's hard to do. I just wanted to mention that, I mean, number 4 is my favorite, but I have a little bit of trouble; it looks like a commemoration of a radio address. And of course, we had stations operating in 1929.

If we could go to Eleanor Roosevelt, number 3. This is my favorite from a very fine point that's going to have, I think, some big impact. If you're going to have two heads on a coin, they might as well tell a story.

And I'm not certain this Committee really understands the difference between story and story board. So if I want to make a story, this definitely would be my choice. Now, if you could go to number 6 reverse. I get what Michael Ross is saying. I understand what he is saying. The problem that I have with this has been said by other people. But that's not what she did there. What she did there was Chair the Declaration of Human Rights. On December 10th, countries all around the world are going to be celebrating the Declaration of Human Rights. If we knew that this was going to come up and we had -- there's a beautiful picture of her standing by the Declaration of Human Rights and it was her, she thought, her crowning achievement, and if you took a look, it's a really big declaration, you wouldn't even need her. And then you're not adding script to it because that's the title of it, The Declaration of Human Rights. And if you had that as the symbol with the story of her younger portrait, it would be a coin that would be treasured by people.

There is a difference between story and story board. So I understand what Michael Ross is saying. Given this, this is terrible for all the reasons that we said.

But if we could -- she considered that, Michael, am I not right -- her most important achievement or at least one of her most --

Member Ross: Well, one of her favorites.

Member Bugeja: -- one of her most important achievements. And it's still celebrated December 10th.

So and then you get rid of the story board by just having that document and then you get rid of the text because it's right on the document, you have a marvelous coin. So if you're not going to do that and if it were I, and this is Eleanor Roosevelt, that's very important.

Now, if you can go to number 3. I wanted to comment on number 3. I like number 3 for all the reasons that people are saying. I dislike number 3 because she hasn't lit the candle yet, and we have brightness everywhere. Now, imagine if the candle was lit and her hand being withdrawn from the candle, you would have what her contribution is. So those are my comments and take them or leave them.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. Okay.

We've reached the end of our evaluation. I'm just going to ask you all to fill out your voting sheets. And while you're doing that we're going to go to lunch.

While you're doing that I'm going to report to you the results of the platinum evaluation for -- these were all reverses of course; for design number 1, it received four, design number 4 received two, design number 5 received three, design number 7 received three; designed 8 received eight, design 11, which is our recommendation, received 23 of a possible 30, I'll note. And then of interest, design number 12, which was CFA's choice received zero from the Committee. So --

Participant: Here, here.

Chair Marks: -- and all the others, the number designs I didn't mention were those the Committee eliminated so we would assume those are all zero. So with that, we have the issue of lunch now. We are scheduled to come back at a quarter after one. We are, right now, a half-hour late in going to lunch. How does the Committee feel about a 45 minute lunch and we'd be back at 1:30?

Participant: Absolutely.

Chair Marks: I think it could bring us substantially back on schedule.

Participant: Absolutely.

Chair Marks: And I think 45 minutes, I hope, would be enough. We've got lunch on premise. So if that seems to suit everybody, with that, that will be our plan. We'll be back here at 1:30.

And we are in recess.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled

matter went off the record at

12:41 p.m. and went back on the

record at 1:31 p.m.)

Chair Marks: The first item I want to cover is the minutes and the letter from October 18th. Those were passed out earlier in the meeting, the minutes were. The letter was in your packet. So if you are prepared, I'd like to entertain a motion to approve both of those.

Oh, first of all, before we do that I need to say that we need to correct Mr. Jansen's name appearing twice. I incorrectly spelled it should J-E-N-S-E-N, which it should be J-A-N-S-E-N. So as you approve it, we're assuming with that correction. So if there is a motion to approve the minutes as corrective and

the letter, I would take that now.

Member Ross: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes and letter. The motion was by me, seconded by Michael. So with that, all those in favor please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed.

(No audible response.)

Motion carries.

Also, I'll circle back before we get to the tally and ask all those on the phone if you would identify yourself so we will know you're there.

Member Ross: Michael. Did you get my vote?

Chair Marks: Yes, we did.

Member Olson: Okay.

Chair Marks: Who else is on the phone?

Mr. Menna: Yes. Joe Menna, in Philly.

Chair Marks: Hello, Joe.

Mr. Bernardi: Tom Bernardi is here as well.

Chair Marks: Anyone else?

(No audible response.)

Mike, thank you.

Mr. Menna: Mike is here, too in Philly. I think he got cut off by the other Michael.

Chair Marks: Okay. Hold on for just a minute.

Mr. Gaudioso: I'm Mike Gaudioso. I'm right here, sorry, I had it on mute.

Chair Marks: Okay. Hello?

Mr. Gaudio: Hello.

Tally of First Spouse 2014

Chair Marks: Just a brief pause here. We're about to read the results of the tally for the first spouse 2014 coins, as soon as we get all the sheets an order. Okay.

For Harding, Harding obverse, design number 1 received 18 of a possible 30 and is the runner-up. The recommended design is number two with 23.

Moving to the Harding reverse, number one received two votes. Reverse number two, which was out of contention, received a vote.

Participant: I wonder who.

Chair Marks: Reversed three, which was out of contention, received two. Reverse 4 received three points. Reverse six is the recommended design, with 28 of the 30. So, Coolidge. Coolidge obverse, we have number one, which was removed from contention, received three votes. Number two is our recommended design, with 24 of the 30 possible. And then three received four.

Coolidge reverse, again, number two, which was eliminated, received three. And reverse three received 29 of the 30. Nearly perfect. And that is our recommended design. Okay. And number four received 13. Okay.

Moving on to Hoover, on the obverse, number one received 10 points. Number two received eight. And number four is the selected design with 20. 20 of 30 possible.

Going on to Hoover reverse, out of contention number one received three. Design three received four. And number four is our recommended design, with 28 of the 30 possible. Strong showing for that one.

Moving on to Roosevelt. Roosevelt obverse, obverse number three received six. Obverse four is our recommended design with 21 of a possible 30. Obverse five received one vote. Six received 11. And seven received three.

Moving on to the Roosevelt reverse. The selected design or recommended, I should say, is number three, with 27 of the 30 possible. Fairly strong showing for that one. And then number five, reverse number five received five. And the CFA preference, reverse number six, received nine points from our Committee.

So if you missed any of those, we'll be happy to go over them again after the meetings. I have received a note, which I think is appropriate, that at two o'clock could we observe a moment of silence for the late President John F. Kennedy. As you all know, that's approximately the time, I believe, that he was assassinated exactly 50 years ago today. So if someone would, if I forget if, someone would remind me as we approach the two o'clock hour, I'd appreciate that. I'll probably be able to handle it though.

So at this point, staff, is there anything before we move on, on the agenda?

(No audible response.)

Okay. Then the next item on our agenda is the -- actually, we're going to look at that, the last item on the agenda. So if we can -- thank you for, by the way, thank you Megan, thank you, thank you. Folks, she tore off at lunch to make this happen. This will be relevant when we look at the visual definition. For those on the phone, we're looking at a visual of the civil rights obverse number 10 that this Committee recommended but was not coined. And we're going to revisit that image as part of the visual definition later on in this meeting. But for now, we're going to look back at our agenda, and then we're going to have our discussion on the 2015 March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Program. And

I look to April for her report.

2015 March of Dimes Coin Program

Ms. Stafford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The March of Dimes Commemorative Coin Act of 2012, public law 112-209, requires the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue not more than 500,000 silver dollar coins in recognition, and celebration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the March of Dimes Foundation. Subject to section 5134(f) of Title 31 USC, surcharges received from the sale of these coins will be paid to the March of Dimes to help finance research, education, and services aimed at improving the health of women, infants, and children.

Regarding the design, the legislation states that, "The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the mission and programs of the March of Dimes, and its distinguished record of generating American support to protect our children's health."

On each coin minted under this Act we have required inscriptions. I'll designate those for you. For the obverse, we have: the year 2015, the inscription Liberty, and in God We Trust. On the reverse: One dollar, E Pluribus Unum, and United States of America. Also, the legislation states that the design for the coins minted under this Act shall contain motifs that represent the past, present, and future of the March of Dimes, and its role as a champion for all babies. Such designs to be consistent with the traditions and heritage of the March of Dimes.

So the United States Mint consulted with our liaisons at the March of Dimes and we received additional information from them suggesting design concept for our artists' consideration. They include, primarily, the idea to convey the history of the March of Dimes on one side and to represent their

current mission on the other. So images might include for the mission of today: a mother and a baby, a baby's face, a doctor or researcher in an isolette, and the large logo symbol. Possible inscriptions they suggest might include, "March of Dimes," and "Stronger, healthier babies."

Regarding representing their history, they suggest designs to represent the victory over polio. Suggested images including depictions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Jonas Salk, poster child, a field of trial children, and President Roosevelt in a wheelchair. Possible inscriptions: "Victory over polio," and "Celebrating 75 years."

We have with us today, we are very honored to have representatives from the March of Dimes. They include Cynthia Pellegrini, Senior Vice President for Public Policy and Government Affairs, Kristy Lysik, Director of Special Events Revenue Development, and David Rose, archivist. So if it's okay with you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pass the microphone to them to --

Chair Marks: Please.

Ms. Lysik: Thank you very much. I'm David Rose, archivist of the March of Dimes. And just a word to start about the history of the March of Dimes. As you all know, it was founded by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1938, as the national foundation for infantile paralysis. The March of Dimes was the first name of our fund-raising campaign, which was a successful campaign. It led to, really, the public being so attracted to that it became the name of the foundation itself later on.

We were committed to lead, unify, and to direct the fight against poliomyelitis. And through the development of the Jonas Salk polio vaccine and Albert Sabin polio vaccine, the March of Dimes effectively ended the polio epidemics in the United States. Due to that, we had a cadre of volunteers across the country that we didn't want to lose. And we changed our mission to birth defects prevention

in 1958, utilizing those volunteers to help us with that.

During the 1960s we set up birth defects treatment and evaluation centers. And then went on to the field of perinatal health and genetics, to the point where, in 2003, we started a campaign against a premature birth, which was on the rise in the United States since the early 1980s. So our mission today is strongly characterized by the campaign against prematurity, promoting stronger healthier babies, and that, in sum, is what the March of Dimes is all about.

So, thank you very much.

MS. PELLEGRINI: Thank you, again, for having us here. The March of Dimes was absolutely thrilled when we managed to successfully pass the legislation leading to the creation of this coin, which we think is an especially wonderful and fitting way to honor our 75th anniversary, given the fact that we have a coin in the very name of our organization.

It was a long and arduous road but, like the polio campaign, it was our volunteers who put us over the top in getting the coin passed. I would like to just add to what David said about our current campaign to, which is broadly around maternal and child health, promoting healthy pregnancies and healthy babies. But very specifically, right now, around pre-term birth. Pre-term birth rates peaked in the United States in 2006 with one in every eight babies born premature. So 12.6 percent -- 12.8 percent, excuse me, of all infants were being born pre-term.

Since that time, we have managed to reduce rates more than a full percentage point. So then now they are well below 11 percent.

And we have benchmarks for every state and nationwide that we are working hard to drive pre-term birth rates to by the year 2020.

We spend tens of millions of dollars in research on this goal every year. And scientists, our scientists are telling us that we will put an end, or at least, understand fully pre-term birth and have more interventions for it within our lifetimes for the vast majority of causes of pre-term birth. So with that idea in mind of commemorating our past with polio, and our present with pre-term birth, and healthy babies we really look forward to working with you on making this as successful a program as possible.

Ms. Lysik: Very impressive, colleagues.

I just want to say thank you for having us.

We, as you can tell, we have a very long and rich history. And we are doing some impressive work now and moving forward. So thank you for having us today and I will turn it back over to April.

Ms. Stafford: So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Back to the Committee for a discussion.

Chair Marks: Okay. There was material provided to us in our packet calling out the details of this coin and detailing some possible suggested images. So I trust that we've all had a chance to look at that. I was just trying to refresh myself on this log. And I'm wondering if the staff or our guests might be able to address for me. I read this somewhere, that a long time ago, but the origin of the March of Dimes itself, the idea of the coin being a part of your name.

Mr. Rose: The phrase "March of Dimes" was coined by the vaudeville comedian, Eddie Cantor, for the first fund-raiser of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. So that name is used from the very beginning of our organization in 1938.

Later on, after Franklin Roosevelt passed in April of 1945, a polio club located in Virginia, it was

affiliated with a March of Dimes Chapter, I believe in Norfolk Virginia, petitioned a Virginia Senator to introduce legislation putting Roosevelt's likeness on the dime. And that was passed within the year.

And I believe it was in 1946 that the first Roosevelt dime was coined or minted. And we, of course, because Roosevelt was such a firm supporter of the March of Dimes and as a founder that his likeness on the time was really intrinsically and symbolically related to the organization itself.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you. With that, I guess I'm going to start the comments. The legislation does indicate that a surcharge will be placed on the sale of these coins and that would then be paid to the March of Dimes.

With that, I'm sure the March of Dimes would like to see lots of these coin sell. And in that frame, as a panel, most of us here, we're not coin collectors. We have an intense interest in coins. And there are several of us who are coin collectors, numismatists if you will, and we are the people who buy these things.

And there's like 32,000 others who belong to the ANA. That's going to be mainly your customer base. Surely, there'll be some from your own organization and those who support you.

So I say this because with the idea or the theme of March of Dimes, and your marketplace is going to be a marketplace where numismatists will be -- your title is a big bonus to you. The mention of dime in your name. I think we'd be remiss if we didn't end up with a design that somehow had some, even some element of a dime on it. I don't know if it's -- maybe the dime size diameter itself somewhere on the silver dollar that had the obverse because that wouldn't call out a nomination -- which would be a confusing issue -- but perhaps the obverse of the dime actually goes on the March of Dimes dollar. Or maybe the traditional portrait of Roosevelt in the midst of a modern design. Something of that

nature, I think is important.

And I think would lend to sales of this coin. It would just make a lot of intuitive sense. If you are the March of Dimes and you have the honor of having a silver dollar minted by the United States Mint, it seems to me the dime should be on there somewhere. And I know that that would motivate, I know it would motivate me to buy it. I don't buy all products. I only buy the ones that I like and that have some meaning to me. And I don't know, something about that, intuitively, I think that ought to be there. You could put just simply the dime on there and fill the rest of the face with some complementary image. So, or maybe some focus on, as you've suggested here images, of a mother and baby or, I don't know. Anyway, I guess those are my comments.

Jeanne, are you ready?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes. I'm not sure if this is on. It's on.

Just to carry on with Gary's suggestion. And I may really be amiss in asking the Mint this or the Committee this but if we have a dollar March of Dimes could we not take that same imagery and make a dime out of it? I mean, is it possible to actually have a dime minted with that same image, a smaller -- we can't do that?

Participant: The law won't --

Member Stevens-Sollman: The law won't let us. That's too bad. I'm sorry. Okay. Sorry.

Member Jansen: Question.

Chair Marks: Go, Erik.

Member Jansen: I don't think the law specifies how the product is merchandised. So maybe a question for April, is it possible that this dollar coin could also be offered in a special set with a genuine proof 2014

dime?

Ms. Stafford: The United States Mint Sales and Marketing Department absolutely explores --

Member Jansen: Yes.

Ms. Stafford: -- lots of those options for special -- and what will encourage the sale.

Member Jansen: Okay.

Ms. Stafford: For their understanding of the theme.

Member Jansen: All right. So here's a maybe odd question that probably hits Steve and Greg. Could a die be constructed that would actually create a cavity, a blank cavity, on the silver dollar upon which a clad dime could be spot welded?

Chair Marks: Steve doesn't think you're serious.

Member Jansen: Steve thinks I'm a nut.

Mr. Antonucci: I love the way your mind thinks.

Member Jansen: My mind doesn't think, Steve. It just kind of rolls in strange ways.

Chair Marks: I have a suggestion. Why wouldn't you put the dime on there and raise it up as a raised item on the design itself?

Member Jansen: Well, why don't we just put it in there and let it brockeridge itself, you know? I mean, there are all kinds of ways of looking at the situation.

Chair Marks: I can see the missing dime error now. We have to weld it on there.

Member Jansen: We know creating scarcity is not something the Mint does on purpose. But it is an open question. I mean, you've done curved planchets, you've done all kinds of things, could you predictably and would the regulations here allow, potentially, a cavity be too struck into the --

Mr. Antonucci: Blank cavity. You mean a void?

Member Jansen: I mean a whole that we stick a dime in.

Chair Marks: You want a doughnut.

Member Jansen: No, I don't necessarily mean a doughnut. I don't want to fabricate a bi-metallic --

Mr. Antonucci: Well, that's what --

Member Jansen: Maybe we can procure one. I don't know. Maybe that's an alternative form of the question.

But knowing the planchet thickness of a dollar is approximately double that of a dime probably, 220-30 percent or something, could you, I mean, it's a dialect question -- could you strike a cavity and insert a dime?

Ms. Stafford: Mr. Antonucci.

Member Jansen: Fortunately, it's not a sculpting challenge.

Mr. Antonucci: That's a highly technical challenge. I don't know. I don't know. I'd have to take some time to -- I can't -- I don't want to say yes and then get held to that.

Member Jansen: And Greg, would that walk on the regulations?

Ms. Weinman: Once again, the coin would be the struck coin would become -- we, as an numismatic element, to include a dime into it, isn't necessarily a --

Member Jansen: It's not including a time. It incusing a dime.

Ms. Weinman: I would have to take it under advisement as well.

Ms. Stafford: Just for clarity, are you saying to

actually make the commemorative coin with the cavity so that a customer would insert their own dime?

Member Jansen: There is even a more provocative interpretation, taking my point further. I was just assuming the Mint would add the dime. But maybe you sell it in a, you know, BYO-dime.

Member Olson: What if you have the cavity of the dime as an incused negative space on the coin, like you said, and the customer could put their own dime in there and then you also have the celebration of the original design in contra relief as an artistic element?

Member Jansen: And you say it so more eloquently than I am capable of.

Chair Marks: Okay. You know what? This is really a technical question. If staff is going to answer it, I want you take the time that you need to answer it. So let's -- if you would take that under advisement -
-

Mr. Antonucci: Absolutely.

Chair Marks: -- and perhaps communicate something back when that is appropriate? That would be great.

I'm going to recognize Mike Olson on the phone. Mike, are you there?

Member Olson: Thanks, Gary. I want to understand just a little bit on what I was hearing of the idea that was just proposed and offer one of my own.

When I think of the March of Dimes, I recall the dime boards that would be up on the merchant's counter that would be full of dimes. And when they became full, I'm sure someone from the organization collected them and deposited them to provide for the good of that the organization does.

The idea that I was hearing talked about, about a

slot or a space in the silver dollar for a dime ties in with the organization as well. And I would encourage the Mint to look into that.

The other thing that came to mind as far as a design aspect is if we were going to incorporate, not a slot for dime but maybe a life-size image of the dime on the silver dollar, exactly the way that a dime looks, that part of the design of the dollar maybe some aspect of the board. And maybe a hand putting the dime into a board.

But the other -- that's just a design concept -- but the other business concept that I was thinking of, the silver dollars have a maximum mintage of 500,000. I can't remember the last time that the Mint came close to even selling half of that much. It benefits everyone to have as many sales as possible. People buy these coins because they like the design or because they have an affinity to the organization. You're going to get those sales regardless.

The way you could get some additional sales, and I heard some talk around the fringes of this, is think back to 1996 when, to commemorate Franklin Roosevelt a special dime was included only in the Mint set, which you could buy from the Mint, with a W Mint mark. You couldn't go to the banks. The only way you get them was to buy the Mint set. Those coins I believe now are selling for upwards of \$20 apiece for a dime.

Chair Marks: Mike, Mike, Mike.

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Can I get you to pause for just a minute?

We need to have our moment of silence. Two o'clock has arrived. And so at this moment we will observe a moment of silence.

(Moment of silence.)

Okay. Thank you.

Mike, please continue.

Member Olson: Okay. Yes. It's hard to remember where I was 50 years ago because I was a month old. But definitely a very emotional time here today.

Getting back to the discussion on the Roosevelt dime. If there would be some consideration to making some type of limited dime available, you know, I read a lot of the internet, a lot of the blogs that some of the other collectors here do. And sometimes the Mint, fairly or unfairly, gets tainted with hey, you're making these expensive coins for the rich guy on some of these issues that have come out and there's nothing for the little guy. Well, you could really serve both constituencies here very well by considering a special dime to be included with the set. And the only way you could get this dime would be along with the purchase of a March of Dimes dollar.

We don't need to go into it all here. It could be a silver dime, it could have a special Mint mark, whatever. And limit the mintage of the dime to 100,000. I'll bet you'd would sell every one of those sets.

I'm interested to hear what everyone else has to say but that's my comment.

Chair Marks: Greg.

Ms. Weinman: Yes. I just want to clarify something from an earlier point. The question that Erik asked was, could we, as part of our manufacturing process, manufacture a dime into this particular coin as the coin? The answer would be, no. Because legislation is actually very specific that it must -- the coin we produce must weigh 26.73 grams, must contain 90 percent silver, and 10 percent copper. And so --

Member Jansen: And why not a dime on a 90

percent silver/10 percent copper planchet?

Ms. Weinman: Could be as an aftermarket numismatic item of some sorts. And that's a separate question.

Chair Marks: Okay. Donald.

Member Scarinci: Yes. I really appreciate that the sponsoring committee is here today at this stage. You know, it really creates, and regardless of everything you're going to hear here, it really creates an opportunity for us to communicate to you something that is, you know, that is very important that you really have to consider. And you're going to be interfacing with the Mint's staff and they will listen to you.

And what you have to consider on your end, when it comes to discussing a design, is really very internal. And I'm not asking the question because I don't want a response. I think you have to ask yourselves, is your objective to make money for the organization? Is your objective to have some commemorative of the organization, for the organization, regardless of whether it makes money or not? Or do you want to try to do both?

And I think if you can internally answer that question for yourselves, you'll be, you know, very effective in the way you communicate to the Mint and the way the Mint communicates back to you. But that's a fundamental threshold question.

And what you're hearing from us is, you know, and you're going to want to, you know do, a little homework, you probably already have, about mintages and what that means to your surcharge, you know, and what that means to your economics. And I think what you will find is that your core buyers are, you know, collectors, essentially.

And you know, while, you, the organization, are going to sell these things, and push these things, and promote these things, the people you push

them to and promote them to will buy them regardless of what they are. Right?

The collectors, on the other hand, are going to be very very more, are going to be much much more selective. Especially, you know, what you hear with, that some people collect, there's so much product each year that they pick and choose what they're going to buy. They don't buy everything. I buy everything. Right? But most people don't buy everything.

And you know, so you know, I think you're going to want to really appeal to that market because that's your core at the end of the day. And what you're going to sell, you're going to sell anyway. And people are going to buy it because they support, you know, they support you.

So collectors will not buy it just because they support you.

So I think that, you know, there are some opportunities. It is a dollar. But I think if you do something that's same old same old, you're going to get the results that we have been, that the Mint has been getting over recent years; same old same old, the collectors aren't buying it.

If you can do something, you know, different creative, and what we've been trying to communicate to the artists is give us, you know, give a symbol, give us art, give us something that's pretty, give us something that's a work of art, because when it is a work of art, people buy it. And then it crosses other circles where people buy. If it's going to be just another image, you know, an image of, you know, a baby and, you know, a mother well, you know, a lot of those. You know, not only here but all over the world. So there's nothing special about it.

If you're willing to be bold and different this is probably the time in the Mint's history that's -- they're doing bold and different things, you know,

with -- and if it were ever possible to do things like bi-metallic coins or coins in parts, in multiple parts, the kinds of things, the kinds of coins that get awards for most innovative in other categories as we're going to talk about later today, when we look at some of these things, these are the people, especially that guy over there, they can do this.

So you have to really -- because this is your coin, and in the end -- so you guys have to really think it through, talk to the Mint, you know, you're going to find from us, you know, that the more creative you are, the more excited we're going to be.

And you know, we like symbolism.

We don't like pictorial images. Images of, you know, in fact we just had that today, earlier today. I think we rejected most of the designs for the first spouse coins that had, you know, pictorial depictions, pictures on metal.

You know, art exciting things, different things, you're going to get people excited.

And something that could, if you could get them to do something that's a first, people collect firsts. So I just wanted to pass that on.

I don't have any comments on the specific, on the specific design and nor do I particularly believe in coin design by committee. I believe in letting the artists be the artists and see what they come up with. And give them as much as rope as you can give them because they think in coin. And we don't. So they think in a multi-dimensional sculptural image and we don't.

So I thank you for coming at this early stage for us. And you know, I don't have any specific comments other than to just give you that suggestion.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Donald. Who would like to go next?

MS. PELLEGRINI: Is it possible just to --

Chair Marks: Please.

MS. PELLEGRINI: -- add just a little bit of information that might be helpful to you all as you think because your points are very well taken. And they are things that we're already discussing, and researching, and trying to plan ahead for. And so just a couple of thoughts. From the information we've been able to collect and glean so far, it seems like the collectors are usually responsible for between, somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000 sales of coins for each commemorative coin. Somewhere in that neighborhood.

We've been authorized to sell up to 500,000. So it's our assumption that, as an organization, we're going to be responsible for generating the sales of at least half, and probably more than half. So how do you balance these not irreconcilable, but certainly challenging different issues, between what is appealing to the coin collector and what is appealing to our audience?

So it might help you to know who our audience is a little bit more. We have well over 3 million active volunteers nationwide. These people, in general, generally our families, often their moms, usually they are parents of a preemie, a child with a birth defect or their families have lost the baby to one of those things, or the friends and close, you know, close friends and family members of those folks.

So we're also looking at this and saying, what will be most appealing to these people who are already supporting us? They're already usually, you know, they're walking in our walks, or they're participating in special events, or they're sending us donations. What can we give them that would incentivize them to support us in this additional way? So it's not a first, probably not going to be a first way to support us for most of these people that we're going to be contacting. It's a second or third or fourth way that they're contributing to the March of Dimes in that

year.

Chair Marks: Thank you very much. Someone else? Any thoughts? Did we get it all set up?

Member Olson: Well, Gary, this is Mike Olson. I believe that was a March of Dimes representative that was just speaking; is that correct? Chair Marks: Yes, yes, it was.

Member Olson: Okay. The only suggestion that I might make to you is you got three million folks that are committed to your cause and are volunteering. You need to be thinking of the way you can drive the message down that these coins are available down to that last person.

With some of these other groups that we've seen here in the past, I'm not sure if the entire interest group even knows the coins exist.

So you're going to want to have a good plan for communicating and then how to order them.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Mike. Are there any other comments?

(No audible response.)

Okay. I'd like to thank our guests for coming and being a part of --

(Applause.)

-- part of this discussion. And most of all, I want to thank you for the service you provide to our nation through a very worthy organization. And I hope that you'll come back when we see these designs as real designs. And we'll be very eager to get your input on those designs at that time.

So thank you for being here. Okay. Next -- well, let's just pause for just a minute. We're not recessing. Just let our guest collect their stuff and exit the room. All right.

Next item on the agenda is the thematic discussion on the 2015, and I believe, 2016 First Spouse Coins. And there's material in the packet.

April, did you have a report for us?

2015/2016 First Spouse Themes

Ms. Stafford: No, sir. It was just simply, we can do this one of two ways. Either we can just give the court reporter a copy of the activities and interests as listed or I can read it into the record. Whatever your preference, that we're simply going to receive your --

Chair Marks: We did receive the material in the packet. I believe that most or all of us have looked that material over. So I think what I want to do, I want to go to our strength on the Committee for these sorts of discussions. I want to start it with Michael Ross, who's our historian.

And Michael, if you're ready, I'd like to understand your thoughts on this.

Member Ross: Sure. I like the fact that we're being included on this end because I think we can save a lot of the artwork that everyone seems to be rejecting on a regular basis of first ladies hosting, of first ladies at the summer retreat, of first ladies with dogs on the front lawn.

And even though some of these things in the past that first ladies do, so it is part of who they were as first ladies, I would like to propose that we very quickly just go through each and just scratch them out so no artist spends any time coming up with artwork that has anything to do with those topics. And instead, focuses on things that can be portrayed symbolically in an inspiring way. And I think we can do this very fast. All right.

Bess Truman. This is the woman who hated the duties of the White House. And they have her in there as the greatest of White House hostesses. She

hated it. She went home to Independence whenever she could. The fourth line down, "Re-instituted the formal White House and considered the hardest worker of all the White House hostesses." Great. She hated it. Whenever she could, she got out of Washington. She hated Washington. She liked Independence. She had been the accountant for her husband's haberdashery. And she's considered the First Lady who was least changed by the White House and kept her simple small-town values, and simplicity, and lack of pretension.

So if there's a way to convey something about her as the person who kept her small-town heart at the White House, it would be magnificent. But that should go.

You know, "Worked as a paid staffer on her husband's seventh -- helped campaign with her husband on the Whistle Stop Campaign," that's virtually every first lady from 1865 on. "Participated in food rationing at the White House during World War II," well not bad but something symbolic about a simple woman with straightforward taste who indeed Harry consulted with her on the Atomic Bomb, we don't need to go into that. But something like that.

Mamie Eisenhower. We do not want her decorating 27 different Christmas trees. We do not want her -- you get what I'm getting at. What she was probably most -- her largest impact -- she deliberately took a secondary role, she thought that was appropriate -- but her largest impact after Eisenhower has a heart attack, she becomes this kind of national spokesperson for the American Heart Association, raises \$70 million, or raises their income 70 percent and makes heart health an national issue. That's a nice storyline. Jackie Kennedy, yes, she gives that that famous tour that we see over and over again of her touring people around the White House. But that's not how Jackie Kennedy, I think, wants to be remembered. I think if when you think of Jackie Kennedy and her input into Camelot, it wasn't just

her beauty and style, but it was the fact that she was the driving force behind one of the key points of Camelot, which was the arts. She's the one that invites Pablo Casals into the White House. Kennedy didn't even want to see Pablo Casals. She's the one that made sure that at all these dinners, there were the artists and the musicians. And that whole image of Camelot as the era of culture is all Jackie Kennedy. And that can be symbolized, I think, quite nicely.

But if we do things like co-founded the White House Historical Association -- scratch. Insisted on remaining at her husband's side during the Cuban missile crisis. What are we going to do with that? Scratch. Gave a televised tour of the White House -- scratch. Authored the first historical guidebook of the White House -- scratch. Worked to secure a loan for the Mona Lisa fits into a larger theme but unless we're going to have her standing next to the Mona Lisa -- scratch.

You get the idea. And look for something that, a theme that symbolizes what her key contributions to the Kennedy mystique was.

Lady Bird Johnson. Very active First Lady. One of these people that her own Press Secretary, her own Chief of Staff. But it is true that the thing she is most remembered for is Lady Bird's Bill, the Beautification of American Highways. She's an environmentalist, conservationist but hated all the billboards and clutter and garbage. And that's a real contribution.

And I think you can do something symbolically with her commitment to the beautification of America's roads that represents her correctly.

But kept a diary of her life in the White House -- scratch. First Lady to hold the missal for her husband's squaring in -- scratch. First Lady to campaign for her husband in her own speeches, it's not bad but you get the idea.

Pat Nixon is the most traveled First Lady in the history of first ladies. She becomes her own, essentially, American representative and taken very seriously. And all of the places that she went without her husband she's not just following her husband around. I think that idea of a world traveling representative of America, great. But used her position as First Lady to advocate for volunteer service, she did do that, all right fine.

And then, Betty Ford, I think if you don't have something to represent Betty Ford's candor about her breast cancer, and her alcoholism, and her efforts to then help other women escape from alcoholism and to cure breast cancer, I think that's at the core of who anyone who thinks of Betty Ford, those are the things you immediately want symbolized. Rather than personally the First Lady to deliver a concession speech for her president's lost reelection bid.

So you get what I mean. Just pare it down so we don't get a story, any kind of story board enough so something every first lady ever has done, hosted the White House, decorate trees, added extra roses to the Rose Garden. Cut.

There. Done.

Chair Marks: Fabulous. Fabulous, Mike. That's why we have this guy on the Committee.

For me, personally you nailed it. That's the kind of thing we want to see. I think those are the sorts of things that will honor these ladies in a way that I would guess that they would want to be remembered. Excellent.

Anyone else have something to add to that?

Member Wastweet: No cuddling --

Member Ross: No cuddling panda bears.

Member Scarinci: I think it's impossible to add to

that. I think he said it --

Participant: Yes.

Member Wastweet: That was very good, Michael. Thank you.

Chair Marks: I will emphasize the last part. I mean, he distilled down those important things for each of those ladies. And the other part that he said at the end, but now let's represent those symbolically. You know, I don't think I want a picture of Pat Nixon stepping out of an airplane because she's a world traveler. That's a story board. I'd like some creativity to represent world traveler, you know. How you do that in a symbolic way?

Member Wastweet: Passport stamps.

Member Scarinci: I think engaging the global community.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Passport stamps, I don't know. Heidi just suggested -- but those sort of symbolic ideas, they're going to convey great. And by the way, we've started the symbolic theme on the first spouse today. All four of the reverses ended up being symbolic designs. So we're on a roll here. I'd like to keep us on that role.

Mr. Ross, just teed us up perfectly for that.

The artists aren't in the room, are they?

Participant: Could I just --

Chair Marks: No, when they get back in the room -- are there any artists on the phone?

Mr. Bernardi: Yes.

Chair Marks: It's been suggested that if you have any questions for our historian at this point it would be great if you wanted to send them his way.

Mr. Bernardi: I would appreciate it in advance of

having a more concrete narrative to the views of the point of reference. It's a little early for that, for me anyway.

Chair Marks: Understood.

Member Ross: Yes. My concern here is we've -- on these narratives -- what we've done is gone to a few websites and pull out a few items that these, you know, the Wikipedia and the White House Historical Association list as achievements. But it's seldom taking a step back from the person and getting at their essence, at the heart of what they represented, and how they're kind of fixed in the American imagination.

And I think we need to make more of an effort to do that rather than lining up these dreary mothball-ish lists of decorating 27 trees at the White House.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Jansen: I'll throw a thought out there. First of all, that isn't to say the work that was done here isn't appreciated. It is.

Member Ross: Oh, sorry.

Member Jansen: No, that's all right. No, I'm the master of brutality myself a few times.

Chair Marks: Yes, you are.

Member Jansen: So I'll only, you know, try to atone for my own sins there.

Chair Marks: I think some of the artists are going to put a contract out on you Erik.

Member Jansen: It's already happened but I live so far away that, you know, they can't touch me.

Member Ross: If they find you.

Member Jansen: They will eventually.

What I was going to say is because we're getting

into the modern age here, where there are assistants to these folks and some folks who may have known them well, would it be within a budget or a conceptual possibility that one of those folks that knew them might actually be interviewed?

Ms. Sullivan: Going that route wasn't something we considered but I have reached out to all of the presidential libraries in trying to get in touch with family members, trying to get in touch with anybody possible.

Member Jansen: Good.

Ms. Sullivan: It's still ongoing. The communication has been kind of slow --

Member Jansen: Yes.

Ms. Sullivan: -- in getting to the right people.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Ms. Sullivan: But I do, I do think there are some family members, actually, interested children and grandchildren that may want to contribute some more ideas. We just haven't hit that --

Member Jansen: Well, we get to this modern age and that's a possibility.

Ms. Sullivan: Right.

Member Jansen: And whether it's a call that interested artists can just dial into or whether it's recorded and made playable, the world changes when you get to the modern era.

Chair Marks: Go ahead.

Member Scarinci: Yes, I guess, you know, not what I was going to say but, you know, when we get to the presidential medal, the Barack Obama medal -- the only one sculpted from life was the Truman medal. And you know, it would be a great thing. I mean, if you could pull that off, getting an Obama

medal sculpted from life. So -- although he hates medals. He didn't even sit still for his inaugural medal, twice.

The thing I want to say is you've seen us, you've seen us as a group evolve and coalesce. And I think what you saw today was the beginning of, you know, don't show us pictures. And when you do, we're just going to delete them and we're not going to look at them. So the people, the artists who are doing them are really spending a lot of, you know, time and energy doing something that we don't want to see.

And I suspect, having been here for a long time, you know, that between now on the next meeting this will become more and more of a hardened position because that's what this group tends to do. So you know, I think take, you know, what happened today with the pictorialism and, you know, let's really focus on, you know, different choices of symbols.

And that, you know, that again, you know, challenges, really, the staff more than the artists because I think the artists think in symbolic terms anyway. You know, but I think you want to give them, you know, more of an opportunity to be creative on major themes, picking symbols, and working on symbols. And then take a chance and throw us stuff, even if you don't think, even if you don't think, you know, it's going to fly. And hear what we have to say.

I think other than Erik, no one on the Committee is shy.

Chair Marks: Right. Thank you, Donald.

It seems like we've said it all. Is there someone who wants to say more?

(No audible response.)

Okay. Then we're --

Member Olson: This is Mike Olson.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Olson: I know we're going to talk about the visual definition of coin design excellence later.

But now I think would be the appropriate time for at least for me to bring up the fact that when I went through our nominations this year and I saw some very good designs that we had nominated. And I picked most of them.

The thing I was struck by is when I will looked at the foreign designs, the quantity of good foreign designs that are exactly what I believe our Committee is telling the Mint that we'd like to see, there's a great body of work there.

So let's try to catch up here and make some progress.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thanks.

The next item on the agenda is completing our discussion on our fiscal year 13th annual report. When last we discussed the annual report, which was back in July, we had completed all of the basic recommendations we wanted to put forward except for the commemorative recommendations for the year 2018.

We had a short discussion at that point about three potential programs that we were thinking about recommending. There are two slots open.

So the three that we were looking at was, the first one was the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Airmail Service. The next one was a commemoration for the nation's fallen firefighters, which would be similar to the 1997 National Police Officers Memorial Dollar that was done for police officers. And then the last one was the 100th anniversary of the end of World War I. That one happens to be in Bill form right now. It's a bill that's being pushed by ANA. And I

think one of their premises is that it's the forgotten war of a sort in U.S. coinage.

I put forward a proposal, which is a little different than the ANA's. It's a \$2 program. One would be a traditional high relief 2018 version of the peace dollar coupled with a modern dollar coin commemorating the end of the war and honoring those who served.

So those are the three items. And I want to ask Michael Bugeja to bring us back up to speed with his recommendation for the U.S. Airmail.

Member Bugeja: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I feel very strongly about this particular commemorative. In 1918, the U.S. Postal -- what became to the U.S. Postal Service started delivering airmail and it was a very hazardous job at that time. Lots of brave pilots risked their lives to deliver mail. And we take airmail for granted, all of us do. And we rely on it every day, perhaps more so than any other -- any other government or postal service.

The thing about the airmail service that is important to me is that the USPS is financially challenged all the time. Rather than get into why it's challenged, you can understand that it is because we are in the process of deciding whether to end Saturday service. Saturday service is absolutely critical to the rural community. It's especially critical to the newspaper industry which relies on Saturday delivery. Coming in here for this meeting, I passed the old post office and there's a statue of Benjamin Franklin out there. Benjamin Franklin was the first postmaster of the United States. But before that and continuing after, he was a journalist.

It is important that the Post Office remember the vital quality of Saturday service. And in when they consider their budgetary challenges.

However, when you look at how these challenges are being addressed, as I look at it, in our local post

office in the middle of town in Ames, Iowa, which is in the middle of the state of Iowa, which is in the middle of the United States, and you look at the products that they're selling, you have U.S. Postal Service bags. It says, "The United States Post Office." Little bags that you could put groceries in, made in China. They have different types of stuffed animals, all made in China. They have watches, trinkets, all made in China. I bought every peripheral in Ames, Iowa. And the only one I found on the day that I purchased it was a pack of postcards that were made in the United States.

It has come to my attention as well that the U.S. Mint has often taken a look at how can we vend our products, because the Postal Service has all these products, why aren't U.S. Mint coins there?

Well, here is an opportunity to have a surcharge for a coin that serves a couple of purposes. More than a couple of purposes. One, it will go some way toward easing the financial burden of the post office.

Two, the newspaper industry and the media will be clearly behind it. I've had inquiries from editors across the country concerning this because I have posted on our ethics website all of the products I bought at the post office that were from China.

And then if we had a commemorative for airmail service that could be vended through the vast distribution centers of the U.S. Post Offices, closing many of those as we speak particularly in rural America, this could be a beginning to use the Postal Service as a vendor of U.S. Mint products.

But if we don't make an attempt to approach the Post Office at this critical juncture, we will miss this narrow window of opportunity.

Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. All right, Committee. Those are the three proposals before you. The task today is to decide which of those

three, two of those three that you want to include in the annual report.

Once we accomplish that today, I know the agenda says approval or final approval of the annual report, but I think I want to put that off to the next meeting where I can get you a clean copy version of the entire annual report.

But this is the last piece of work that has to be done to allow me to put that together for you.

So let's have the discussion. You've heard the three. Which two do you want to put into the annual report? Anybody?

Member Scarinci: What are the three again?

Chair Marks: Okay. The three --

Member Scarinci: The airmail --

Chair Marks: -- U.S. airmail, fallen firefighters --

Member Scarinci: Fallen firefighters.

Chair Marks: -- World War I.

So Michael Olson, are you on the line?

Member Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Did you want to make any comments? I don't want to overlook you. We can start --

Member Olson: This is for 2017, is that correct?

Chair Marks: 18. 18.

Member Olson: 2018. Okay.

You know, I really like your idea of the World War I with the peace dollar concept. That has every hallmark of our winner. And to re-issue a modern day peace dollar that you could continue your collection with decades after the last one was made, that is an exciting concept. And I think it would be very well received. And above and beyond that, the

commemoration of the soldiers that fought in that war is long overdue. So for that reason, I would certainly support your idea for that.

I know, Gary, you have been very gracious in the past to acquiesce the fallen firefighters' slots to allow others to fill in. And that is another one that I feel is long overdue.

So I guess, I've heard what Michael Bugeja has had to say and I don't disagree with anything he's saying. It all makes sense.

But for 2018, the firefighters and the World War I, they're long overdue. And we'll lose our opportunity to commemorate the 100th anniversary of World War I after 2018. So I think that one, in my view, is a certainty with the firefighters just edging out the airmail slightly.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael.

Member Olson: That's it.

Chair Marks: Someone else?

Member Scarinci: You know, I'd like to speak in favor of the airmail because, you know, one of the things that we had talked about a long long time ago was to -- and now obviously is not the time with the United States Postal Service to talk to them about anything that doesn't involve Harry Potter, you know or any of that stuff that they're doing -- but at some point it would be good to re-engage the, you know, our equivalent in the Post Office. And attempt to do what a lot of countries, coin-ish countries in the world are doing. Which is, you know, the concept of joint numismatic philatelic items. Where we issue a commemorative coin and simultaneous with the release of the U.S. commemorative coin, there could be a U.S. commemorative stamp. And the stamp coin could be a set. You know, which is stamped for the first day. So that's something we really, you know, we touch on it, we have these neat little president

dollar things, and we've done in the past but it's not really a numismatic philatelic item in the sense of, here's the stamp that's issued simultaneous with the coin. I think, you know, doing something like this, if we use it as a gesture to -- and we have plenty of time to deal with it and we can chairman-ize someone here to go to the Postal Service -- you know, that might create an opportunity to break the ice on this issue. And do it.

So I kind of like the idea, I kind of like the idea of this.

On the other coin, if there's any risk that were going to reproduce something, I'm going to go with the fallen firefighters.

Chair Marks: Okay. I have a suggestion that I think could make it a lot easier for us to complete this item and allow the postal issue to go forward.

Last year, I deferred to the Alaska Commemoration when I presented fallen firefighters. This year, I will willingly defer to the Postal Service if the Committee would be gracious enough to include in your motion that the 2019 year, which we will address in our next annual report, automatically, a slot goes to fallen firefighters. It will be an established fact when we look at that report.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Gary, I think that's a great idea. It will help all of us to make a better decision.

You know, when we are faced with 100th year anniversaries, you know we can't move that around. That's what they are. And I like the fact that we might be able to work in conjunction with the Postal Service.

Chair Marks: Yes, the firefighters are not a year specific commemoration.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Correct.

Chair Marks: And we've got to the --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes, exactly.

Chair Marks: We've got World War I, which I think we would be remiss to not include that in some way. And the postal idea is a good one. So --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Could I move? Could I move that we -- propose we do the 100 year postal anniversary coin and the 100 year World War I coin, and then put Gary's fallen firefighters definitely on 2019?

Member Uram: I'll second the motion.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. And so it's on the record and I'll say it so it it will make it into the record. That when we look at next year's annual report, we're all going to know that fallen firefighters are going to get their --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Chair Marks: -- recommendation from us.

I have, being in my profession, I will be able to bring a lot to bear to push that one when the time comes.

So with that, I'm going to call the question. All those in favor, please raise your hand. We have a unanimous vote. Michael, what is your vote?

Member Olson: I am raising my hand.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Jansen: Who seconded your motion?

Chair Marks: Tom did. Tom seconded it. Okay.

So it is, indeed, a unanimous vote.

And I'm very pleased that the repeatity of the last couple of agenda items will allow us some extra time for the visual definition. And that's the item

that we will move to now.

The question is will the artists in Philadelphia be able to see any of these materials?

Ms. Sullivan: They're all, they've all called in. I don't know that they have access to the -- I don't think we're streaming it to them right now.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Ms. Sullivan: On the video system.

Ms. Weinman: But if you give me your presentation on the drive to share with --

Chair Marks: Okay. And I want them to see this. This is, there's some interesting stuff in here. So --

Mr. Bernardi: We don't have access to that. This is Tom speaking from Philadelphia.

Visual Definition of Design Excellence

Chair Marks: Okay. Just a little preface to all of this. In 2010, this Committee issued the blueprint report which was our kind of call to modernize the design process. There were a number of recommendations made in there.

And one of them was to move the artists out of the basement into the facility they're in now.

Another one was to involve this Committee earlier on in of the thematic discussions.

Both of those have been accomplished. We've made some great strides in design. We saw that today with the symbolic representations that we were provided. And that we also approved.

And at that time back, in 2010, as part of the blueprint we adopted what we call the Visual Definition of Coin and Medal Design Excellence. And we appended it to the end of the blueprint report. So if you're interested in seeing what we did back

then -- because today is an add-on. We're adding designs that have been issues since 2010. So if you want to see that original work, if you go to the CCAC website, ccac.gov, go to the tab about us. And then once you're there, go to the tab special reports, and you'll see the blueprint. If you'll then scroll to the bottom of that, you'll see the designs, the three categories one being classic American designs, another being more modern American designs, and then a third category of foreign.

So with that, today we're looking at the years 2011 through 2013.

Prior to this meeting, I asked the Committee members to provide me with their nominations for designs that individual members, I'll stress that, individual members felt were worthy of being included in the Visual Definition of Coin and Medal Design Excellence. So what we're going to see here are what individuals put on here.

The objective today is ultimately for us to tabulate our votes as a Committee on which one of these designs presented will be inducted, if you will, into the visual definition. We received 58 designs. So I want to -- we have some extra time, which is good. But still I don't want to, I don't want to go too slowly through this. But also spend enough time to really look at what we've got. I've asked the members to study ahead of time to make notes to themselves, pre-vote if you will, on the designs they like and others that they felt should not be included.

And for the artists in Philadelphia, there are several here that are American designs that we're going to be considering.

So with that, whoever's controlling the PowerPoint, if you could go to the next page.

The first category is the American being the U.S. Mint products. Okay.

The first one, actually was pointed out to me after

we put this together, it's the 9/11 medal both obverse and reverse. It was pointed out to me earlier, and it's correct, that the Committee already included this one into the definition. We did that as an individual add to the definition with an individual vote. And it was a couple of years ago. I think it was about the time this was issued. So both of these obverse and reverse designs are already a part of the definition. If we can go to the next page. Here, we have the New Frontier Bronze Medal reverse and the 2013 America the Beautiful Fort McHenry reverse quarter dollar.

Next. We have the America the Beautiful Great Basin reverse quarter dollar. And the America the Beautiful Hawaii Volcano reverse quarter dollar.

Member Jansen: A question.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Jansen: Backing up to U.S., what I think is U.S. five, I knew there's some discussion about the difference between maybe the artwork we originally looked at and then how it was practically sculpted. And I think US-05 is an example here where I know there has been some discussion about, hey, those leaves in those trees, or the needles on those trees, or something --

Chair Marks: For those on the phone, we've got a letter and number identification of each of these designs. Erik is speaking about the Great Basin reverse.

Member Jansen: US-05. And this is kind of like, it's kind of like the spaghetti hair that begot George Washington on the quarter a couple of decades ago. I think we're going to have spaghetti needles on this tree. Where the needles were sculpted fairly simply, for whatever reason. And I'm not sure the original artwork had that on it.

So how are we to think about this, Gary? What do you --

Chair Marks: Well, individually, we're each going to vote.

Member Jansen: Okay.

Chair Marks: And what we did last time was we had a super majority, actually it was unanimous at the time, we created the first definition. But we're going to have a super majority/two-thirds vote, any of these designs that reaches that level we'll deem as worthy, if you will, of being added to our definition.

Member Jansen: So once we go through this, or sooner if you feel you've already made your decision, just send me your votes and I'll try to tabulate this real-time yet this afternoon. And if, once I give that back to you and you want to change your mind, just come to me and I'll annotate my tab. And then I'll circulate the results. And then if -- are you thinking we'll do approvals today based on that?

Chair Marks: Well, we've got quite a bit of time. Let's see how it goes.

Member Jansen: Okay.

Chair Marks: If we can do it all today, that's great. If not --

Member Jansen: Okay.

Chair Marks: -- then from a practical sense, we might have to put that, the results off.

Member Jansen: Okay.

Chair Marks: Okay. So the next one is our only 2014 add, and that is the Native American reverse. Again, for 2014 of the one dollar coin. That one is up on the screen now.

Also the 2013 Girl Scouts of the USA Centennial reverse.

Member Scarinci: Before we -- are we commenting

on any of these or --

Chair Marks: Well, how do we want to this? I mean, my idea was that after I went through all of these, we could do it as I have them up on the screen or we can have each member make their comments --

Member Scarinci: Yes.

Chair Marks: -- as they want. I'm assuming and really really hoping that you don't all want to comment on all designs. We don't have enough time in the day to do that. So pick and choose carefully which ones are really powerful that you want to convey, and we'll circle back and do all that.

Member Scarinci: Well, actually, all I wanted to say about the Girl Scout piece --

Chair Marks: Go ahead.

Member Scarinci: -- here, the problem with it is it's not really, it's really the logo designed by the Girl Scouts. So I'm not sure it belongs here.

Chair Marks: Well, I think the thought here is that it was represented in a stylistic way that is, indeed, unique to this dollar coin.

Member Scarinci: Yes, no, no. And it's a great design. But it's --

Chair Marks: The point of the program was to commemorate the Girl Scouts.

Member Jansen: I don't think we're attributing who owns the image. I think we're attributing the quality of the image to our --

Chair Marks: Okay. Point taken, Donald.

Member Scarinci: Okay. No problem.

Chair Marks: And again, each of, we're each going to vote on these. And if we don't get to two-thirds then it doesn't make it. So, but point well taken,

Donald. Thank you.

Next item here is the 2013 American Bison obverse and reverse. Of course, this comes from the original James Earle Fraser American Bison design which was on the nickel from 2013 to -- no, 1913 to 1938. This image, maybe not in a \$50 denomination, but this image early exists under the classic category of the definition. I personally believe that's where it belongs but to honor our process I asked for nominations. It legitimately is a 2013 coin. It's up here on the screen for you to look at. Next. The next one is the obverse and reverse of the 2013 Edith Roosevelt First Spouse coin.

Next. We have the 2011 platinum Ensuring Domestic Tranquility reverse and the 2013 platinum to Promote the General Welfare reverse.

Next, we have the obverse and reverse of the Star-Spangled Banner silver dollar for 2012. Also we have the obverse and reverse of the five dollar gold Star-Spangled Banner.

Now we're shifting into the foreign category. We have some entries from Australia. We have 2013 Australian Antarctic Territory Emperor Penguin reverse and the 2012 Australian Southern Cross coin which is the concave coin that I think a lot of us on the Committee are familiar with. The Australia 2011 Australian Kangaroo reverse which is a one dollar coin as well is that 2013 Kangaroo at Sunset reverse one dollar coin.

Next. The Australia 2012 Kangaroo in Outback reverse one dollar coin. Lots of Congress.

Member Ross: Yes. They have kangaroos in Australia?

Chair Marks: I think they do. I think they're proud of it too.

Next we go to Austria 2013 Prehistoric Life Triassic. I don't how you pronounce that. Also, the first and

reverse of the Austrian 2013 Stefan Zweig. Is that the current next pronunciation?

It's the obverse. A writer -- and anyway.

So next, please. We have the Canada 2012 Farewell to the Penny one cent one ounce silver which is the well-known reverse of the Canadian penny with the gold leafing on the maple leaves.

And also we have from Canada the 2011 Year of the Rabbit reverse \$15 coin. It's a scalloped coin.

The Canada 2011 Canoe reverse. It's a \$20 coin which shows a canoe on the water and it's supposed reflection which is not, indeed, a reflection if you look at it hard.

Then we also have the Canadian 2012 Polar Bear reverse for their \$20 coin.

Next. We have an entry from Cook Islands, 2012 Windows of the World Titanic obverse and reverse.

We have from the Czech Republic, a 2011 Jan Kaspar reverse 200 koruna.

We have from Finland obverse and reverse of the Hella -- I cannot pronounce that last name -- Wuolijoka, a €10 coin.

From Germany, the 2012 100 Years of the German National Library, €10 coin, obverse and reverse.

From Germany, the 2011 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Franz Liszt, obverse €10.

Another familiar image is one from Great Britain of the 2013 silver Britannia, reverse £2. That's kind of the counterpart to our silver eagle.

So then we're moving on to the British 2012 Olympic Swimming 50p coin which is a seven-sided coin.

Next would be from Greece, 2013 Plato's Academy

obverse €2 bi-metallic coin. Next. Next is from Italy, the 2011 500th Anniversary of the Birth of Mr. Vasari, Giorgio Vasari, obverse reverse €10. And I'll admit to putting this one on here. The reason I put it on here was I felt, particularly with the obverse but also with the reverse, I felt that it was a very creative way of putting a traditional image forward in a little bit of a modern context. Next. Next is from Latvia 2012 Latvian Sculptor Karlis Zale, one lat.

From Latvia, obverse and reverse of 2012 Riga Zoo, one lat coin.

From Lithuania, 2013 January Uprising 1863 to 1864, obverse and reverse, 50 litu coin.

Also from Lithuania, obverse and reverse of the 2011 Lithuania Culture Theater, obverse reverse 10 litu.

Also from Lithuania, the 2012 Olympic Sailing reverse, 50 litu.

From Luxembourg, the 2013 European Honey Bee €5 coin which is bi-metallic.

From Malta, 2013 Self-government obverse €2, bi-metallic.

New Zealand, we have the 2013 Maori Art Koru reverse \$1 coin.

From Niue -- am I saying that right? Niue, 2014 -- oh I misspoke earlier. This is a 2014 coin. This is the second one. 2014 Year of the Horse reverse, five ounce gilded silver. The horse image, for those of you who can't see it, there's a horse image on here on a silver coin and the horse is gold, a \$8 coin. Interesting denomination.

Also from Niue is a 2013 Birds of Prey Osprey, \$2 coin.

Slovakia 2013, 20 Years of National Bank of Slovakia, reverse €10.

Also from Slovakia, 2011 Centennial Birth of Composer John Cikker, €10.

And that is it.

Oh, yes. And I asked the staff, Megan in particular, if she could scare up the design for the obverse number 10 that we selected and recommended for the Civil Rights coin. As I think some of you are aware, we talked about this earlier before the meeting, that image was not selected, ultimately. And at least some of us felt very strongly that this is one of the better pieces put out recently, put before us. So I asked that it be brought forward. It's not on our ballot. But I think it would be wholly appropriate if the Committee felt, as I do, that we would add this and also the reverse of this same coin, which is being used. It has the stylized torch on it. And if you saw that earlier today, the Mint did a fantastic job of the toning of the various mirrored and frosted images.

Member Ross: What did they go with on that? With the reverse?

Chair Marks: The reverse was that torch image, if you recall that one. And we recommended they pair it with this obverse image. They paired it with the protest image of three individuals carrying protest signs. So, that doesn't mean that the design that wasn't chosen ultimately isn't an excellent design. I think it is. And I think it's one that we would like to memorialize in our collection of visual excellence as something that we're very interested in seeing similar things in the future.

So with that, if there's any discussion on any of these designs, let's do that now. And I think I'll just take people as they are wanting to talk.

Heidi.

Member Wastweet: I wanted to say that we've had discussions in the past about colorization and all these little add-ons to coins. And the answer that

we've come up with repeatedly is that may be something we'd admire in other mints and some of us like those, some of us don't like them. We've come up with up the answer that we don't necessarily want to see that from the U.S. Mint at this time.

So I think, in the interest of sending a clear message that we not include those colorized coins in this particular list even if they happen to be appealing. Just remember that you're sending a message that this is the kinds of things that we want to see from this Mint in the future. So keep that in mind as we're picking these coins.

Chair Marks: Anyone else? Donald.

Member Scarinci: A couple of coins, you know, a couple of things I want to point out in some of these coins.

And I guess, first of all, you know, I would urge as you take another look at these coins to vote, you know, some of them are pictorial and we're saying on one hand we don't want to see pictorial. And if we submit these, you know, in our design excellence we're really confusing everybody. So you know, I really ask you to take another look at, you know, at these things for pictorial. I also want to point out, you know, a couple of specific designs that, you know, are interesting. One being the Australian Kangaroo at Sunset. The 2012 Kangaroo at Sunset. You know, this, you know, this use of proofing for the shadow, a very, a very simple, a very simple design. You know, very successful in its simplicity.

And I think, in the theme of less is more I want to move you to, from there to the Latvia coin. The theater coin. Okay. You know, we see that same kind of simplicity, simplicity by the way, with the Lithuania Uprising coin. The Latvia one lat Riga Zoo coin is just an awesome perspective and, you know, very different, very interesting. But the simplicity of the Lithuania Theater obverse, you know, that's

just, you know, nice lines forming, you know, a subtle yet powerful image. And communicating exactly what the coin is without using any legend to describe what it is because you know what it is when we see it. So that's the Lithuania 2012 Culture Theater obverse.

So I just want to, you know, wanted to, you know, use some of these.

Now coins like the Malta Self-government, you know, I mean, I really don't think we want to see that. And you know, and in reality, and I actually have seen this coin, you know, it's everything, it's everything -- you know, I mean, we used to say that when coins are on a small planchet with so many images they look like bugs. And that's exactly what this coin looks like. It looks like a bunch of bugs on a small tiny planchet. And it just -- not a nice coin in person. And I could understand when you see a picture of a coin, you know, we have that problem here. When you see a picture of a coin and then you see the actual coin, you say, "Oh, my God." And like, it doesn't look like it's picture. You know, and in this case, that is the case. In this case.

And there were a few others like it. Some of which I actually, I actually bought because I thought the design was interesting. And when I got it, I, you know, just, you know, it was just, you know, actually just didn't work.

So I just wanted to point this things out. You know, my thing being simplicity and clarity, the image should be a symbol without words. And it should live without words. We're stuck with words but it should live, it should be, stand on its own as an image.

That's all.

Chair Marks: Anyone else?

(No audible response.)

Okay. If you still have your ballot, you could get that into Erik.

Member Ross: Erik, I didn't ballot. This is not my area of expertise. I would just skew the results based on --

Member Jansen: Well, being a mere historian, we can see how your opinion would probably not be valid --

Member Ross: Correct.

Member Jansen: -- so we appreciate it.

Member Ross: Good. Excellent.

Member Scarinci: I screwed with the --

Member Jansen: Again?

Member Scarinci: -- I didn't --

Member Jansen: Just a pause here.

Member Scarinci: -- I didn't do the ballot. I x'd the ones I want, the ones I like --

Member Jansen: So that little thing means a yes, and nothing means no. Okay.

Member Scarinci: Nothing means --

Member Jansen: Okay. Thank you.

Member Olson: Gary?

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Olson: It's Mike. I couldn't get the mute button off, but I do have a few comments.

Chair Marks: Okay. Go ahead. And Mike, if you could resend your ballot.

Member Olson: Okay. As soon as I'm done I will do that.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you.

Member Olson: You know, again, as I look through these and I first want to complement anyone who sent in the foreign designs. I don't collect foreign, so it was nice to see some of these designs that are very good ones that are being done elsewhere. One of the constraints the U.S. Mint has that it's apparent that some other mints don't is the requirement for the devices and inscriptions that must go on our coins. The medals are not as restricted but I believe only two medals made this list.

I agree 100 percent with Heidi. Colorization is a gimmick that I don't think we want to go down. Good designs and good work will show themselves on a traditional coin without the need to colorize. I think colorization, for the most part, is a distraction.

And again, the American ones that we, that made the list, I was pretty much in favor of almost every one of them. I think they stack up very well with the foreign designs.

And I'm hopeful that the next time there's a call for a list like this that the American designs are a little more in balance with the foreign ones we see.

That's it.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Mike. I'll just point out that given that we had many nations, I think the largest contributing nation to our collection here is, in fact, the U.S. Mint. So while the numbers, because there were so many countries, the number of countries and their designs outweigh the products of the Mint here, still the American coins were the largest contributor to our nominated list.

So with that, Erik is tabulating the results.

I wanted to circle back while he's working on that. During our discussion on First Spouses, I know that there was at least one design we wanted to,

perhaps, have some more discussion on. And that was the reverse with the U.S.A. on it. That was the reverse that was approved or recommended by our group. And I didn't want to get away here today and Erik's been very good to keep reminding me we need to circle back to this.

So on that U.S.A. -- help me out guys, which one was that?

Member Jansen: It's the three sign language symbols on the White House --

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Wastweet: That's right. The tattoo.

Chair Marks: Grace Coolidge. Our recommended reverse design for Grace Coolidge. Did we want to put any further recommendations concerning the U.S.A. letters?

(No audible response.)

There was discussion earlier that one of the options was just to recommend that they are eliminated. Another was to, kind of mess around with the design and get them back on there without putting them on people's wrists.

I'm not seeing a lot of interest.

Member Bugeja: I'm thinking if we try to fiddle with the design it might not go over very well at this point because it's the overwhelming majority, I think, that people wanted it. We should probably just leave it.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes, but I believe, Michael, that it was recommended that we move the U.S.A. to the open field.

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Take it off the wrists because it's a tattoo thing. I don't like it. The tattoo --

Member Ross: Body art. Gary referred to it as body art.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Body art and whatever.

Chair Marks: So are you making a motion?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes. I'll make that the motion if we can recommend to the Mint to remove U.S.A. from the wrists and put it in the open field below, I would think that that would still make it understandable that that's what it says.

Chair Marks: Okay. That's the motion.

Is there a second?

Member Stevens-Sollman: No one cares.

Member Ross: Second. Second.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded.

Member Jansen: Wait a second. A historian seconding an artistic opinion?

Member Ross: I was told to second it.

Member Jansen: Are you married?

Chair Marks: Order, folks. Before I called the question on that --

Ms. Weinman: Just as a point of information. It was mentioned earlier, but the CFA specifically also recommended simply removing U.S.A. from the -- they didn't recommend moving it anywhere they just simply recommended removing it, removing the letters.

Chair Marks: Well, in the interest of variation in making things interesting for all of you, we want to remove it but we also want to add it back to the

field I guess. Well, I should say if this motion passes.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Correct.

Chair Marks: So with that, raise of hands, all those in favor of this motion, please raise your hand.

Member Jansen: Read the motion again, please?

Chair Marks: The motion is to remove U.S.A. from the wrists of the Grace Coolidge reverse that we recommended and add those letters to the open field below.

Member Jansen: And add them?

Chair Marks: Yes. And add them. All those in favor please raise your hand.

Member Scarinci: Well I may make another motion to remove the letters and not add them back.

Chair Marks: Okay. Five. So five.

All those opposed?

Michael Olson, how do you vote?

Member Olson: I vote with the five majority.

Chair Marks: Oh, six.

Member Olson: Whatever that is.

Chair Marks: Motion carries as 6 to 3. Okay.

Are there any other motions to be made today on any of the designs that we are recommending?

(No audible response.)

Okay. Then, Heidi, did you have something?

Member Wastweet: We talked a little about the platinum reverse. Some of us didn't like the road. We could just simply remove the road. If there's some interest in that, I would make a motion to do

that.

Chair Marks: Your motion is taken and I will second it.

Member Bugeja: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay. So it's moved and seconded to remove the road from our recommended platinum reverse for 2014.

All those in favor, please, raise your hand.

One, two, three, four, five, six.

What's your vote?

Member Ross: My vote is to make liberty a confident adult.

Chair Marks: Olson. Michel Olson.

Member Olson: Yes, I'm raising my hand.

Chair Marks: Okay. So that's seven in favor.

Those opposed?

Okay. One opposed. One abstention. The motion carries. That is a motion made and adopted.

Is there any other?

(No audible response.)

Okay. Here's the plan folks. We're going to try to finish the tally on the definition. Technically, I'm going to recess this meeting. For all practical purposes, the meeting will be done but I'm going to come back on just briefly to report the results of the visual definition. And that will be part of our record. So just, I don't know, five minutes and we're going to come back on the record.

Member Jansen: Do I have everyone's ballots?

Chair Marks: And report this in.

Member Jansen: I think I'm missing --

Chair Marks: We'll get that Erik. So we're in recess for the next 5 to 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:12 p.m. and went back on the record at 3:24 p.m.)

Chair Marks: Okay. Can we put the images up on the screen? This doesn't count. It was already put on.

Member Jansen: I just count the tabs baby, you --

Chair Marks: Okay. U.S. 1 one and 2 which is the 9/11 medal was previously put on the definition. Interesting result, the reverse got re-put in, the obverse didn't. So I don't know how we sort that out. But anyway, it probably shouldn't have been on here in the first place. But let's see.

Member Jansen: It's a hanging chad thing.

Chair Marks: Yes. Go to the next one please. Those didn't make it.

Go to the next one. Those did not make it.

The next one, please. Girl Scouts made it. The other one didn't.

Member Jansen: Yes, it did.

Chair Marks: Yes, yes, yes, yes. Both of them.

Member Jansen: U.S.-07 made it.

Chair Marks: Yes. Both of those on the screen which is the Native American reverse for --

Member Jansen: 2014. Yes.

Chair Marks: -- and the Girl Scout reverse made it.

The next one that made it, if you go down to 2013 platinum.

Member Jansen: U.S. 14.

Chair Marks: Yes. 14 made it. The next one would be --

Member Jansen: U.S. 16.

Chair Marks: -- 16 made it.

And go -- let's see, where do we go now?

Member Jansen: Australia.

Chair Marks: Go through Australia. Go to Kangaroo at Sunset, which is --

Member Jansen: 4.

Chair Marks: -- that made it.

Go to CA-3, Canada 3. Canada 3 --

Member Jansen: Can you reflect who made it?

Chair Marks: -- and the polar bear --

Member Jansen: Made it.

Chair Marks: -- made it.

Next let's go to --

Member Jansen: Keep going. FI-1.

Chair Marks: Finland --

Member Jansen: Finland 1.

Chair Marks: -- 1, got in.

The next one would be --

Member Jansen: I highlighted --

Chair Marks: -- go to --

Member Jansen: Latvia 2.

Chair Marks: -- Latvia 2, yes.

Member Jansen: Bingo. On the left.

Chair Marks: Latvia 2 made it. Then go to Lithuania 1. Lithuania 1 on the left there.

Member Jansen: That's all she wrote, baby.

Chair Marks: Those are it, guys.

Member Jansen: That's it.

Chair Marks: Everything else fell.

Member Bugeja: Gary, will you send that out --

Member Jansen: I'll --

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Jansen: I'll --

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Bugeja: All right. Thank you all.

Chair Marks: Good man.

Member Bugeja: -- for a wonderful meeting. Thank you, Gary

Chair Marks: We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was concluded at 3:26 p.m.)