

United States Mint

+ + + + +

Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee

+ + + + +

Meeting

+ + + + +

Tuesday,
February 11, 2014

+ + + + +

The Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee met in the 8th Floor Board Room at 801 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 10:00 a.m., Gary Marks, Chairperson, presiding.

CCAC Members Present:

Gary Marks, Chairperson
Michael Bugeja
Robert Hoge
Erik Jansen
Michael Moran (via teleconference)
Michael Olson
Mike Ross
Donald Scarinci
Jeanne Stevens-Sollman
Thomas Uram
Heidi Wastweet

United States Mint Staff Present:

Steve Antonucci
Don Everhart
Bill Norton
April Stafford
Greg Weinman

Contents

Welcome and Call to Order	5
Discussion of Letters & Minutes from Previous Meeting	5
Review and discuss candidate designs for the 2015 America the Beautiful Quarters Program	6
Discussion on a 2014 24K Gold Kennedy Half-Dollar special product	96
Discussion of the 2013 and 2014 Annual Reports	136

Proceedings

(10:05 a.m.)

Welcome and Call to Order

Chairperson Marks: Good morning.

I'm calling this meeting of the Citizen's Coinage Advisory Committee for Tuesday, February 11th, 2014 to order. We have an agenda today with a review of some America the Beautiful quarters for 2015, I think an interesting discussion about a 50th Anniversary Edition for the Kennedy half dollar and, then, the Committee will be discussing annual report subject matter towards the end of the day.

Discussion of Letters & Minutes from Previous Meeting

But, first, before we launch into the Agenda, in your packet, you have the letters and the minutes from the November 22nd, 2013 meeting and I would ask for a motion to approve the minutes.

Member Olson: So moved.

Chairperson Marks: And, I'm sorry, minutes and the letters.

Member Olson: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. It's been moved.

Member Uram: Second.

Chairperson Marks: Been moved and seconded to approve the letters and the minutes from the November 22nd, 2013 meeting. All those in favor, please say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

Chairperson Marks: Opposed?

Member: Aye.

Chairperson Marks: Motion carries and I would note for the record, we do have a full Committee in attendance today and Michael Moran is on the phone. So, with that, we'll go down to the review and discussion for candidate designs for the 2015 America the Beautiful Quarters Program. And, April, can you give us your report, please?

Review and discuss candidate designs for the 2015
America the Beautiful Quarters Program

Ms. Stafford: Yes. Thank you. The United States Mint America the Beautiful Quarters Program is a multi-year initiative authorized by Public Law 110-456, The America's Beautiful National Parks Quarter Dollar Coin Act of 2008. The Act directs the United States Mint to mint and issue 56 circulating quarter dollars with reverse designs emblematic of a national park or other national site in each state, the District of Columbia and the U.S. Territories. Five quarters are issued sequentially each year in the order in which the featured site was first established as a national park or site. The coins' obverse features the familiar restored 1932 portrait of George Washington by John Flanagan, including subtle details and the beauty of the original model.

The inscriptions are United States of America, Liberty, In God We Trust and Quarter Dollar. The reverse inscriptions are the designation of the site and the host jurisdiction, the year of minting or issuance and E Pluribus Unum.

I would remind the Committee that the artists, before they began their design phase for this portfolio, they received all of the input from the site liaisons with whom we worked to articulate imagery that should be considered in developing designs and they also received the CCAC's input that we discussed at a public meeting a few months prior to that.

So, we'll be reviewing candidate designs for the 2015 sites, starting first with Homestead National Monument of America in Nebraska. The Homestead Act of 1862 brought about significant and enduring changes to the United States. By giving government land to individuals in 30 states, this law allowed nearly any man or woman a chance to live the American dream.

Over 1.6 million people rose to the challenge and claimed 270 million acres. Homesteaders from all walks of life, including newly arrived immigrants, farmers without land of their own from the East, single women and former slaves came to meet the challenge of proving up and keeping this free land. Each homesteader had to live on the land, build a home, make improvements and farm for five years.

Homestead National Monument of America was created in 1936 to commemorate the people whose lives were forever altered by the Homestead Act and the settlement of the West. Homestead National Monument of America is committed to telling America's Homestead story and helping to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of homesteading history.

We are very pleased to have with us today Mark Engler, the Superintendent of Homestead National Monument of America, as well as Blake Bell, the historian. So, Mr. Engler, thanks for joining us. Would you like to make a few comments?

Mr. Engler: Sure. First of all, thank you for inviting us to your meeting today. I think we're pretty fortunate that we had other business in Washington to take care of, so it's worked out very well for us, so, but thank you. And we're excited. We're delighted to represent the State of Nebraska on the America the Beautiful quarter.

I don't know how many of you have been

to Homestead National Monument and how many of you have even thought that there could be a National Park Service site dedicated to telling America's homestead story. I'm guessing very few of you. But, anyway, the Homestead Act of 1862 has been said to be one of the nation's most important laws ever created, most significant laws ever created.

In fact, historians have often ranked it, of all the laws, all the laws ever created within our nation's government, it to be one of the three most important pieces of legislation created. And April touched upon a couple of those reasons why it's significant, from the standpoint that it was a law that was really inviting citizens of the world to come to this nation of ours, before they were even citizens, to take advantage of the idea of free land.

And what an incentive it was. If you move here, we'll give you 160 acres. And they came by the millions. And, through the Homestead Act, 270 million acres was distributed through 30 homesteading states, directly impacting those states. And the rest of the nation, it indirectly affected those states through the industrialization of our nation.

I already mentioned immigration. Also, in some of the states, it had an impact with the American Indians and, as well, it had a significant impact to the industrial might of our nation as we moved forward in feeding the world.

The law was in affect for 123 years. It started with President Lincoln, ended with President Reagan and, so, it was a law that had a tremendous amount of impact. And Homestead National Monument has been set aside to tell this story in American history.

As we look at the designs that have been created, and I want to say that it was great working with April and great working with the artist, that I think one of the most important parts of it is that it

speaks to the idea of free land, because that's what separates the homesteading story from so many other stories within American history.

I think it's also a very challenging quarter to design from the standpoint that it's a very, very big and a very, very complex story. But, one thing for sure that we can say about the Homestead Act is that it was really unique or revolutionary for its time, because it offered former slaves the opportunity to own free land. It offered, again, citizens of the world the opportunity to acquire free land and it also offered women, before they had the right to vote, the opportunity for free land.

So, this law was very unique. It was really a law that is still having a tremendous impact upon the world in which we live in today. I guess, at times, I'd like to refer to the Homestead Act as kind of like the elephant in the room. It's just so big and it's such a part of our everyday fabric that it's really hard to see and it's really hard to understand.

In fact, it's estimated that there are 93 million descendants of homesteaders. That's roughly a third of our nation's population that's living today. So, anyway, thank you for the opportunity to be here and thank you for the opportunity to share a little bit of Homestead National Monument of America with each of you.

Chairperson Marks: April, will you please go through the other quarters we're going to review today and, then, I'm going to go through a process of pulling out designs, so we can get the whole set down to a manageable set that we'll then have our discussions about. So --

Ms. Stafford: Sure. Sure.

Chairperson Marks: -- if you could present the other four, that would be appreciated.

Ms. Stafford: Absolutely. Okay. So, and thank you, Mr. Engler. All right. We have 12 candidate designs for Homestead today. Design 1 depicts a homesteading family working a variety of chores required to build and maintain a life on their free land.

Design 2 represents three fundamentals to survival common to all homesteaders: food, shelter and water. The 30 stars symbolize the 30 states that participated in the Homestead Act.

Designs 3 through 6 depict variations of a homesteader working the land, including one design featuring the plow itself, and two others with the inscription Free Land. So, here's Design 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Design 7 shows a homesteader with his team of horses plowing the field. Design 8 depicts a homesteader with a team of oxen preparing a field for planting. His cabin, a windmill and a fence are seen in the background. Design 9 is a close-up of Design 8, featuring a homesteader plowing his land.

Design 10 depicts two men working together to harvest a successful crop of wheat. Design 11, once again, shows a homesteader and his team of horses plowing a field. Design 12 shows a portion of the Homestead Heritage Center, a multipurpose facility that brings the homestead story to life for visitors to the Homestead National Monument.

Okay. Moving on to Kisatchie?

Chairperson Marks: Yes, please.

Ms. Stafford: Kisatchie National Forest contains over 600,000 acres of land spread across seven parishes in Louisiana. The National Forest is home to bayous, bald cypress groves, old-growth pine, endangered and threatened species, as well as 400 miles of trails. It also contains a nationally designated wild and scenic river, the Saline Bayou,

and the Kisatchie Bayou.

The forest is known for its long-leaf pine trees and is the only federally designated forest in Louisiana. Do we have our representatives from Kisatchie on the line?

Mr. Caldwell: Yes, we do. This is Jim Caldwell and Amy Robertson and I'm the Public Affairs Staff Officer for Kisatchie National Forest. Amy is our Public Affairs Specialist and thank you so much for having us on the call today.

Ms. Stafford: Thank you for joining us. Would you like to say a few words, Mr. Caldwell?

Mr. Caldwell: Kisatchie National Forest is really a special place in Louisiana. As you said, 600,000 acres, and it's such a popular place for camping, hiking, biking, using motorized sports and, definitely, for hunting and fishing. And hunting and fishing are so popular, and bird watching as well, and the eastern wild turkey is one of the things that really attracts people to bird watch and to hunt on Kisatchie National Forest.

It's really a symbol of a large game bird, very, very beautiful, very picturesque and we're proud to have so many on the Kisatchie National Forest. And we work with our partners like the National Wild Turkey Federation in making sure that this wonderful bird has a great future on the Kisatchie National Forest.

Kisatchie's really a destination place. It's in central and northern Louisiana and many people from some of the towns that many of you have heard of like Lafayette and New Orleans travel through Kisatchie for really their getaway place. And it is marked by the beautiful long-leaf pine.

Once there were 93 million acres of long-leaf pine in the South. Now, we're down to about three million acres and most of the long-leaf pine that is left is on federal and state lands, much of it

lands like Kisatchie National Forest. So, we're very, very proud of the long-leaf pine and the wild turkey and that's some of the choices that are on our quarter.

Ms. Stafford: Thank you, Mr. Caldwell. I appreciate it.

Mr. Weinman: Can I ask him a question? Can I ask him a question?

Chairperson Marks: Yes, quickly. We usually do that -- go ahead.

Mr. Weinman: Just the pine, in Design 7, is that the pine that you're referring to?

Ms. Stafford: Design 7, just skipping ahead, the red-cockaded woodpecker shown in flight against long-leaf pine trees.

Mr. Weinman: That's long-leaf pine. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Caldwell: Yes, that is the red-cockaded woodpecker and the trees you see in the background there, that is the long-leaf pine and, if you look at Design 1, which shows a close-up of a pine trunk and the pine forest in the background, that is how the trunks of the long-leaf pine appear.

If some of you may be familiar with long-leaf pines, some of you may be familiar with Ponderosa pine in the West. It's kind of our eastern version of Ponderosa pine: an open-grown, clean, bold trunk with very few limbs and you have that clean bow-cut telephone-pole appearance to it with grass in the understory.

Ms. Stafford: So, I believe, after we go through each of the portfolios, if our site liaisons will stay with us on the line, so if there are questions afterward we can do the same for each of the other portfolios. Okay. So, thank you so much, Mr. Caldwell. Appreciate your remarks.

Today we have a total of eight candidate designs for consideration for Kisatchie. Design 1 shows wild turkeys walking in blue stem grass in front of a long-leaf pine tree.

Designs 2 through 4 depict the endangered red-cockaded woodpecker on long-leaf pine. So, here's Design 2, 3 and 4. Design 5 features a wild turkey in flight over blue stem grass with long-leaf pine in the background. Design 6 shows a red-cockaded woodpecker flying over a bayou with cypress trees in the background.

Design 7 depicts a red-cockaded woodpecker in flight against long-leaf pine trees. And Design 8 highlights the recreational activities at Kisatchie National Forest showing a man in a canoe fishing in a bayou with cypress trunks extending from the water.

Moving on to Blue Ridge Parkway. The Blue Ridge Parkway, named America's Favorite Drive, extends 469 miles and connects the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina to the Shenandoah National Park in Virginia. Weaving through 29 counties and serving as an economic boost for regional tourism, the Blue Ridge Parkway's stunning scenery and recreational opportunities make it one of the most visited sections of the National Park System.

Please note Designs 3 and 4 were removed from the portfolio during the design process. That was after, however, the park liaison had commented. So as not to confuse their comments with the Committee's, we've just simply removed them and kept the numbering.

We should have Peter Givens, Interpretive Specialist with Blue Ridge Parkway, with us on the phone. Mr. Givens, are you there?

Mr. Givens: I'm here. Thank you.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. Would you like to

say a few words?

Mr. Givens: Sure. And the summary you just provided is a great deal of what I would say. But the Blue Ridge Parkway has for many years been the most visited unit of America's National Park System. It's enjoyed by people who live close by and it also has a great deal of international interest.

The Parkway is many things to many people. It's the longest road that was ever planned as a single unit, single park unit in the United States. And many people sort of think of it as just a road. We like to emphasize and we glean more of this every year in research that our species list, as far as protected species and ecosystems, is virtually the same as Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The Parkway has a huge diversity of resources stretching almost 500 miles north to south. The elevation ranges from about 600 to over 6,000 feet. So, we protect headwaters of many of the water systems along the East Coast in that range. And we have a pretty impressive list of endangered species along the way.

The Parkway goes through four National Forests. It goes through the eastern land of the Cherokee Indian on the south end. There are five adjacent U.S. wilderness areas and it's been called and it was called in the beginning days a museum of the managed American countryside.

It's very much a product of the 1930s vision of landscape architects who were looking at painting those pictures on the landscape. Some of them were Cornell-trained and did some work in Westchester County New York Park System. And they brought those skills here and protected many of the views, the landscape, the cultural and natural history of the Appalachian Mountains through which it travels.

Studies a number of years ago indicated

that Parkway visitors contributed over two billion, with a B, dollars to the economy of North Carolina and Virginia. And, so, state tourism offices understand that, in these two states, both governors have been traditionally very, very strong supporters of Parkway issues and tourism here.

And, so, it's a great place to show the design of the Parkway and to use it as a feature in the program that we're talking about today. So, I will stay on and be glad to answer any questions anyone has later.

Ms. Stafford: Thank you, Mr. Givens. We have a total of six designs for review. Design 1 captures the Parkway's long views at the Linn Cove Viaduct, one of the most popular spots along the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Design 2 highlights the curves of the Parkway and the distinctive stone walls found along the drive. Designs 5 and 6 again depict the Parkway at Linn Cove Viaduct, showcasing the drive's scenic beauty. Design 6 also features a stone wall and the Virginia and North Carolina state tree and flower in the foreground. I should mention the bird. Apologies there. Don't forget about the cardinal.

Design 7 depicts the grace and curvature of the road hugging the side of a mountain and includes the extraordinary stonework that typifies so much of the Parkway's tunnel facings and bridges. Again, the Virginia and North Carolina state tree and bird are in the foreground.

Design 8 also shows the view near Linn Cove Viaduct with rhododendron in the foreground.

Moving on to Bombay Hook. Bombay Hook National Wildlife Refuge, which stretches eight miles along Delaware Bay and covers more than 16,000 acres, protects one of the largest remaining expanses of tidal salt marsh in the mid-Atlantic region. The refuge is predominantly marsh, but

also includes fresh water impoundments and upland habitats that are managed for other wildlife.

Bombay Hook was established in 1937 as a link in the chain of refuges extending from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. It is primarily a refuge and breeding ground for migrating birds and other wildlife. The value and importance of Bombay Hook for migratory bird protection and conservation has increased through the years, primarily due to the management of the refuge and the loss of high-quality habitat along the Atlantic Flyway.

Okay. We should have on the phone with us Oscar Reed, Jr., Wildlife Refuge Manager. Mr. Reed, are you there?

Mr. Reed: Yes, I am.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. And, also, Al Rizzo, Project Leader. Mr. Reed, would you like to make some comments?

Mr. Reed: Sure. Thank you for the opportunity. I'd just like to thank you guys and we are a national wildlife refuge, one of two in Delaware, because we don't have those to a national park site, yet.

But, as you mentioned, we're over 16,000 acres, 13,000 of that is the tidal salt marsh. And that salt marsh is a crucial part of the environment. It absorbs some of the storm surge that we get from these large storms that we've been getting.

We estimate there are over 100,000 visitors a year. A lot of those are bird watchers. At least during the fall, we'll host over 100,000 snow geese, over 50,000 Canada Geese, several thousand duck species and, also, several species of raptors.

In the spring, we're a spot for shorebird migration with several species of shorebirds coming

through as well as wading birds that are here in the spring and year round.

And we're centrally located. We're about two hours from D.C., about two hours from Baltimore and about an hour and 15 minutes south of Philadelphia. So, there are a lot of people in commuting distance to the refuge. I guess that's all I have for now.

Ms. Stafford: Okay.

Mr. Reed: I'll be on the line.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. Thank you. There are a total of eight candidate designs for Bombay Hook we'll be reviewing today. Design 1 depicts a great blue heron with a fish in its beak. Design 2 features a great blue heron in the foreground and also includes a pintail duck.

Design 3 shows an egret in the foreground with great blue herons flying in the background. Design 4 depicts a great blue heron in flight. I should note, per the liaison, some last-minute conversations we were having about accuracy, they had noted that, if this design moves forward at all, the stripe through the heron's head should be made darker.

Design 5 features Canada geese in flight over the salt marsh. Design 6 depicts a great blue heron in the foreground and an egret in the background. Design 7 shows two great blue herons, one in the foreground and one in flight. And Design 8 depicts a great blue heron in flight.

Okay. And to our last portfolio, Saratoga. In the autumn of 1777, American forces met, defeated and forced a major British Army to surrender at Saratoga. This crucial American victory renewed patriots' hopes for independence and secured essential foreign recognition and support without which the war would have been lost.

Saratoga National Historical Park commemorates the beginning of the end of the Revolutionary War and the independence of the United States. Collectively, the battles of Saratoga have often been referred to as the most important battles fought in the world in the last 1,000 years and one of the 15 most decisive battles in all of world history.

We have Eric Schnitzer, Historian for Saratoga National Historic Park on the line. Mr. Schnitzer, are you there?

Mr. Schnitzer: I am. Hello.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. Hello. Would you like to say a few words?

Mr. Schnitzer: Yes, thank you very much. The Saratoga National Historical Park was established in 1938 and it's a 3,400-acre park in upstate New York. The location of the park is where the battles of Saratoga were fought in the year 1777. Saratoga National Historical Park also incorporates some other related but discontinuous sites located nearby.

One is the General Philip Schuyler House, which is a historic home built in 1777 and it was the second home of one of the Continental Army's general officers.

We also have Saratoga Monument, which is a 155-foot stone obelisk, which was built about a century after the Revolutionary War and it commemorates the battles of Saratoga, the Northern Campaign of 1777, which led up to the battles, and the subsequent surrender of the British at Saratoga.

We also have a location called Victory Woods, which is where a part of General Burgoyne's last British encampment was located just before they surrendered.

At Saratoga National Historical Park, our primary interpretive theme here is to let visitors know that this location, what happened here is known as the turning point of the Revolutionary War. Even since 1777 itself, participants in the battles of Saratoga and of the monumental events that happened here were referring to it as just incredibly amazing.

Henry Dearborn, for example, future Secretary of War, stated in his journal that it was, quote, the greatest conquest ever known. Sir Edward Creasy, a British historian in the 1850s, included the battles of Saratoga as one of his 15 decisive battles of world history.

The very phrase turning point of the revolution -- I've noticed some Revolutionary War battle sites do use that for their own. They consider themselves turning points but, in fact, that moniker was developed for us in the 1920s by an American historian, Hoffman Nickerson. He published a two-volume set called *The Turning Point of the Revolution* and it was a history of the battles of Saratoga and the surrender of Burgoyne's army.

Richard Ketchum, who was a -- well, the late Richard Ketchum I should say was a great author of Revolutionary War histories and he was a long-time editor for *American Heritage*. In his *New York Times* notable book called *Saratoga*, published in 1997, he said, quote, at Saratoga, the British campaign that was supposed to crush America's rebellion ended instead in a surrender that changed the history of the world.

Most recently, perhaps, was R.W. Apple, Chief Correspondent of the *New York Times Magazine*, who, in the Best of Millennium edition of the *New York Times Magazine* published in April 1999, he said that the Battles of Saratoga were the most important battles, collectively, ever fought in the world within the last 1,000 years.

So, we have all these great accolades

and, of course, when we tell people this, they're like, really, upstate New York? It's so rural up here. How is it that something so important happened up here? And the reason is it's not the battles themselves. The battles themselves were relatively small, involving a few thousand troops only.

Casualty numbers for both battles were about 1,000 for both sides, inclusive for both battles. But what makes the battles of Saratoga so decisive was the strategic result of the battles. After these battles were fought at what is now the battlefield, our main unit here at Saratoga National Historical Park, the British retreated and they ended up surrendering.

General Burgoyne, the Commander of an army of about 6500 officers and men, surrendered. This is that event called the turning point of the Revolutionary War and, of course, the very famous John Trumbull painting to this very day hangs in the rotunda not too far from where you all are sitting and standing now.

The surrender that occurred at Saratoga was the first time a British army had ever surrendered in Britain's history. It had never happened before. Our American Army, in this Revolutionary War, had been constantly losing to British aggression. We had some successes in the first year, in 1775, but come 1776, George Washington's Army in New York and New Jersey and our Army in Canada, we had invaded Canada in 1776, were getting trounced.

And, now, finally, in 1777, we had this major victory and it convinced the French to recognize our independence and join our side in a formal military and commercial alliance.

If I may, I think it's illustrative that, when John Trumbull painted his history painting of Saratoga, he depicted not the battle but the surrender. The surrender is the key point to why Saratoga was so important, so decisive, why it was

the turning point, why the New York Times Magazine said that it was the most important battle ever fought in the world in the last 1,000 years.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. Thank you so much and I want to thank our site liaisons for joining us. And I appreciate you staying with us as the Committee has their discussions. They may have more questions for you.

So, going on to the Saratoga designs, we have ten candidate designs for consideration. Design 1 features a Revolutionary War cannon in the foreground. A farmhouse used as one of the American Army's headquarters during the battle of Saratoga is seen in the background.

Design 2 depicts the moment General Burgoyne surrendered his sword to General Gates. Design 3 is a close-up of the sword surrender and includes the inscription Surrender, 1777.

Designs 4 and 5 are a representation of John Trumbull's painting of General Burgoyne's surrender to General Gates. They feature the inscription October 17, 1777. Here's Design 4 and Design 5.

Design 6 is another close-up of the sword surrender and includes the inscription October 17, 1777. Designs 7 and 8 depict additional renditions of General Burgoyne's surrender to General Gates.

Design 9 features a Revolutionary War cannon overlooking the Hudson River. Design 10 also depicts a Revolutionary War cannon and an American Flag of 1777. That concludes the portfolios, Mr. Chairman.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you. Before we dive into our review of these designs, just a short item of Committee business. There seems to be some confusion in the Motion to Approve the letters and the minutes at the beginning of the meeting. Was there a nay vote on that? Did

anyone vote nay?

Member Hoge: I heard somebody say nay.

Chairperson Marks: I think it was a late aye.

Member Hoge: Yes. It was a late aye.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Then, we're going to record that as a late aye. So, thank you for that. All right. So, let's go to our technical questions. I guess I'll start off with just a couple.

For the gentleman on the phone for the Saratoga quarter, I wanted to ask for just a brief reply, short discussion on the significance of the cannon in the battle of Saratoga? How significant was the use of the cannon?

Mr. Schnitzer: Right. They were not significant. Both sides had cannons. In the battles, the Americans never brought their cannons to the field. The British had cannons but, as the tactical nature of the battles played out, the cannons proved to be completely ineffective.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Did we capture those cannons?

Mr. Schnitzer: Yes, we did. The captured artillery pieces were captured in the second battle of Saratoga as well as at the surrender itself. So, they were captured in combat and they were captured at the surrender.

Chairperson Marks: So, would those spoils have been used to the American advantage thereafter?

Mr. Schnitzer: Oh, yes. Absolutely.

Chairperson Marks: So, it would be significant from that point of view, a fledgling army trying to defeat the massive British Empire takes

their own weapons and uses them against them?

Mr. Schnitzer: Definitely a story. Sure. Absolutely. Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Thank you.

Member Hoge: Could I say something to address this point about armaments in the battle?

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Then I'll come back to my next comment.

Member Hoge: Are we out of order here or --

Chairperson Marks: Go ahead.

Member Hoge: One thing that is not observed in any of these designs is a crucial element of this battle in terms of tactics, which was the first major instance where American Riflemen played a very significant part. And a good measure of the surrender was due to the fact that the Americans assassinated British officers using rifles. The British considered this a terrorist tactic, extremely unfair.

(Laughter.)

Ms. Stafford: Unfair.

Member Hoge: But they lost so many that it became a crucial issue. And we don't see any rifles represented here but, you know, this was really an important part of the thing.

Chairperson Marks: Okay.

Mr. Schnitzer: Yes, it is true that there was an entire rifle battalion of about 400 officers and men commanded by Daniel Morgan and very famously with their rifle pieces they did definitely prove effective in both battles of Saratoga and certainly assisted with the demise of Burgoyne's army most famously by the shooting of Brigadier

General Simon Fraser, the only British General who was shot in a combat situation during the war and buried in America.

However, I don't think there are any small arms depicted in any of the proposed quarter designs and, during the review process, none were submitted to depict that.

Chairperson Marks: All right. Then I will go back to my next technical question. Thank you to the gentleman on the line for those comments.

Mr. Schnitzer: Certainly.

Chairperson Marks: I want to talk briefly about the Blue Ridge. During our thematic discussion, I don't know, a few months ago or more, one of the items that we suggested be depicted from a point of view that I think a road is one of the more difficult things to put on a quarter, which is an inch around, and have it really make it something of interest. Okay?

And, so, one of the things that we talked about was maybe showing a vintage automobile on the Parkway, something that may have been used to travel on the Parkway in its early days, understanding that, you know, you can't depict a Ford or a Chevrolet or something like that, specifically. But something like has been done on the \$10 bill for years. On the reverse of the \$10 bill there was a little car outside the Treasury Building and it was a nonspecific car.

And, so, I was somewhat disappointed that we didn't have something like that on these designs, because it would have created a focal point for the design. And I'm just wondering why we don't see any automobiles except I think on 6.

Member Hoge: Number 5.

Chairperson Marks: On 6 there's a very, very small one. I'm talking about automobile in

terms of a focal point. Was that just something that just wasn't submitted or --

Ms. Stafford: Of the designs -- I mean I'll throw it in to Don Everhart, who worked with Leslie Schwager, who was Program Manager at the time that this portfolio was being developed. But, to my knowledge, I don't recall any automobiles being featured in any of the designs. But, certainly, the Committee's verbatim transcript was shared with all of the artists. So --

Chairperson Marks: I think it was a missed opportunity, because on a parkway, how do you experience a parkway? Most people are in an automobile traveling the Parkway, seeing the scenery as it goes by. And that's the significance of a parkway is you're most typically in an automobile. So, anyway, for what it's worth, I was just curious what happened with that.

Mr. Givens: This is Peter Givens. I understand the question. I think it would have been appropriate. I don't remember any conversations with the design or the artist or with Leslie or with you, April, about that. So, there were none put in the design.

Chairperson Marks: All right. Okay. Thank you.

Member Olson: Gary, I have another question on this one.

Chairperson Marks: Go ahead.

Member Olson: On Design Number 6 and Design Number 7 --

Chairperson Marks: You're talking about the Parkway?

Member Olson: -- yes, of the Parkway, the description says it's the state tree and flower. That would be the bird and the flower, correct?

Ms. Stafford: Correct.

Member Olson: Okay.

Mr. Givens: That's right, the cardinal and the dogwood. Tree and flower, I'm sorry that should read the bird, being the cardinal, and the tree, being the dogwood.

Member Olson: Okay. The other follow-up question to that, are those state symbols, are they common to both Virginia and North Carolina?

Mr. Givens: Yes, they are.

Member Olson: Okay.

Chairperson Marks: Heidi?

Member Wastweet: April, on Homestead, why do we have just the word "Homestead" instead of "Homestead National Monument"?

Ms. Stafford: I'll speak for Steve and Don, but I believe it was the amount of room. We had to reduce it down to "Homestead". Are you talking about in the perimeter for the template?

Member Wastweet: It looks like there's enough room for the whole thing to me.

Mr. Everhart: It does get pretty crowded. If you put "National" and "Monument" in there, you're going to be bumping up against "Nebraska" and "Unum". I think it would look cluttered.

Member Wastweet: On Blue Ridge Parkway they have the whole thing spelled out. I guess it's not quite as many letters, but it seems like "Homestead" is not quite enough.

Member Jansen: Or even "Homestead Monument", if you had to abbreviate that and take "National" out.

Member Wastweet: So, the only reason was for space?

Mr. Everhart: As far as I know. I wasn't really part of that discussion, but I would have said that it was too crowded to include all three of those words.

Mr. Antonucci: When we initially developed this idea, I know we looked at this. This was probably one of the worst-case scenarios and the text just basically, like Don said, it comes right up around on top of "Nebraska" and "Unum". I don't know. We just all thought that it looked very crowded, too much so. And we don't want to reduce the size of the font, because then it gets off kilter with the rest of the programs.

Mr. Weinman: I'll just note, not that this can't be revisited, but this was actually a decision in the early days of the Program with the space consideration.

Mr. Antonucci: Yes. We took the worst-case scenarios and this was one of them.

Member Wastweet: This was the longest?

Member Olson: Effigy Mounds in Iowa would be another one that was Effigy Mounds National Monument.

Mr. Weinman: Actually, I believe the worst-case scenario was the Frank Church, which was The River of No Return -- Member Olson: Yes.

Mr. Antonucci: Yes.

Mr. Weinman: -- National Park.

Member Olson: River of No Return National Park? Wow.

Mr. Antonucci: That phrase left no room

for letters.

Member Wastweet: Thanks. Second question, the Blue Ridge Number 3 and 4 that you mentioned, April, was removed. What was the cause of the removal?

Ms. Stafford: One was for coinability. The other was some legal concerns about the source materials.

Member Wastweet: Last question --

Member Moran: Gary --

Member Wastweet: Go ahead. Who's that?

Chairperson Marks: Michael Moran?

Member Moran: Yes. I've got a question on the Bombay Hook.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Michael --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Moran: It reminded me that these gullies were very close to what we saw with the Everglades National Park --

Chairperson Marks: Yes.

Member Moran: -- from several times ago. And, if I remember right, we ended up with an egret and some shorelines in the background behind the egret and it looks to me like we run the risk of having an almost duplicate, although we might end up with a heron instead of an egret here. It won't be that noticeable on a quarter. It'll just look like the same as what we did for the Everglades. Am I on the right track in saying that?

Chairperson Marks: Don Everhart, would you like to --

Mr. Everhart: Actually, Mike, that was

an anhinga on the Everglades. It was not an egret or a heron.

Member Moran: Okay.

Mr. Everhart: Anhinga.

Member Moran: But, Don, by the time you get this thing reduced down to a quarter, for the common man in the street, we run the risk of having two designs that are very similar. We could.

Mr. Everhart: If I recall, the Committee specifically asked for a large great white heron. It was one of the suggestions that the Committee made early on.

Member Moran: Okay.

Member Jansen: I had the same thought and, as I'm looking at the specimen that Gary has in his hand here next to me of the proof set there, it is an anhinga with a neck against a large proof blank sky. But it's definitely an issue here and it may be something that ends up almost directing us towards Image Number 5, because being two fowl in the air, two ducks, you end up with a distinctively different image.

And I don't mean to advance the discussion to the designs, but I will advance that as a solution at this point to what we have here. And what we have here may not be something that we feel is sufficient to make an election.

Member Bugeja: I have to concur entirely with you.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. We're getting into a design discussion here. So, I'll ask the Committee to hold that. Michael Moran, are you done?

Member Moran: Yes, I'm done.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Heidi was not

yet finished. So, Heidi, I'll recognize you.

Member Wastweet: Last question, back to Saratoga, the sword that's depicted in the designs, is that an existing artifact? Is that historically accurate? Is this a specific sword or is this representing any sword, or is it a particular sword?

Mr. Schnitzer: Sure. Right. Right. Excellent question. If you do even a Google search, I think, for something like "Burgoyne sword" or "surrender sword", you'll find about ten different ones. Various individuals and historical societies claim to have it. What actually happened, historically, was Burgoyne tendered his sword to Gates and Gates then returned it back to Burgoyne.

We know nothing about what happened following the return of the sword. Burgoyne theoretically took it back home with him to England in 1778. The sword design as depicted, especially in SNHP-06 as well as SNHP-04 and 05 and I think SNHP-07 and 08 are more closely associated with the designs depicted by John Trumbull in his 1820s painting of the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga.

The sword depicted in SNHP-02 and SNHP-03 are of a different design than the one depicted in the Trumbull painting. I would like to say that the one depicted in the Trumbull painting is not the sword. It could be very similar to it. It was most probably a small sword, so it makes sense that that would be the kind of sword Burgoyne would have given to Gates. But we actually don't know.

So, if we look back at the historiography, if you will, I think the sword closest representing the one most likely, again, would be SNHP-04, 05 and 06, 07 and 08, as opposed to 02 and 03.

Member Wastweet: Thank you. And a follow-up, would the sword have been used in battle or was it decorative, symbolic?

Mr. Schnitzer: For Burgoyne, for a general officer, it was definitely symbolic of his rank and station as a general and a gentleman. He would not have employed it in battle.

Member Wastweet: Thank you.

Chairperson Marks: Others who have technical questions not bearing on your design comments? Donald.

Member Scarinci: Okay. Well, let's stick with Saratoga for just a second. The sleeves and the uniforms, is that historically accurate or is that out of the Trumbull painting?

Mr. Schnitzer: Oh, well, there's that question. I worked very closely with the artist on this point, because it's one that's very tricky. Uniform details are so complicated and complex. I'm a uniformologist myself, so I really do track these things. We're very lucky that Horatio Gates had his portrait drawn in Philadelphia in the summer of 1777, literally months before the battles of Saratoga.

So, we know the uniform that he had, which was a simple plain frock, double breasted, just like you see in the depictions here. He has a round cuff with buttons. He has plain lapels with buttons. In the Trumbull surrender painting, again, painted in the 1820s, although Trumbull got the general looks correct, he got certain details wrong.

For example, he gave all his figures what are called rise and fall collars, which is something they would have been wearing in the 1790s, but it's an impossibility in the 1770s. It was far too fashion forward. Nobody was doing it yet.

So, in fact, when you look at Gates's portrait as drawn in Philadelphia in 1777, you see he has a flat collar, meaning a collar that just, like a shirt collar today, falls right down on the fabric of the shirt itself.

So, the coat collar would fall down on the body of the coat. So, when the depictions were made in, for example, SNHP-07, SNHP-08, the uniform details that Gates has is reflective of the drawing made in Philadelphia.

However, because SNHP-04 and SNHP-05 were more or less copied from the historic Trumbull painting of the surrender, the artist decided to keep that integrity by having those same uniform idiosyncrasies depicted that Trumbull put in, in the 1820s, because he wanted to keep that, you know, approach, in terms of copying Trumbull's artwork, because it's a historic painting in its own right.

As for Burgoyne, you have the same issue. For Burgoyne, it gets very technical here, but for Burgoyne, Trumbull gave him I believe four buttons on the forearm singly placed. In fact, that's the button arrangement for a full-ranking general officer in the British Army, when, in fact, Burgoyne was a lieutenant general. And through another drawing that was made at the time, we know, of course, that Burgoyne had the proper uniform.

And, so, that's why, for example, when you look at SNHP-02, you see an extended view of Burgoyne's forearm and he has six buttons with what is actually embroidery surrounding both sides of the buttons. And they're in two groups of three buttons each. So, that is accurately depicted and that detail is also reflected on Burgoyne's lapels.

But, likewise, in SNHP-04 and SNHP-05, the depiction by that artist was in keeping with the historic Trumbull painting. So, you have Burgoyne, like Gates, depicted in a uniform that is accurate to the painting of the 1820s as done by Trumbull, but not accurate exactly to what they would have been wearing in 1777, but very close, very close.

Member Scarinci: Thank you. I wish you knew a little bit more about this.

(Laughter.)

Member Scarinci: I'm kidding. Thank you very, very much. Next question, in Louisiana, is the depiction of the woodpecker in Number 7 -- I particularly want to know is that depiction accurate? Are we right? I mean they don't have these in Washington Square Park. So, I don't know what these birds look like. Is that accurate?

Mr. Caldwell: Well, yes. This is Jim Caldwell and Amy Robertson back. And really, when you look at the woodpecker and according to our biologist, that's not the best depiction of the bird in that picture. The red-cockaded woodpecker is an endangered species and Kisatchie National Forest has one of the largest populations of the bird.

It generally occurs where the long-leaf pine occurs and is the only bird that nests in a green pine tree. It's kind of an unusual bird. And we band every baby that's born, hundreds of those, and keep up with them and we actually donate them to other populations. But that's not the best depiction. You would never really see the bird in flight looking like that.

Member Scarinci: From the pictures and the way you're describing it, two would be the most accurate, right? Because, if seven is not accurate, then six would not exactly be accurate?

Chairperson Marks: Even less. It's a cypress.

Member Scarinci: And even less accurate?

Chairperson Marks: Yes, not in its habitat.

Mr. Caldwell: That is correct. They do not occur where the cypress occurs. That's not really their habitat. It's the long-leaf pine. And, actually, the Kisatchie National Forest's upland

ridges is dominated by long-leaf pine.

I mean we do have cypress in some places, the lakes and the bottoms and so forth. But it's not the dominant tree by any means. Two and three are more accurate with probably three being the most accurate.

Member Scarinci: Four kind of looks like a close-up of three. Is it not?

Member Wastweet: No.

Ms. Stafford: It's different.

Mr. Caldwell: Well, four could be a close-up of three. There's just something about the way the woodpecker is placed on the tree and the way he's holding his head. The way they're on the tree in 3 and the way his head is held is more accurate of how the bird appears.

Ms. Stafford: Obviously, Mr. Caldwell, we'll obviously defer to the site. I know that we had conversations where we referenced that there may be modifications, depending on the recommendations that move forward to ensure the exact, you know, details are perfect. But this entire portfolio had been reviewed for accuracy and all of that.

So, our understanding was that what was presented was accurate, but that there may be small modifications that may have to occur to ensure complete compliance.

I had a follow-up to one of Mr. Caldwell's comments responding to Donald. You said you wouldn't normally see the woodpecker flying like this. I'm sorry if this is a silly question but, if it is a bird, I'm assuming that the woodpecker does, at moments, fly. And, so, while humans might not see it for whatever reason, it's possible that the bird might find itself doing just what it's doing on 6 and 7, is that true?

Mr. Caldwell: Yes, that is true.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. So --

Mr. Caldwell: That's true. And, you know, in a depiction of a bird, that's the wonderful thing about an artist and the wonderful thing that's been done here is capturing that moment in flight that's really hard to pick up.

You see, the red-cockaded woodpecker is a very, very small bird, you know, unlike a turkey, which is a very large bird. So, as he flits through the forested tops of the pine trees, you know, you don't normally think of a view like that. But in the artist's depiction, you do capture that. And, yes, they do fly. They fly often and they fly well.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. So, those aren't illegitimate images on the coins? I mean it's the bird in flight and the bird flies?

Mr. Caldwell: No. Those are accurate as far as the flight goes. Yes. There is not anything illegitimate about them.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Thank you very much. Donald, did you have more?

Member Scarinci: Yes. Thank you, counsel.

Chairperson Marks: Sorry.

Member Scarinci: You did well. You did well. People like 7 and, if I were a bird person, right, if I were somebody who knew these birds and studies these birds and I snapped that photograph of 7, would that be what I would see if I snapped the photograph? Would I be excited about snapping that kind of a photograph? What would it be like?

Chairperson Marks: It's kind of up to you, Don.

Ms. Robertson: Hey, April, this is Amy.

Ms. Stafford: Okay. Hi, Amy.

Ms. Robertson: Hey. You know, just to give you all sort of an idea of kind of like what we did on our end is, when we got the portfolio, we did send it out to all of the biologists on our forest to ask about accuracy as far as the way the bird looks, everything about it. And, you know, we did go through that process. So, everything that is depicted in this portfolio would be, you know, accurate in that regard.

But, when we went through a second round where we asked all of our folks, if you had to choose something that would really represent what Kisatchie National Forest is about, and although the red-cockaded woodpecker is a very beautiful bird and it is an endangered species and a lot of what we do to manage the forest is for the red-cockaded woodpecker, most of our folks really felt like the wild turkey would be something that would really represent Kisatchie National Forest the best.

And one of the reasons behind that is, you know, all the quarters that have the red-cockaded woodpecker on them are very beautiful, we just felt that most people would not know that that's what that bird is, if you know what I mean.

But they would know what a wild turkey is and we do have an excellent wild turkey population. So, we kind of honed in on the two quarters that had the wild turkeys, because we felt like that represented Kisatchie National Forest and would represent Louisiana the best.

Member Scarinci: But the wild turkey, if I may, that's not endangered, right? I mean that's just a wild turkey that we eat on Thanksgiving, right?

Ms. Robertson: Yes. That is correct. But I think our thought process was that the general public who would look at the quarters and see the bird, they would not know that it's a red-cockaded

woodpecker. They wouldn't know what kind of bird it was. We would know, but nobody else would. Everybody would know what a wild turkey is.

Member Scarinci: Okay. My last question is a Bombay Hook question. The egret in Coin 5, those guys are all over the place, right?

Ms. Stafford: Which design?

Member Scarinci: Three -- I'm sorry. Design Number 3.

Ms. Stafford: There's a, yes, egret in the foreground.

Member Scarinci: That's an egret, right? An egret, that's not unique to Bombay Hook. Those things are as far down as the Bahamas and beyond, right, or is that a different species?

Ms. Stafford: Mr. Reed, could I ask you to comment?

Mr. Reed: Sure. Yes. They are a common species in the summertime and they are featured along the flyway, you know, along the Atlantic Flyway.

Member Scarinci: Is any of these other birds, you know, the one in Coin Number 8, are any of these unique to Bombay Hook?

Mr. Reed: I wouldn't say that they're unique to Bombay Hook, but they are birds that people associated with when they do come to the refuge that are usually here, especially the great blue heron tends to be here a large portion of the year.

Member Scarinci: So, the point you're making is that Bombay Hook would be, if you were a bird watcher or a bird lover you would go there, judging from the fact that all we have here are pictures of birds?

Mr. Reed: Right. We do have a large portion of our avian population are usually based out further.

Member Scarinci: Thank you. No other questions.

Chairperson Marks: Robert, did you have any questions?

Member Hoge: I had one on the uniforms, the same that Don asked.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Does anyone else have any purely technical questions? Okay. Looks like we've come to completion of that. Okay. So, at this point, we're going to move into our comment phase.

And, before I launch into that, I asked the staff if they could make available to us here in the room today examples of the America the Beautiful quarters for both 2013 and 2014, so we could see what the quarters actually look like when we take these designs and put them down onto the small planchet of a quarter.

And the versions I have here are the proof versions. And I'm going to pass these around and what I want to stress here, in hopes that it could help to guide some of our discussion, is, when you look at the 2013, I want you to notice the Perry's Victory quarter and that the contrast between the frosted surfaces and the mirrored background is very sharp.

And, so, from a distance even on this very small coin, there is an obvious focal point with the statue and I don't know if that's really an obelisk, but the pillar monument that's shown on the coin. So, look at that and then look at, on the 2014, look at the Great Smokey Mountains image and see how far away you can look at it and make out the detail, because this is the extremely other way of what I'm talking about.

That we have so much background detail that is frosted that there isn't an obvious focal point. Okay? And what we're going to see today in a lot of the designs that we've looked at already is that, in some of them, there's significant background. So, keep in mind that, when we do that, there's a chance that we are somewhat defusing the focal point on a very small object, such that it'll be difficult to really understand what you're viewing when you look at the quarter.

And I think, for the interest of these quarters and the places that they represent and honor, I think we really want to try to get designs where they are discernable to the naked eye and even beautiful, if we can accomplish that.

Recognizing that the America the Beautiful quarter series is a difficult one from the start, because it almost demands that we put photographs of objects onto a coin. It kind of defies the whole ability for symbolic images, which those of us in coins know usually are the better images.

So, I want to pass these around, so you can look at that and just give you a point of reference. And, also, look at the Arches quarter. This is kind of like a half-and-half quarter, half of what I talked about on both sides of the issue. On the top half, if you know what arches look like, it's very obvious, because there's contrast. The bottom part of the arch is somewhat lost.

So, with that I want to go through a process where we call out, and this is a process familiar to us, the designs that we want to focus on today. So, if I can have the images on the screen, if you could recycle back to Homestead and we're going to move forward from there.

And, as we go through each of the quarters that we're deciding on today, I'm going to also from my point here at the table hold up the image. If any member wishes to consider the image in my hand, which will also be on the screen,

please indicate. If there is no indication, that image will be set aside and won't be considered further.

Again, the idea here is to focus on those images where there's identified interest among Committee members to consider it and I think that will help us be more efficient with our time and identify more quickly those designs that we want to forward as our recommendation.

So, with all that said, we're starting with Homestead. Homestead Number 1, is there interest in looking at this design? Okay. I'm setting that one aside. Design Number 2?

(Chorus of yes.)

Chairperson Marks: Design Number 3? Yes? Design Number 4?

(Chorus of yes.)

Chairperson Marks: Five?

(Chorus of yes.)

Chairperson Marks: Six? Setting 6 aside. Seven? Seven, anyone? Did I hear yes? Okay. Eight? Yes. Nine? Set 9 aside. Ten?

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. That's a yes. Eleven? Setting that aside. Twelve? Twelve? Setting that one aside. Okay. So, that takes us to Kisatchie. Kisatchie Number 1?

Member Moran: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Number 2?

Member Olson: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Number 3?

Member Moran: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Number 4? I'll say, yes. Number 5?

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Number 6? Six? Setting 6 aside. Seven?

(Chorus of yes.)

Chairperson Marks: Eight? Setting 8 aside. That takes us to Blue Ridge Parkway. Parkway Number 1? Yes. Two? Interest in 2?

Member Scarinci: Yes for a point, but yes. Thanks.

Chairperson Marks: For a point.

Member Scarinci: For a point.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. For a point, it's in. There is no 3 or 4, so we're going to 5.

Member Olson: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Six? Interest in 6? Setting is aside. Seven?

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Yes. Eight?

Member Olson: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. That takes us to Bombay Hook. Bombay Hook Number 1?

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Two?

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Yes. Three?

Member Uram: Yes, because I have a point on it that's similar.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Four?

Member Uram: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Five I know is yes.

Member Uram: Yes.

Member Moran: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Six?

Member Uram: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Wow. Seven?

Member Uram: Yes. Oh, no. Sorry. Sorry.

Chairperson Marks: Seven? Setting 7 aside. Eight?

Member Uram: Yes.

Member Moran: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Going to Saratoga, Number 1? I'll say yes. Number 2?

Member Ross: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Three?

Member Scarinci: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Four? Four? Setting 4 aside. Five? Five? Setting 5 aside. Six?

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Seven?

(Chorus of yes.)

Chairperson Marks: Eight?

(Chorus of yes.)

Chairperson Marks: Nine I know is yes.
Ten?

Member Jansen: Yes.

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Then, for the record, would you like me to read back what we have?

Member Bugeja: Yes, if you would. Maybe as we start with each kind, so that we don't get lost going through the whole thing at once.

Chairperson Marks: I'm really not interested in going five times around the table, folks. In the past, we've always done the whole batch and each member gets their time in the limelight and goes through the whole collection.

Member Bugeja: I didn't mean that. I mean just tell us which coins that we eliminated and kept.

Chairperson Marks: We're doing that all at once. So, I might as well just go ahead and do it.

Member Bugeja: Okay. All right. Okay.

Chairperson Marks: So, I'll do this quickly. For Homestead, we have 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10. For Kisatchie, we have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7. For Blue Ridge, we have 1, 2, 5, 7, 8. For Bombay Hook, we have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8. And for Saratoga, we have 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Member Bugeja: Okay. Wow. Got it.

Chairperson Marks: So, that's the grouping that we'll be continuing to look at. The

others I did not mention are set aside. Okay. So, with that, I usually, when I get a request for someone who wants to go first, I'll honor that. In this case, Mr. Olsen asked if he would be able to go first.

Member Olson: Oh, so, we're doing all of them now?

Chairperson Marks: Do all of them.

Member Olson: Oh, okay.

Chairperson Marks: And, then, after Mike, I'll go to Heidi and we'll just work around the table. And, Mike Moran, I'm going to call on you right after I make my comments.

Member Moran: Super. Thank you, Gary.

Chairperson Marks: Mike Olsen, please proceed.

Member Olson: Okay. All right. On the Homestead, Number 2 I think carries the most interest for me. However, the stars do make it appear to be a little cluttered. The Number 2, without the "Free Land", I think that is an interesting design. There's a lot of negative space there.

In talking with the representatives from the site, they indicated that "Free Land" was important to them to be placed on the coin, which brings me to Number 5 and Number 6. To me, that just overpowers the design. It almost looks like it ought to be in neon flashing "Free Land". Come get it.

So, there may be a way to incorporate the "Free Land" in a different space on this design, but my feelings are, on 5 and 6, it's just too big. It overpowers it.

Seven and eight, the horse or oxen

designs, in my view there they're much too cluttered. When you take a look at the actual size of that, you're most likely going to end up with a bunch of frosting and it's going to be hard to tell what that is.

Number 10, I didn't really care for that. We've talked in this committee before about having your back to the viewer. I understand they are working, but that one just did not hold a lot of appeal.

Moving on to the Kisatchie, I believe Number 1 is an appealing design. When you take a look at the actual size, that turns out fairly nicely. It's interesting, with the two that we have, two of these five we're looking at today, a collector or an enthusiast that just takes a look at birds and wildlife, there's a subset being created within this set of National Park quarters that would lend itself nicely to a separate collection of its own.

And these depictions that we're looking at in this particular case are all, other than Andy Griffith there in the canoe, they're all very nice depictions of wildlife. So, again, Number 1 was going to get a good portion of my support. I like Number 2 as well. I just like the simplicity of that. I think it translates well to the actual size.

Three, again, I think we're trying to put a little too much on there. Four, the feathers of the bird really get intertwined with the pine needles and, maybe on the 5-ounce hockey pucks you might be able to make that out but on a quarter size, most likely you won't.

I do like the action that is depicted in 5, 6 and 7, the perspective especially in Number 7. I know there was some question as to whether the bird is rendered in an accurate fashion. If it's not, I would encourage whatever corrections need to be taken, if we do select this one, to make it look accurate.

That's a stunning design. You're actually looking up. I think Donald mentioned, someone mentioned about a photo op. That's, again, something new.

So, moving on to the Bombay Hook. Excuse me, Blue Ridge. Blue Ridge. With the Blue Ridge, I've never had the pleasure of actually visiting that site or that road. I am a Corvette enthusiast and I've got a lot of friends that have Corvettes and they take trips specifically to that area to drive that road. It's something that I would certainly like to do someday myself.

But, when you're talking about the Blue Ridge Parkway, from everything I've been told from my friends and my research online, it's really all about the road and where the road takes you and what you can see along the road.

And there are, in my opinion, even without the vehicles depicted, a couple of designs here that really strike my fancy, with Number 1 and Number 5 primarily being those two designs. When you look at the quarter size, actual size, it does present an interesting perspective.

It draws you in, particularly Number 1 with the vista that you see in the background. It's not just the road, it's where is the road taking you, encouraging you and inviting you to come down that road.

Same way with Number 5. I understand, on 6 and 7, we've got the cardinal and the flower there. They appear to have been pasted on top of a scene and, if the bird doesn't look out, it's going to get hit by the Corvette coming through that tunnel. So, very nice depictions there trying to incorporate the state bird of both states and the flower. But, again, for me it's about the road. It's about the perspective and there's really only two choices, Number 1 and Number 5.

Number 2, it takes you to a dead end.

Whereas, 1 and 5 you see the expanse. You see the possibilities. Number 2, I don't know where that road's going. It's going somewhere. I don't want to disappear into that background there. So, it really is like a wall that the road is leading to.

On the Bombay Hook, again, a lot of nice artwork there, wildlife artwork and I could see several of these being a successful design, Number 1, in particular. I commend that artist for putting a little piece of interest in that design.

I'm sure the fish doesn't find it very interesting, but simply having the bird there would be fine, but adding the fish, again, you're depicting some action. You're drawing the viewer into that to take a closer look. So that, in my opinion, is a very nice touch.

Some of these, I'll make the comment on Number 2, but it carries forward on several of these. There's too much background. It obscures what the focal point should be, which is the wildlife. On the actual quarter sides for Number 2, that duck could very well be an alligator coming to eat that bird. It's just too small.

On Number 3, the blue herons in the background, you know, they really distract from the design. They're too small. I think without those that would be an okay design. The designs here starting with Number 4 that depict birds in flight are very interesting. I'm not sure if we've had one of those yet. We've had several wildlife just kind of sitting there, but here, especially with Number 5, beautiful design and those birds are either going to somewhere or coming from somewhere, but today they're stopping in Bombay Hook. So, I really like -
-

Member Moran: They're en route to a golf course, Mike.

Member Olson: There we go, or to the hood of my freshly cleaned car. But, anyway, that's

a really neat design, Number 5. Number 6 has a lot of nice balance. Number 7, that one kind of throws me off, because we've got birds facing in different directions with their backs to each other.

I don't know. There's just something about that one that doesn't harmonize well for me, Number 7. You've got a bird flying one direction, another bird looking the other way. Kind of chops it up a little bit.

Again, on Number 8, that's a nice scene, but I'm not sure. There might be just a touch too much background in that one for me.

Moving on to the last one, Saratoga. I got online and I did some looking at the web site for this park. This one is a tough one to depict. Certainly, the claim to fame is the surrender. There's no question about that. So, you're faced with a choice of do we depict what occurred at the park to gain its recognition or do we depict something in the park that is there today?

Unless there's some cannon sitting around, there's really nothing there to show what's there today in the park. So, I'm a little mixed on this one. I'm going to kind of wait to hear what --

Member Hoge: Number 1 is the headquarters house.

Member Olson: Okay. You're correct. Now, is that -- representative from the park, is that the way it still looks today?

Mr. Schnitzer: Yes. The scene in SNHP-01 is actually the actual scene. We have the original Neilson House in the background, which was Benedict Arnold's headquarters and, then, in the foreground, there is a reproduction cannon on display, just like you see it there.

Member Olson: Okay. Before listening to all the discussion, I really didn't put a lot of stock

in the historical scenes. I was more drawn to Number 9 and, you know, just kind of questioning there.

You know, that could be today or that could have been after the battle. The cannon's sitting there unattended overlooking I believe it's the Hudson River.

Mr. Schnitzer: Yes.

Member Olson: There's a question there, you know. What happened? What's going to happen? So, Number 9 had some interest for me and looking at Number 10, I really couldn't figure that one out. Somebody's going to have to explain that one to me. The cannon's sitting there. I think maybe that's supposed to be the river behind it. There's a big negative space there with some land behind the cannon. Then the flag's kind of stuck in there.

I'm not sure what that's all supposed to represent. I don't know if the artwork's just not coming through on that one or if I'm missing something. But that one I just had a hard time with. So, with that, I'll wait to hear what the rest of the group has to say.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you, Mike. Heidi?

Member Wastweet: Thank you. Today's kind of a special meeting, because this closes the lid with my being part of this Committee for four years and it went by in a heartbeat. And we've made some good changes that I'm really proud of.

And, when I got this packet in the mail and I opened it up excitedly like I always do -- I'm going to go to Homestead Number 1. This is the first picture that I saw.

In the four years that I've been here, I think every single meeting that we've had we have

voiced the same message. Please don't show us storyboards. Don't show us busy designs. Don't show us saccharine scenes and be accurate.

And this Design Number 1, which we voted that there was no interest, I want to talk about why there's no interest, because this design hits every point that we've been talking about every single meeting I've been here for four years.

This is what we don't want to see. It's busy, it's literal. It's completely inappropriate for the size of the quarter and, as we've heard presented to us today, part of what was amazing about this Homestead Program was that it was open to the former slaves and women to own land. But here the dominant character is a white man again.

And, on top of all that, it's inaccurate. That's a magic plow driving itself through what appears to be a lawn. This is everything we don't want to see. What else can I say? I think we do an injustice to the people that came to this land and worked it to make it productive and fruitful. This was not a walk in the field on a sunny day, like we see here. There was muscle involved.

And, in the scenes where we have the team of horses, out of eight depictions of this plow, only Design Number 7 has reins. You can't drive a car without a steering wheel. You can't drive a plow without reins. So, that eliminates a lot of designs right there.

And I don't see any of these people exerting any muscle. This was hard work to get this land to bear fruit and crops. It wasn't just show up and get your free land and then everything's smooth sailing. We're doing these people that came before us, our ancestors, we're doing them a disservice by depicting them this way.

And by depicting white men, we're eliminating all of the other people that worked here. I would have rather seen a team of horses putting

all their muscle into pulling that plow, just the horses to represent the people and the teamwork. It wasn't just one man in the field, but people working together. And we could have shown that symbolically with a team of horses with all their might pulling against that hard ground. And we don't have that.

This is a missed opportunity and I would like to propose that we not let this go by with a mediocre design once again, after I've been here fighting for four years. Do we have time to go back to the drawing board and make this better.

Ms. Stafford: Is that question posed to me?

Member Wastweet: To the general staff.

Ms. Stafford: This portfolio should have been presented to the Committee at the end of last year but, because of work volume that we've discussed obviously this morning, it was put off until this month. March is the month that, for any given year, we have to have coins that show up in circulations presented.

I guess I would turn that back to the Committee and wonder if that's the general consensus versus concern about several designs? But I should not the comments about storyboards.

I want to be sure the Committee understands, at each and every turn, we share that with artists. Conversely, however, we have also been asked and implored not to filter and cull the designs that emanate from our artists.

And, without naming the artist, I can tell you that the artist that designed Homestead Design 1 also created 2. So, if, in fact, there are no designs that this Committee can get behind, that is a point of discussion. But, having heard some initial comments, I do wonder if there's a recommendation that could come from the Committee.

I do know that we've been in this place before where the Committee to send a signal, which I hope over the past year plus you acknowledge has been heard and we have been working hard to implement, you've sent back portfolios in order to have that point driven home.

So, that point has been taken, is being passed to the artists and this is the portfolio that was developed with those artists and in concert with the site liaison. So, really, maybe we should return that back to the Committee and see what comments they have.

Chairperson Marks: Let me comment on that. We have, over the years, developed a process. It'll get us to what Heidi, the answer to what Heidi has posed to us. And that is that you go through this ranking scoring process. And we've established, in fact Heidi was the one who started it, that if a design does not reach the threshold of 50 percent in that evaluation that it doesn't go forward.

So, I would suggest, in view of the fact that one of the values of this Committee is that we hear each other's comments, in totality. I would suggest we go ahead with the our discussion as planned.

Let's do the scoring and the scoring will, I think, point us in a direction. If there was one of these national places that none of the designs reached that 50 percent threshold, I think that should speak to us.

And, even if the showing is weak and one ekes out something a little over 50 percent, then I think we should focus our discussion on that rather than a wide-open general discussion without the direction of our process. So, I want to encourage us to honor our process. Let's go through the exercise here and let's see what comes out the other side and we'll have further discussion depending on what that tells us.

Member Wastweet: And thank you for your addition, April. You guys have been working very hard to relay our messages and we have seen changes and we are getting a higher number of designs that do answer our pleas. So, thank you for adding that and I recognize that and, really, I'm trying to drive the point home to the designers to keep going in that direction.

Mr. Weinman: Mr. Chairman, Joe Menna in Philadelphia would like to make a comment on this topic, if you can allow it?

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Joe, go ahead.

Mr. Menna: Hi. Can you guys hear me?

Mr. Weinman: Yes.

Member Scarinci: Go ahead.

Mr. Menna: All right. Forgive the hat. It's cold over here. No. The CCAC subcommittee got very involved in the activities within the Engraving Division because of concerns over what they perceived as our being limited in our design choices by certain general processes that their efforts have corrected.

But my concern, as an artist on this end, is that the Committee has become, in many ways, respectfully, has as much of an affect on the designs that the situation that they tried to correct formerly did. In that, when I sit down and draw now, I think what does the Committee what to see? The Committee has told us that they want to see not unfettered but true creativity, original designs, artistic originality.

There's a very broad art world out there now. I'm not talking about the abstract stuff in extreme galleries, but there is a large pool of talent and creativity out there that we could participate in, but, instead, we run the risk of kind of becoming

like the JCPenney of the art world, in that, if we are totally focused on observing certain criteria, it doesn't really allow us the freedom to explore other avenues, not that we're being told not to.

But, for instance, when you talk about having a prescription for a certain amount of field that you want to see, it's almost like a formula. If you look at the history of numismatic art, you've had thousands of great coins and designs that are almost all artwork and no field. There are so many different ways that we could be designing coins, in my opinion, respectfully.

But, we've now established this whole new criteria. So, every time when I sit down to draw I'm thinking not what would be great as a coin. I'm thinking what does the Committee want to see and I think that there is a danger in that. That's all I'm trying to say. So, I thank you for your time.

Chairperson Marks: Heidi?

Member Wastweet: Thank you, Joe. It's great to hear from you and hear some input back that we rarely hear. So, I really appreciate that. Can you talk more about the criteria. You mentioned a percentage of field and really our suggestions are to open things up.

Mr. Menna: I'm saying storyboard, right? Well, you know, the great tradition of figurative art, that started arguably with the Egyptians down to the present day, has been driven by narrative. So, narrative is a very strong component of numismatic art and relief art in general, going back to hieroglyphics.

So, to say that we don't want to see stories or narratives in that context I think is problematic. To say that we only want to see strong bold symbols is also a prescription. I think the list can go on.

To say that you want to see a certain portion of field in relationship to the artwork, these things, you know, yes, they're great ideas. They're all valid ideas.

But, by making us observe all this criteria every time we design, you run the risk of making all the designs look the same. And I'm not saying that they do or that the Mint is getting anything less than its absolute best. But I feel a little bit stifled as an artist in the way that things have developed.

Member Wastweet: This is a great opportunity to talk about defining words. When we say "storyboard", we're not talking about narratives. Narratives are very valuable and the old traditions and you mentioned the Egyptians. That's a prime example of a decorative design-oriented narrative. And we'd love to see that.

What we don't want to see is something that looks like it's a snapshot from a movie, something that's very literal with a lot going on for the size of the pallet. So, we're not trying to say no narratives. We're saying we want it to really consider the tradition of coins and what looks good on the size of the pallet.

And, when we talk about the field, we're not trying to limit you, but trying to give you a guideline of what looks good on the size of the pallet as having a clear silhouette. So, within your creativity --

Mr. Menna: According --

Member Wastweet: -- to find ways within that envelope to be creative. We don't mean to restrict you, but open you up to thinking outside the box.

Mr. Menna: But you're making a box, respectfully.

Mr. Weinman: It just seems like --

Chairperson Marks: We need to move on. Folks --

Mr. Menna: Respectfully, I mean, it just seems like --

Chairperson Marks: -- I need an interest --

Mr. Menna: I'm not trying to be argumentative. I was texting back and forth with Greg and Greg suggested that I bring some of my comments forward.

I understand that we're having a symposium with the outside artists coming up in May and maybe some way there would be a way to invite a member or two from the Committee to participate in that and we could have a meeting of the minds and maybe try and find a way to all get together on the same page.

Member Wastweet: Yes. Clearly, this is --

Chairperson Marks: Yes.

Member Wastweet: This is clearly a subject for a bigger conversation. And, I'm glad to get started and let's carry on in the future.

Mr. Menna: I don't want to distract the meeting now.

Chairperson Marks: Joe, I think we have more in common than maybe you might think and I would invite that discussion. In fact, I know I'm already going to be a part of that panel discussion and perhaps Heidi. So, I will welcome that. At this juncture of our meeting --

Mr. Menna: Yes. That's why I felt comfortable enough to mention it now. I really do appreciate your time.

Chairperson Marks: Yes. Well, thank you for your comments. At this juncture though, we've burned a lot of time that was allotted for this discussion.

Mr. Menna: Yes. Excuse me.

Chairperson Marks: So, I need to bring us back to point and, Heidi I need to have you conclude your comments so we can move on.

Member Wastweet: All right. Let's move forward and talk about Kisatchie. I want to look at Design Number 2. I want to caution against having a lot of masses overlapping each other and the difficulty of that in a coin sculpture, as well as Design Number 3.

If you look at your bigger sheet and look at the actual size, the tree trunk is really overwhelming there and in Design Number 4, too. And, if you look at the actual size, the long pine really does get lost in the wings.

Design Number 5, I think this is as well drawn as you can get with a flying turkey and it works well as a drawing. But, again, if you look at the actual size printout on your page in your packet, it looks a little odd.

And I think Design Number 7 is actually my favorite design in all of the designs that we're reviewing today. It's a unique perspective. It's a beautiful layout. It has a repeating pattern of the branches and the feathers and I think it's just beautiful.

I think it could stand for a little simplification in the sculpture stage with those trees. There's a lot going on there. We can make that a little clearer. But I would leave that up to the artist's discretion.

I like the way the wing rakes the edge of the coin. I talked to Steve Antonucci earlier. He

felt confident that we could work with that on the technical level. And, so, I weigh my heavy support to Design Number 7.

On Blue Ridge Parkway, I appreciate the artists' efforts to bring in the birds and the flowers, but it's coming across as a little too much. I do prefer the simpler layouts of Design Number 1 and 5. I'm leaning towards 5 for the reason that the skyline is a little more descriptive and we see a more full s-curve of the road.

Whereas, in Design Number 1, the perspective recedes rather quickly. So, when reduced down to the size of a coin, I think Design Number 5 is actually going to look a little bit better.

On Bombay Hook, for here I want to say, if we have two designs in our overall series that depict similar animals, I don't see any problem with that. I think as long as this species is not necessarily unique to the park, but special to the park, I think that it should be allowed and not voted against just for that.

I do like Design Number 1. Again, we're breaking the edge of the coins, very creative. It's a strong silhouette. It's a lovely depiction of the bird. That's on Number 1.

Design Number 5 I feel that this Canadian goose is not as unique to the park as the heron. So, based on just the species alone, I feel like Number 1 is a little more unique, where the Canadian geese I think are more ubiquitous across the country.

Saratoga, I'm torn on these. I want to point out, on Design Number 6, the placement is important. Here we have the surrendering general handing the sword down, meaning that he is above the winning general and I think that this is the wrong orientation symbolically.

Whereas, in Design Number 3, we have

the winning general's hand on top of the sword. You know, usually, we don't want additional lettering on the coin. I think this is an appropriate case where it says, "Surrender 1777", because that is the important event of the park. That's a case where wording does work.

Designs 7 and 8, let's talk about 7, the close-up version. The gesture is right here, the bowed head, handing over the sword. That's a lot of stuff going on in the background for the size.

Design Number 9, I like what Mike Olsen said about the fact that this could be a scene from the past or the present that ties the two together. I think that's nice. I like the simplicity of it. I'm going to stand behind Design Number 9. That's it.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Thank you, Heidi.

Member Wastweet: I'll mark myself off.

Chairperson Marks: Yes, you are. Okay. We'll cycle back to Homestead, please. In the interest of time, I'm going to mainly focus on the ones I would like to see recommended.

And, on Homestead, I want to say, as is the case with many of these America the Beautiful quarters, this is a tough subject I think to bring down in concept to a one-inch palette and have it represent something that's meaningful to the historic place.

In the case of Homestead, my focus is on Number 2. You can show that one on the screen, Number 2. I'm focusing on it because it's the closest thing and it is symbolic. It represents the food, shelter and water, which were important, of course, to survival for the settlers.

I think it does it in a somewhat interesting way for a one-inch palette. I would suggest that, if we recommend this, that we remove

the stars and kind of enlarge the three objects, which are the focus of this design. I like it also because, as I referred to earlier, creating contrast. This would create some nice contrast that I think the images would be fairly readily discernable.

So, I think this is a nice approach to a difficult subject. The others to me are just problematic. So, I'll be supporting Number 2 for Homestead.

So, if we move on now to Kisatchie, there's two that I'd like to comment on that I think have the most merit in my mind. Actually, I would comment on two and I have another comment on a third.

But, on Number 4, I think this design has a lot of potential. I think there's too much in it right now. I think the branch plays an unfortunate role ultimately in this design that, if you remove the branch, keep the tree that the bird is on, you would isolate the bird as far as contrast.

And I think you result in a simpler, much more pleasing, more readily discernable image of the bird, because, after all, that's the intended focus I believe of the artist was to show us the bird. So, I'd like to focus on the bird.

So, I like Number 4 and, if it were the will of the rest of the Committee that that be our recommendation, I would encourage or if necessary make a motion to recommend that the branch be removed.

As a comment and not as a suggestion that we recommend it, Number 5 had Benjamin Franklin had his way about our national bird, we might be talking about honoring our national bird. Now, I believe the Canadians have put an American bald eagle on one of their coins recently. So, in fact, that's the comment that I want to make later. I'm sorry.

So, anyway, the turkey is an interesting one. It does have some merit, so I wanted to mention that one. But the one that I'm really focusing the most on is Number 7 with the woodpecker. I think this is a very interesting perspective for the bird.

Here, again though, if we were to pick this one, I'd like to keep some of the stand of trees, the two immediately to the left I'd like to keep. The ones to the right of those first two trees that kind of go along the outside behind that wing, I'd like to remove those, so we further define the bird as far as contrast.

And, then, the same on the far right by the tail of the bird. I'd like to keep the rightmost tree in that image and eliminate the ones behind the tail. Kind of try to keep some of that perspective but, again, isolate the focal point, which is the bird.

Moving on to Blue Ridge Parkway, two that I'd like to comment on and those are Number 1 and Number 5. I think I probably favor 5 the most for a lot of the reasons that Mike Olsen mentioned. It looks like an inviting roadway and it's going somewhere.

I think this is probably one of the more difficult national places to render, because it's a road. And most of the time we know a road by what we experience on it, when we're in a vehicle. So, I'm not sure what else you do with this image or this item.

So, I'll be supporting 5 with some consideration to 1, depending on what my colleagues have to say in the balance of this discussion.

Going onto Bombay Hook, there's two that I am particularly interest in. I like the Number 1, the heron. As we passed around those quarters just a bit ago, the Everglades one I found to be kind

of analogous to what we might expect with this design.

And I believe, when we talked about the Everglades quarter many months ago, one of our recommendations was to remove the horizon line in the background, again, because we thought it might help define the focal point of the design on a small palette and make the bird more visible.

And I think the same situation exists here that, if you took the farthest horizon line just under the bird's body --

Member Jansen: Which image are you talking about?

Chairperson Marks: Number 1. I'm sorry. Number 1, the heron. Can we put the big image of that up there, perhaps? Yes. If you took that uppermost horizon line out of there, you instantly totally define that bird. And you saw, with the frosted examples, that unless you have the object of the coin up close to you, and analyze it from a distance, it kind of confuses what you're seeing.

So, I really like Number 1. I'll put most of my support behind Number 1. I think it's a very interesting image in 1 that I think it would do well on this coin. I also like Number 5, though.

And this is my comment about the Canadians who put our eagle on their coin. It would be great to have Canadian geese on ours. Once again, though, if I were doing it, I'd take out that horizon line. Leave the other detail at the bottom and, just in a very simple design of two geese flying. I think that would be beautiful. And my compliments to the artist on that one. I really like it.

Then moving on to Saratoga, I want to support Number 1. But I guess I want to ask Steve and Don a question, either or both. I'm not sure

who might want to respond to it. Is there some way that we can treat this, as far as how it's sculpted or how it's frosted and proofed, some way to handle this image where the cannon would really stand out? There's a lot of background to it right now.

Mr. Everhart: Yes, absolutely. If you texture the grass behind it, it'll make the mechanism of the cannon pop out I think, or give it good contrast.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Because I think what's important to this design, if it were to work, is that the cannon be made the focal point somehow.

Mr. Everhart: Yes. The challenge is going to be with the grass behind it. We've got texture there and we've got a cannon and the wheels.

Chairperson Marks: Right.

Mr. Everhart: You've got a lot going on here and I could easily see that cannon getting lost in that.

Chairperson Marks: And the grass is part and parcel to the design, so I don't know how you eliminate it.

Mr. Everhart: Oh, you don't. Pretty much what the artist did is you concentrate on detail up front and fade it out as you go back. So, you know, you would create contrast with it kind of in that way.

Chairperson Marks: Okay.

Mr. Everhart: Plus the fact that the cannon is mechanical and the rest of the composition, save the house, is natural forms. I think just that fact alone will contrast.

Mr. Antonucci: I'm thinking, Gary, to

one of your questions earlier. I wanted to address it, since we're here. This is one of the places where I think we can apply the multi-tone frosting --

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Mr. Antonucci: -- very well.

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Mr. Antonucci: You're welcome. And what I see, maybe the grass is a horsehair polish. It's not --

Chairperson Marks: Right.

Mr. Antonucci: But it's a muted polish. And the cannon will be frosted. I know it will get a pop that way. And, of course, the background, the sky would be highly polished and you'll get that differentiation of textures there.

Mr. Everhart: Just an added thought. Blue Ridge Parkway, you could do the same thing with the road, not polish it, but give it sort of --

Member Jansen: Thank you. Cool.

Mr. Antonucci: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Yes. I think that would really help that one, too. Yes. But anyway, so, I probably will ultimately support this one as my top pick. I do it with some concerns, but some reassurances now from you folks that maybe you could make that cannon pop out. I think that would be critical if we go with that one.

So, that's the totality of my comments. And, so, I'll go to Mike Moran on the phone. Mike, are you there?

Member Moran: Yes, I'm ready.

Member Jansen: And, Mike, before you get going here, would you be kind enough? I sent

you an email just now to establish the email connection. Would you email me? This is Eric Jansen talking. Email me your votes at some point when you have them?

Member Moran: Yes. I think I've got your contacts with me, Gary. If not, I'll be yelling here in a minute, but I'll get them to you.

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Member Moran: I want to make some comments on the Homestead and do a positive and negative. I think my support will be going toward Number 2, although I think we run the risk there of losing the effect of that well. It'll get lost in the house. Possibly not, if you get rid of those stars.

The stars, to me, the 30 homestead states, are not really integral to the story itself. And I think you can make a case for dropping those and merge into the other design details on the reverse. My vote on that would be contingent on dropping the stars.

I want to talk about 7 and 8 for a moment. Seven does have the reins on the horses and they don't on 8. Heidi's catch on that was a good one. But my problem with both of these is the horses are standing still, guys. You look at those two front legs and they're stopped.

And, as a contrast we dropped out, but take a look at what the artist did there. They get the motion of the horses in it. And I would not want to see some of these get to this level of review, when you've got such a basic mistake in the animal renditions here. So, I hope we can stop that in the future.

Moving onto the Kisatchie. I want to talk about the sketching in Number 2, the drawing. It's a beautiful sketch. It sucked me in every time. But the problem is the simple theme here, the red-cockaded woodpecker, is not shown in profile

against negative space. So, it will get lost when you reduce it to a quarter, particularly if everything is glossy here.

So, if you look at what's in contrast and in profile, it's Number 1, the turkeys, which I think is good. Number 3, I tend to agree with a comment that was made earlier that the long-leaf pine is going to overshadow the two woodpeckers when you get it down to a quarter.

Again, these two birds are shown in profile and compliments against negative space. There's no way you're going to show a flying battleship on a coin. They are ugly when you get them in flight. It just doesn't work.

I applaud the concept of 7, where you're looking up at the trees, but I just think that, by the time you get this bird in profile so the proper right wing can be seen, you're going to lose a lot of the effect, the uniqueness of the perspective here, looking up at the bird, because you're going to drop out a lot of those trees. So, I would come back and my support is going to be for Number 1, the turkeys, on that one.

On the Blue Ridge, I agree with Heidi. I think that this is one where you use the negative space of the highway itself to define the coin and, while I think the sketching is probably better in Number 5 than Number 1, I am going to go with the more artful sketch in this case and support Number 5.

Bombay Hook, to me, and again I'll point out a couple things I think we ought to try to avoid, Gary's already hit the skyline, the horizon issue. If you look at Number 8, on the heron that's flying, you can see those legs are against the ridgeline there going across that landscape. That will never show up on a border. Those legs will get totally lost and it's something we need to avoid.

Otherwise, that would probably have

been my choice, because it shows the motion and shows it well. So, I'm back all the way to Number 1. I like the little trick of the fish in the beak. I think it will stand out well and that's where my vote is on that.

On Saratoga, let's look at Number 3 first. Well, back to Number 1. I'll be surprised if you can make that show up. And, as a Park Service representative said, cannons are not integral to the battle. It may be part of the landscape there at the park now, but I'm going to shy away from the cannons.

But Number 3, we have "Surrender 1777". We need to get "Surrender" off the coin. If we choose that, we need to put something there like either "Victory" or "Triumph". "Surrender" is just going to send the wrong message to somebody who doesn't understand the American history.

Moving down to 7 and 8, I like this one. I like the dejected look of the British. It's clearly a defeatist pose. It will show up on the quarter. But I don't like that Gates' head would be cut off in the three-quarter view.

So, that means that my support is probably going to go to Number 8, because I don't see how you can get the head in there without getting the two bodies closer together on the quarter and it will run together.

Number 9, I think it's a beautiful sketch of a cannon. I'll be surprised if it shows up on a quarter. So, I back Number 8 on that one. There you have it, Gary.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Thank you, Michael. At this point, I'll recognize Eric.

Member Jansen: Let's see here. I think, and I really appreciated the comments coming from Steve and Don on this one. I think the Mint is at a place here where we're going to have to ask the

Mint to make a decision to implement multi-grades of frosting on production proof coins, if production and proof in the same sentence are not oxymorons, because the term "blast white" is blasting our designs apart, if there isn't enough negative space to carry some eye control.

As Gary passed around the 2013 and '14 sets, thank you for doing that, because some of those are just so blast white that they just lose -- relief has lost its power in these designs to frosting. And, so, I ask the Mint to internally have this discussion, because our frosting has become so powerful that we've lost the impact of relief.

So, a lot of my comments are going to call out for negative space in order to offset this pendulum swinging that we've created technically. I'm going to talk about where I really think some proofing has to be done, which might otherwise just be frosted, because it's always been frosted in order to increase the contrast.

I'm sorry, Joseph Menna left the scene because I appreciated his comments. And this is a second point in my comments here. I would invite for the March agenda some chatter chat, maybe some homework dialogue written by some of us and submitted ahead of that meeting, so that when we come to a Philadelphia meeting where we're talking to the artists in a symposium, we make sure the Committee has got a common message and we don't confuse these artists with shotgun opinions from various factions or individuals on this Committee.

I wasn't aware of that risk until Joe Menna made his comments and then it just hit me like a shotgun blast. If we're not careful, the Committee's directions are going to come in such a scattered fashion that we may do more destruction, in terms of getting what we want, than otherwise.

Overall, before I go through my comments, because I happen to see how these

tabulations come through, I want to encourage people when they're voting today to exercise your right to vote not only zeroes or threes, but ones and twos. Again, I add these up every time and so I see the flavor and the feeling and the dynamics of these numbers.

I, personally, was not real happy with the art we got this time. Yet, I echo Gary's comments that I want to see the market. I want to see the Committee. I want to see the tabulation work against this 50 percent of possible points to make or not make recommendations here. And the way for that system to work best is for you to not vote bimodally, zeroes or threes.

But, you know, if you aren't real positive on anything, give some ones and twos and don't give a three, because I think that will make the system work the best. Okay.

Specifically, two comments, starting with Homestead. I'm on Design Number 2 and I'm on Design Number 2 taking the stars off. I ask the historian for an interpretation. Is that pump accurate with the timeframe we're talking here, pipe, pump, the ability to dig a well?

Member Ross: Well, and I will turn to our resident experts as well, but they looked time-accurate based on homesteading photographs that we looked at from the period. And I recognize that a lot of the homesteading is done with the plowing rather than with well water, but I would think that's accurate. Am I incorrect?

Mr. Engler: It's correct. And, also, there's been a discussion talking about reins and all that sort of thing. I don't know how many people in this room have plowed. I have plowed and you don't usually use reins. So, I would say that, in the instance of those photographs, maybe not the planters and all, but those photographs are accurate.

I would also say, it may be out of place for me to say, if we miss saying "Free Land", we are missing the Homestead Act, because that law is not like the preemption laws where you had to actually buy land. This was where the government was doing something really unique, something very special. And that was giving away free land.

I know it was mentioned that this was like having a neon light. That's absolutely true. It was. And that's why, on the flyers that went around the world, that there was the message "Free Land".

And that's why immigrants, that's why former slaves, that's why women all pursued it. They did not have the means to go out there and secure that land with it not being free. Was it really free in the end? No, because of the hard work that was mentioned. But, indeed, it was free.

And a whole system was built around that and I think that, if we miss that opportunity to communicate that, I think that it will become a story, just like anyone else I share with you.

Also, to show you how unique this idea of free land is, you know, there are communities across the Midwest trying to change the demographics that are tied to their local communities of today. These communities are trying to lure new people to their communities by offering free land.

I can share with you that years ago Radio Free Europe called us and it was Russia that was looking at giving away free land. And, so, we were interviewed by Radio Free Europe. It's the idea of free land that makes homesteading very unique.

It's the light of land ownership and it also allows people to pursue and achieve the American dream. If we don't include it, I think that this story will be like any other story. Thank you. And I hope

I'm not out of line.

Member Ross: And I want to add a "here here" to the record.

Member Jansen: Well, here here.

Chairperson Marks: Just to check, guys, I want you to know we've got four minutes left to finish this up. I just want to encourage us all to be as brief as possible. I'm sorry to say that, but we do need to complete everything on our agenda today and, unfortunately, we've had to go in directions today that's kind of limited us. But let's just go forward and let's get this done.

Member Jansen: Well, if I were to choose a singular one, it has to be Number 2, just on this symbology involved here and the ability to use negative space to create contrast with images that will survive the flatness of super blast white frosting.

If there's a second choice, it would be Item Number 3, again, because of the plow-blade symbol. I am very sympathetic to "Free Land". I think putting it in, in the option we have here, is essentially neon lights and I don't like that. I would much rather have used a symbol used of a placard or some kind of a western kind of wanted-poster kind of appearance saying, "Land for Free, Work It, Own It".

I don't like Number 4, because I don't think that's a symbol that most of the world will recognize. And the rest of the images are just too much background and I think they get lost. I'm not going to support anything there with a three.

When I got to Kisatchie, Number 5 is a turkey. It's a turkey. Sorry. It's a turkey. Turkey's don't fly like that. I grew up where there were turkeys and they don't fly like that. I am favored to Item Number 3, because I think that one is going to survive the negative/positive space the

best.

I know Design Number 2 is popular, but the body and the bark are going to merge into one. Design Number 1 is not bad. It does have the positive/negative space that's going to work. And I can't support the rest of them, because I think the frosting's going to destroy the effect of the relief in making a picture.

I'm going to go to Blue Ridge Parkway and I'm going to go to Steve and Don here and say, how are you going to treat the pavement? Because if you're going to frost the pavement, the designs are all a waste.

Mr. Everhart: Well, there's different types of frosting that we can do and Steve can address that better. But we could put a lighter, more reflective frosting on the road that doesn't compete with the polish of the sky.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Everhart: And, then, have a third texture, which will take care of itself when you do the sculpting.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Everhart: So, I think it's a no brainer.

Member Jansen: See, I think that has to happen or I send them all back.

Mr. Antonucci: Let me tell you what I just envisioned for this as you were talking. The road would be, again, like the field with Saratoga, it would be this horsehair polish, which is a more muted.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Antonucci: That way you could still see the lines in the road and so on and so forth.

The sky would be the high polish as we normally do. I think it sets it off.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Antonucci: And I would use a heavy frost, Eric, on the rockslides.

Member Jansen: Of course,

Mr. Antonucci: And the rest of it, the vegetation, I'd put a light frosting there, because you really start to pull it apart and it makes you --

Member Jansen: In the context of the sculpture and the technical treatment, 1 and 5 are the choices. Five's just flat out I think a better choice than 1 in that regard and that's what I'm going to support.

When it comes to Bombay Hook, the fish disappears on the quarter, guys. Look at the rendering on a 1-inch palette and you don't see a fish. I'm not sure what you see, but you don't see a fish.

There is too much background noise, unless we get into this discussion of gradations of frosting on almost all the designs, with the exception of 5, which stands out naturally and extraordinarily well. I'm not going to be a diplomat American/Canadian and argue the geese thing.

I've seen a lot of heron's flying and I like 8 and 4, but neither of those cant the neck the way a heron flies with his neck canted.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Correct.

Member Jansen: And I'm sorry to steal what I think was about to be your thunder.

Member Stevens-Sollman: That's my thunder, but you can have it, new rope.

Member Jansen: So, I would say I'm

going to give 4 and 8 a light vote, but only if we fix the necks.

I'm going to go to Saratoga and -- I'm going to go to 6 and say Heidi's absolutely correct. We've got the loser on top handing the sword down to the winner on the bottom and it's just wrong. It might have been an interesting design, if it was the other way, where I'm handing it upward to the accepting hand, who's the victor.

I heard the story about the cannons -- I don't buy it. Image Number 10, whose flag is that? I don't see any stars. All I see are bars. What's that about? I don't like any of these designs.

If I have to go for one at all, it's going to be Design Number 3. And thank you very much for the comment on "Surrender" has got to go away, because it makes the coin look like we lost the battle.

And I think it needs to be "Decisive Victory 1777" or some other term to put it from the perspective of this is a U.S. coin and put the U.S. outcome as the lead letter. If you do select another design here, I'm questioning the 1777 font style, Junior Subordinate 7s, it's just weird.

Artistic favor aside and everything it's just weird. So, I don't know if that's helpful to anybody, but I really feel strongly that we are at a point of really needing to understand our ability to frost for effect here, because I think we have the power.

But we need to realize that it's not cannon fodder. It needs to be applied with careful work for die life, consistency of proof strikes. Otherwise, all we do is hand the grading surface as a whole other dimension with which to grade things Proof 68.

Member Olson: Just one quick comment. We've got to remember we're not just talking about

designs here for proofs. They could do a lot of cool things with proofs.

Member Jansen: No. Understood. But the bulk of these, the ones the kids are going to collect, are uncirculated from the bank. So it's got to look good on those coins as well.

Chairperson Marks: Jeanne.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay. Quickly, at first, I was a little disappointed in the fact that we're looking at plowing and accuracy in animals that are doing the plowing. And I can't stand behind any of these teams of horses for the simple reason that I think Michael Moran mentioned. It's that they are not moving and, when they are moving, they're not moving correctly.

I feel sort of bad for the artists who are really paying attention to some headgear and some of these things and not to the horse or the ox. And that's a little disappointing. There's a lack of homework done there.

I would like to see a little bit more understanding of what they're doing. That said, there's actually too much, as my other colleagues have mentioned, too much in these images. And I'm wondering, can we say "Homestead Act" in the border or are we going to get beyond that. So that, if we said "Act", would that indicate free land?

Mr. Weinman: Actually, I don't think we could say "Homestead Act". You're honoring the national location.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay. It's the location.

Mr. Weinman: We're not honoring the Homestead Act, but the location.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay. Thank you. So, with all of that said, I think I'm going to

have to speak to Number 2 without the stars. I think that probably explains Homestead best with what we have here.

Going on to Kisatchie, I have to skip over most of these and go to Number 7. I think that this is a particularly interesting view of the cockaded woodpecker. I like the fact that those trees are in there in the background, but I do worry very much that the frosting is going to wipe out a lot of the detailing of the trees. The bird is quite interesting.

And, in respect for our time, I'll move on to the Blue Ridge Parkway. Number 1 and Number 5 are my choices. In the beginning, I thought it was very nice to have the state bird and flower there and also to look at some of the historic construction of the roadway, but we're going to lose that in a small planchet. So, my choice is going to be with the more simple piece in Number 5.

Going on to Bombay Hook, the heron in Number 1 is pretty accurately done. I'm pleased with the artist's rendition there. The fish is going to be lost and maybe he doesn't need to carry that fish.

The one thing I'd have to agree with Eric to take my storm away a bit with the neck of these herons. The neck in Number 7 and Number 6 is correct. Number 2 is correct. Number 1, I think if we choose this, perhaps that little s-curve could be just a little more accurate.

It's a very beautifully done bird. It's using up the entire space of the coin and the older herons do have all of this extra feathering in the front on their crest and on their chest. So, my choice is Number 1.

And, going to Saratoga, this was very hard for me, extremely difficult. I liked the simplicity of Number 10, although it doesn't make any sense in a way. So, I'm going to go with Number 9 only because it's probably more simple

and maybe, when I have been to Saratoga, this is like in your face, the cannons are.

It's what I see when I'm there that's important. So, I'm going to go with that one. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry you don't have much time.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you. Mike Ross?

Member Ross: Two comments, one for all the coin people at the table, from a historical perspective, when you're honoring a national historic site, particularly on a quarter, when you're doing a commemorative coin for artistic, sell it to the coin collectors. That's going to be the key.

If you're doing a natural site, artistic as you can do woodland scenes in an artistic way. But, when you're honoring a national historic site on a quarter, it's a chance for it to be a lesson in public history that will make people look the quarter and say, what happened there? Do I want to go there? Is this interesting?

And, on Saratoga, a cannon is just an awful choice.

(Laughter.)

Member Ross: Every battlefield in the country has a cannon. They won't know what war it's from, Civil War, War of 1812. What is it? That will not get one person to Google Saratoga or travel to Saratoga to ask what's going on there.

So, I know you don't like storyboard, but something that reflects the fact that this was an extraordinary battle that changed the course of the Revolution and, therefore, in some ways, human history, because of taking down the divine right of kings that comes out of the Revolution. Something that reflects what happened in Saratoga, besides a cannon, which wasn't even used in the battle, is

essential.

And, then, on the Homestead Act, our stakeholders' emphasis on free land, maybe it's done in a ham-fisted way on 4 and 5 or whichever ones have the giant "Free Land". But, if there's a way to slip that in there, for all the reasons our stakeholders have discussed, it's extraordinarily important to the Homestead Act story.

And I would argue it's also important to the story of why the Homestead Act came about, because the Republican Party was pushing the Homestead Act coming up to the Civil War as a place for non-slave-holding settlers. And that's why, at 150 acres, you couldn't have a plantation.

In most of the places that was homestead land, it wasn't plantation crops. And, for that reason, the South blocked the Homestead Act every time it came up, because they knew the people going there would not be slave owners. So, the free land has a double entendre meaning, both the free land that will lure immigrants and all kinds of people to the Dakotas and Nebraska --

Mr. Antonucci: I thought one of the things that was talked about was the design to take the stars out. Why don't we put "Free Land" in where the stars are.

Member Ross: That would be awesome.

Member Wastweet: That would be cool.

Member Ross: And it's also a story of the Homestead Act being about free land, free from slavery and it tell both sides of the story beautifully. So, take the stars out and put "Free Land" under the corn and I think that would be awesome. Okay.

Ms. Stafford: Thank you. Can I just say thank you so much for making that point about the double meaning of free land. That was really very special. So, thank you very much for that.

Seriously.

Chairperson Marks: I agree with that. Thank you, Mike. You will be missed.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Robert?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I still like the cannon, guys.

Member Wastweet: Which one did you support?

Member Ross: What's that?

Member Wastweet: Which one did you support?

Member Ross: Oh, well, I like 2, if it says "Free Land" on it.

Member Wastweet: Oh.

Member Ross: And, then, on Saratoga, I think I would be going with the 7 and 8 that actually show an abject British surrender,

Member Wastweet: The one with his --

Chairperson Marks: Don, did you have a comment?

Mr. Everhart: Yes, I'll wait.

Member Wastweet: -- with his head in a pose?

Member Ross: With his head down as a sign. The other one he doesn't look too unhappy surrendering. It seems like a transaction.

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Member Ross: But on 7 and 8, it's a sign that this was a key turning point in a war that had

not been going very well.

Member Wastweet: What about the cannon in the background?

Mr. Everhart: Yes. I have a suggestion for Number 2 that I think will make everyone happy. We eliminate the stars. We increase the size of the image inside. We cut back on the tops of the cornhusks and we put "Free Land" on top.

Member Olson: How about "Free Land" along the bottom, on the base?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes. How about on the bottom?

Chairperson Marks: I'd like to suggest this. Because we don't like to design by Committee, or at least we say that, if we're going to do a motion afterwards, let's just make it motion that we ask the art staff to place the words "Free Land" in an appropriate place on the design and let them figure it out.

Member Hoge: Absolutely.

Chairperson Marks: Okay.

Member Moran: And, Gary, eliminate the stars or in place of the stars.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Yes, that's what we're talking about. We really need to move forward, people. Robert, please give us your comments.

Member Hoge: Thank you. I really appreciate all the comments everyone's had so far and I'll try to be very brief. I think we do have problems with frosting and variations on these quite a bit indicating sky or water, by having extremely polished backgrounds. But these have to be taken into account, when we're dealing with something which essentially could be landscapes.

In almost all these contexts, to put landscapes on a tiny coin is always a great problem and, you know, artists are to be congratulated for almost anything they can come up with along these lines.

To refer to the Homestead, I think "Home" is very important. If we don't show something relating to a home, then, whoever is shown there doing some kind of field work could simply be hired hands. I think having a house, and this is one reason why I kind of like Number 2, and also I kind of like Number 8, even though I think that the small elements in the background on that one would be lost.

I like Number 8 as well, because it shows oxen, even though they're not doing their job here. I think that the plowman would probably need a bullwhip to do some bull whacking here. Those oxen obviously don't have any incentive.

(Laughter.)

Member Hoge: On something like this, you'd have to eliminate the fence in the background and change the proportions of the windmill on the house. I think a windmill is very important. I have friends whose families were homesteaders, late 1800s, early 1900s. And, essentially, sometimes all that's left today, the essence of what they did, is the windmill. And, if that could be shown a little bit larger and more prominently, I think that could be very important.

But the home aspect is really crucial on these, because that was what had to be done. You had to prove the 160 acres by living there. You had to do work. You had to make some kind of product. You could raise animals. You could plow.

Oxen would be favorable to horses, I think, because they were much less expensive in these time periods. The yoke is not shown here very well. I think that we need a proper ox yoke

and maybe show the chains attached, something like this.

So, I would vote for that one more than the others. And I think the other designs I can't say much on.

For Kisatchie, I like Number 1, because the turkeys are shown quite clearly. However, the long-leaf pines are not. I would prefer to see something like Number 5 with walking turkeys and, perhaps, even with the tiny woodpecker up in the upper part of the tree. You couldn't tell exactly what he was, but you couldn't tell that on these other things on the size of a quarter either.

So, I would prefer to see something like walking turkeys with a background similar to Number 5.

For the Blue Ridge Parkway, Number 5 and Number 8 are almost identical views but with extremely different vegetation and I'd like to know what is the correct vegetation? Is it pine trees like that or is it some kind of lumpy foliage that you see in Number 5? In any case, I think one of these might be nice.

Number 8, I like the fact that it includes the flowers. They're a little bit too large, but --

Mr. Givens: This is Peter Givens on the Parkway. The vegetation on Number 8 is a close-up view of rhododendron. And it's kind of hard to tell on Number 5 exactly what that is, but it would certainly include a great deal of native rhododendron.

Member Hoge: Well, then, my vote would probably go for that one, since that would be accurate and Number 8, where you see the pine trees all over the place, must be less accurate, right?

I wouldn't go for Number 7, because I

don't think that rhododendrons and cardinals live in tunnels and I don't think that they're growing on walls or sitting there while cars go flying by, as in Number 6.

For Bombay Hook, my preference would be for Number 8 with a correction in the neck of the bird and elimination of the horizontal line. And somewhat a large size for this one, because it's a fine looking image and I think the flight upward is very attractive.

The bird needs a little improvement. If it was enlarged so that perhaps its beak and its feet could break through the encircling line, it could be a very interesting feature.

I prefer that to Number 1, because I think, again, the fish would probably be lost in the details. Although, it's a more accurate looking bird, perhaps.

Number 5 I think is a beautiful image. However, I don't about putting the Canada geese on the American coin. They are characteristic of very park everywhere. They don't have a problem with their flyways, whereas some of these other birds do.

For Saratoga, my preference probably would be for Number 3 with modifications as noted. I don't want any "Surrender" in there either. And I would want to be sure that this sword is, in fact, a general officer's hanger of the type that would have been included. It just doesn't look quite right to me.

Maybe it does represent one of the purported Burgoyne swords in some museum collection, however, but I would want to see that clarified, because it just doesn't look correct for Gentleman Johnny Burgoyne with all his finery.

Thank you very much and I'll just leave it there, so as to be quick.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you, Robert.

Member Hoge: Thank you.

Chairperson Marks: Tom?

Member Uram: I'm not going to go over what I like or what I don't like. I'm just going to make a couple comments in the essence of time. But, under the Homestead in particular, I was thinking the same thing regarding the stars and widening the corn and putting the "Free Land" in there.

I think I would keep it on top, because it would then connect with "Homestead". "Free Land", the two are right together, versus "Homestead" on top and "Free Land" on the bottom. But, obviously, that would be something to be discussed.

On the Kisatchie, I'll make a quick comment there. Gary mentioned about Number 4. I like Number 4 a lot but I think in the narrative we heard that the pine tree was a very big part of the park and, maybe if we don't take the whole branch out, but cut it back or having it moving back, swishing back a little bit more, to still keep the pine in there, but still keep the freeness of the two depictions of the pine and the bird.

So, I'd like to just kind of modify what Gary was saying there as it regards to that one. But I do like that.

The one I want to spend just a minute of time on, though, is the next one with the blue heron. The reason why -- and I'm not going to go over the Parkway; I'm going to skip right to Bombay Hook here. The reason why I want to spend a little bit of time with this is I just happen to have one of these guys that are nearby backyard. And I've been amazed.

If you haven't seen on of these birds, number one, they're monsters. Okay? Now, this

first one is a little bit too fat for me, as it relates to the whole thing with the neck and so forth. When I look out my window and I see Number 2, that's the depiction I see more or less than this Number 1.

Member Olson: Yes.

Member Uram: And, Mike, when you mentioned about the fish, it was funny because when I see it eat a fish, that's a blink of an eye. It's down its neck. I mean, its neck would be bulging there because it's eating the fish. It just goes down in one swoop.

Member Olson: Maybe the one that you like should eat more fish.

Member Uram: That's right. That's right. That's right. The other thing I've found out in very little investigation is I understand this is a solitary bird and they tend to be by themselves. So any of the depictions that I see on the coin, I would not really want with another. I'd like it by itself, I think, just because of the nature of its species.

Now, the reason why I kept Number 3 in, obviously there's too many of them because, like I just said, they're by themselves. But, if you look at Number 3, I think the coin is the one right there in the center. I think if you had that flying, the proportion -- you know, the lift, the wingspan of a blue heron, if you haven't been near one, is huge.

I mean, when it starts its wings, it's like a helicopter starting up. But having that one in the center -- now, if you notice it's the same as Number 7. It's the same basic. If you go to Number 7, there it is again. It's the same bird. So, the wings high versus the wings low in the other one versus the legs being straight back, that's what I envision and see when I see that bird take off.

And like I said, it is good, so I guess I would defer to 8 with more or less that type of a wing.

Chairperson Marks: I agree with that.

Member Uram: This one looks too happy. I mean, he just looks like he's smiling. It's just like a spot on there and he's too happy.

(Laughter.)

Member Uram: So if you could take that one that's in the center, get rid of that background and either one of those, I think you could really have a powerful-looking -- because it's a mean bird, I should say. It's not good to its predators.

Member Stevens-Sollman: No, it's nasty.

Member Uram: Nasty. Right. I mean, it makes geese look good. But that could be why they're solitary, also. So, that's why I wanted to make my comments more towards that one. Thanks.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you, Tom. Michael?

Member Bugeja: Okay. I'm going to make my comments on the designs brief, but I need to address what Joe said in response to Heidi, because I don't want only those points to go on the record when we have people putting them on the record.

First of all, there's a difference between story and storyboard. And it's rich. For instance, if you want to take a look at a story, a narrative, then take a look at the Oregon Trail Memorial by Laura Gardin Fraser or James Fraser. Look at the Lafayette Dollar, where you have George Washington and Marquis Lafayette. The two gaze right and then you have the monument looking left.

You have the Buffalo Nickel and the native American is looking east and Black Diamond, who was in a zoo in New York City, for Pete's sake,

looking west. You have Adolf Weinman's Walking Liberty toward the dawn of a new day and the eagle following.

These are stories. There are narratives. But there are two types of art, and I get upset when I hear artists complain about restrictions because you're supposed to rise above restriction and find something new.

Okay. A storyboard is just a picture, by itself. That's called a lyric moment. A lyric moment does not tell a story unless attached to another lyric moment. And to put your comments, Mike, in perspective, a lyric moment of a cannon does nothing. But the lyric moment of the surrender with the sword is memorialized because it tells that story. So, it's not only just the park. It's what lyric, static moment is emblematic of that story.

So, if you take a look at one of the most modern designs that have incorporated this, take a look at the Ben Franklin Scientist 2006 dollar where you have two historic moments by Ben Franklin that actually defined him not only as a scientist, but a scientist with politics. And you have the kite facing right and the kite string actually is in the same movement as the snake in Join or Die.

So, you're not only joining two lyrics, you're making a story on it. If you want to take a look at the 2012 Star Spangled Banner, you have the evolution of the flag. There are many more examples where you take two lyric moments and combine them on the easel of an obverse and a reverse.

But if the design is static and not memorable, then you should have a reverse to tell the story. If you have a motto, you attach a motto to a lyric moment like Free Land, you turn a static into a symbol. So, that's what you were getting at.

And when you take a look at some of these designs, I mean, I am flabbergasted that

every one of the designs was taken at noon in late spring or early summer with a straight-on shot. When you have a highway and you don't attach it to the border of a rim, because you have the coin and you have a highway that can go into the border. When you have a sword that doesn't go out of the edge, when you have a woodpecker, which is the perfect type of bird. I mean, I have woodpeckers in my backyard in Iowa. You cannot see their head. Their head is moving so fast, it's a blur. That's left out.

You're talking about the fundamentals of art being omitted in these designs. Now, I'm a journalism professor, but I also won a National Endowment for the Arts Award in 1990. So I know what I'm speaking about when I'm speaking about art.

When you talk about teamwork and the Homestead Act, my wife -- her family goes back to the pioneers. It was not only the women, it was the children. It was total, total work. So, if you're going to put Free Land somewhere, to put text on a symbol, to put text on artwork is tantamount to voice-over in a movie. The artist can't do it, so you have to use the text. So, keep those things in mind.

Everything that people said here has been reiterated in one form or another. So, I don't need to do anything, but I don't want those comments to stand on the record in response to Heidi. There's a whole other artistic discussion that we can have.

But please, let's distinguish between a story and a storyboard, between lyric and narrative and the basics of what Michael Ross took out about a memorable moment. So, I'm not defending you. I'm just explaining what art is to a frustrated artist. Thank you.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you. Donald?

Member Scarinci: Let me open just by saying I agree, you know, that what Joe said, you know, is very important and we need to listen to what he said and I think that, you know, that we need to spend some time, A) as a Committee to discuss what he said and, because we're obviously not intending to give any artist --

Chairperson Marks: That's right.

Member Scarinci: -- you know, restrictions. That's everything we fought very hard to prevent.

Member Uram: That's right.

Member Scarinci: So, it's important that we talk it through. I think, you know, what Mike tried to do, you know, in a five-minute discourse, is really something that needs to be discussed in more like an hour --

Member Bugeja: Right.

Member Scarinci: -- and be discussed with the Mint artists. And, perhaps, you know, we should use our time when we go to Philadelphia --

Member Bugeja: That's right.

Member Scarinci: -- with the Mint artists. And, you know, I certainly, you know, have difficulty, number one, since I favor modernist designs, I want America to join the rest of the world in its coin designs and I've been saying that forever.

You know, what I'll do, since it's in Philadelphia, I can put a thousand world coins from my collection in my car and bring them there --

Member Bugeja: Please do that.

Member Scarinci: -- and show them what we're talking about, country by country --

Mr. Antonucci: That's right.

Member Scarinci: -- and award-winning coin by award-winning coin by award-winning coin.

Mr. Antonucci: I think it's important to see. You know, we talk about what other Mints are doing, but I think there's a storyboard for you. That's what you've got to do.

Member Scarinci: Yes. I think better than to say it is to show it.

Mr. Antonucci: That's right.

Member Scarinci: So, I'll go through the tedious process that I'm sure Greg is going to require for me to do that and, you know, and I'll bring a bunch of coins. It's a short car ride for me.

Member Jansen: To a hotel nearby, since we can't get them into the Mint.

Member Scarinci: We should get them into the Mint. I'll even leave them in the Mint so they can study them long after we're gone and study them in their leisure, so that they can see it. And Greg can -- we'll deal with it.

(Laughter.)

Member Jansen: Not getting them in the Mint isn't the problem.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Maybe not getting them out is the problem.

Member Scarinci: So, I thank Joe, you know, and I want us to all be clear that we thank him for his candor today as we thank him and the other artists for their candor three years ago.

So as to the designs on this, I'm just going to tell you the ones. You know, in Homestead, I could go with Number 2 with the modifications. There's nothing in the Homestead group that excites me or thrills me, but I hear there seems to be a lot of people subject to modification

of Number 2. So I'll probably just give it a one, just to give it something. But, other than that, I --

Member Jansen: I want you to feel good about yourself.

Member Scarinci: I'm just going to feel good just by being a team player, but I don't like any of these designs and, you know, and I think why is a future discussion.

As to the three designs on the rest of the coins, I think we should be careful only to go with two birds on coins because of the group. And I think what I've heard is that seems to be the inclination. We're only going to go with two birds for the rest of the coins and not have multiple birds, so it doesn't become -- so 2015 is not bird year.

In Kisatchie, I'd like to argue for the woodpecker and against the turkey. And the reason is we will have many, many opportunities to do a turkey, all right. But there's one chance for this woodpecker, which is an endangered species, which is unique to the area, to be depicted on a coin. And it might --

Member Wastweet: Create awareness.

Member Scarinci: It might be this little guy's only chance to be memorialized in metal, and certainly his only chance to be memorialized on a United States coin. And maybe as little as 100 years from now, if we're unsuccessful. But certainly, a thousand years from now, this might be the only image in metal of this particular bird.

So I would like to advocate one of the woodpecker designs over one of the turkey designs. The turkey will have his day. We'll do a turkey. Plenty of ways to do turkeys.

So obviously, you know, it's no shock that, of all the woodpecker designs, I like Number 7. You know, it has the perspective. It has a nice,

artistic perspective and shows the bird in some majesty. And when I asked the question earlier about, is this something that bird watchers, if they took a picture of it, would be excited about, you know, my guess is, you know, that it probably would be.

So, I'm going to go with Number 7 on that one and for that reason. And I would urge woodpecker, woodpecker.

On the Blue Ridge Parkway, I was persuaded by the arguments that were made by various people and the process to go with Number 5 instead of Number 1. Again, I don't like the missed opportunity in the Blue Ridge Parkway to do something modern.

I mean, if this were a Latvian coin, if there were a coin from Belarus, if this were a coin, you know, even from the United Kingdom with some of the creative stuff they're doing, they would use the opportunity of depicting a road in a new and modern way, all right.

You know, the series is what it is. You know, I think the historian makes an excellent point about this series, and I'm a coin person and I'm an art person. But I think you're right in this case, if we could do a nice -- and the pressure's going to be on Steve to make this work because if it doesn't work, we're all going to blame Steve.

But it's a loss of an opportunity to do a road and, if we weren't talking about a commemorate, if we were talking about something else, or a metal, I'd be on my soapbox right now. But I'm not doing that.

As to Bombay Hook, I guess my problem with the heron is, I mean, I have herons in my backyard in Turks and Caicos. And, you know, herons are all over the place, down the Bahamas chain and into the top of the Caribbean.

So, you know, I think there's nothing any more special about the heron than there is of the Canadian geese. And the reason why I want to do Number 5 -- and I really like the two geese flying and, if we could have the two geese flying without the landscape, I'd be passionately advocating for this.

But I will confess, the reason I want to go with the Canadian geese in '05 is because I think Canada needs a message that if they take our eagle, we're taking their geese.

Chairperson Marks: Donald, I'll make you a deal. If you support Number 5 to the fullest, you can make the motion and, if no one else will second it, I will and we'll recommend that the background --

Member Scarinci: Get rid of the landscape?

Chairperson Marks: Yes. Yes.

Member Scarinci: You've got the deal. I think it will make a really nice coin.

Chairperson Marks: I do, too.

Member Scarinci: I think it will make a really nice coin.

Member Ross: Don, how about a coin with your house in the Turks and Caicos on it?

Member Scarinci: Well, we can do the March meeting in Turks and Caicos if we can get the travel office to approve it. I'm sure even the visitors would like to come.

In Saratoga, I guess I show my passion for colonial coins and I have to say, I like Number 3. I think we will have opportunities to do a cannon, but what is important about Saratoga is the surrender. That is why it's important and really, everything else is apocrypha. I mean, you know,

it's all about the surrender.

So, I think when you go with the surrender, you know, the classic surrender -- a gentleman surrenders, surrendering his sword and walks away, you keep your sword. And that's what's happening here.

I like Number 3 because it's a historically accurate depiction instead of trace and bake. And I think we had our rebellion about the artists giving us trace and bake -- taking an image and just, you know, putting it on metal. We don't want that, so I think the Trumbull is great because it's Trumbull but, you know, I think we can do something more accurate, certainly, for one of these coins.

You know, I'm not particularly bothered by Surrender, but if there's a motion, there's a motion. I mean, surrender clearly means, since it's an American coin, we're not talking about us surrendering. We're talking about the British surrendering because it's on an American coin. But I can understand people not liking that word, Surrender, on a coin.

Mr. Antonucci: Maybe British Surrender"?

Member Scarinci: Yeah. "British Surrender makes it more clear.

Member Bugeja: They Surrender.

Member Scarinci: British Surrender because it was the surrender. If we're going to use a word, the word is surrender. It was surrender that got the French in the game.

Member Stevens-Sollman: British surrender.

Member Scarinci: The French. This surrender showed them we can possibly win and they wouldn't be losing with us. So in any event, I

would support Number 3 and that is my abbreviated commentary.

Chairperson Marks: In the light of the hour, we just consumed our lunch time, metaphorically.

(Laughter.)

Chairperson Marks: So I'm going to suggest that we've had a thorough discussion on this and that you fill out your scoring documents. Pass those in to Eric and we'll get those tallied.

But, before we move on, I wanted to ask the staff, is lunch in another room somewhere.

Okay. We need to be done by 2:30. So here's what I'm going to propose, and you can all tell me if you think this works. We had 40 minutes scheduled for lunch. If we come back here in half an hour, at 1:30, we can allot 45 minutes to the Kennedy half dollar subject, and then 15 minutes to the annual report.

If we do that, we'll be done at 2:30. We had an hour budgeted for the annual report. I don't think we need it, but kind of our cushion to save us on the day. So, if that works for everybody, be back here at 1:30. I want to encourage the members and the staff members to please be punctual because we are so short on time.

45 minutes is calling it close, I think, to talk about the half dollar. I'm not seeing any objections to my idea here, so we will stand in recess with the intent to begin the meeting again at 1:30. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 1:00 p.m. and went back on the record at 1:30 p.m.)

Discussion on a 2014 24K Gold Kennedy Half-Dollar special product

Chairperson Marks: Calling the meeting back to order. The next item on our agenda is our discussion on the anniversary version of the Kennedy half dollar. And Michael Bugeja has to depart us to catch an airplane flight. So even before the staff report, I want to get Michael's comments on the record so he can depart. So, Michael.

Member Bugeja: Thank you very much. I'll be very brief. I wanted to speak in favor of Design Number 2, where it says 1964 to 2014 rather than just have the date of 2014. One, it shows it's commemorative, but as any hobbyist would know, in 1964 we had the Liberty Dollar, the Peace Dollar was going to be reprised in 1964. It's an important year numismatically. That never happened in Denver, but I like this 1964-2014.

The other point I wanted to make was, I think we have an opportunity here for the artists in the Mint. I don't have the exact historical data, but because that Benjamin Franklin half dollar was a short series and was from 1948 to 1963, and the assassination happened late in '63.

So, what happened is they rushed the coin to production and the reverse, they put the presidential seal on it. And variations of the seal have been used since 1791, okay. You get the heraldic eagle, where you have a variation on it. You get the Barber Series quarter and half dollar. You get a variation on it.

When you go to the Mount Rushmore silver dollar, you actually have that seal inside another design. So, you have the motto E Pluribus Unum. That should be E Pluribus Duo because it's mentioned twice. So, I just think that reverse opens up an opportunity to put the weight of the gold or whatever you want to put on there.

But it seems a great artist opportunity to take a look at the reverse and come up with a design that will help not only celebrate 50 years of this coin, but the important presidency of JFK.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you, Michael. Excellent.

Member Bugeja: Thank you all very much.

Chairperson Marks: With that, I will recognize April for her report.

Ms. Stafford: To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Kennedy half dollar coin, the United States Mint is considering producing a 2014, 24 carat gold, .99995 proof Kennedy half dollar special product.

Regarding specifications, these 24 carat coins would be comparable to other 2014 Kennedy half dollar coins being struck for the special anniversary sets with the exception of the coin's gold content, weight and thickness.

If this concept is pursued, the United States Mint would seek Secretary of the Treasury approval to strike these proof coins under authority of 31 USC 5112 Section (i)(4)(c). Gilroy Roberts, a former Chief Engraver of the United States Mint, developed the original obverse design of the Kennedy half dollar coin in 1964.

After changes to the tooling and coining processes, the sculpt detail had to be enhanced in 1997 in order to maximize die life and increase productivity. Accordingly, the hair, cheekbones and facial expression were slightly enhanced.

This enhanced or optimized design is currently featured in all of our regular numismatic products, which include the United States Mint Proof Set, Silver Proof Set, Uncirculated Coin Set, the United States Mint Birth and Happy Birthday Sets

and rolls and bags.

It should be highlighted that, in 2014, this same enhanced or optimized design will still appear in these regular numismatic products. By employing state-of-the-art digital technology and working with the original 1964 sculpt and master tooling, the United States Mint will be able to restore the fidelity of detail found in the original Gilroy Roberts sculpt.

Beginning in 2015, the United States Mint intends that all half dollars minted will feature the original 1964 Gilroy Roberts sculpt. So today, we have some mockups of this 24 carat gold coin.

The first mockup shows the original 1964 Kennedy sculpt with the year 2014 featured on the obverse. The second shows the date range, 1964 through 2014, featured. And we'd also like to ask that the Committee comment on if the weight and fineness of the gold should be included as inscriptions and, if so, where they might be.

The Chairman has asked that we also bring to you the reverse of the Kennedy half, the current half, which we do have available to show in case the conversation goes towards perhaps looking at the reverse to highlight these inscriptions. So, that is it from me, Mr. Chairman.

Steve Antonucci also has some comments. I don't know if you'd like to go to them next?

Chairperson Marks: Yes. Please go ahead, Steve.

Ms. Stafford: Do you want to go ahead first?

Mr. Antonucci: No.

Chairperson Marks: Show the reverse.

Ms. Stafford: So the reverse, when we

get to the conversation about potentially, we can call that up. Okay. Steve?

Mr. Antonucci: So, we're going to talk about what we did on the Kennedy Half Dollar Program, where we started. This is our current design, which is the 2013 rolled into 2014. You can see the stark differences between the two.

What's on the left, obviously, is the '64 design. This is, obviously, Gilroy Roberts with the original plaster sculpt, which we were never able to find. We could never locate this. We looked high and low for this. So, whether it just walked out the door one day or ended up damaged or broken, we just don't know.

Member Jansen: It is in the Smithsonian Collection. I saw it.

Mr. Antonucci: That's interesting, because we had historians that are on site that --

Member Jansen: I take that back. I'm thinking the flowing hair Gilroy Roberts dollar coin.

Mr. Antonucci: That's different, yes.

Member Jansen: I stand corrected.

Mr. Antonucci: So, the only thing that we could actually find was a galvano of the original '64 sculpt. So, we took that galvano. And what's interesting to note, this is the actual original die from the '64 Kennedy half dollar. The interesting thing is, at the bottom, you can see this die was dated December 28, 1963. This was just a little over a month after his assassination.

So, our understanding is that the original sculpt for his presidential medal was used and it was expedited to get to this point.

Member Jansen: Is that the accented-hair version?

Mr. Antonucci: I'm sorry?

Member Jansen: Is that the accented-hair version?

Chairperson Marks: No, that's the original.

Mr. Antonucci: That is the original '64 sculpt.

Member Jansen: Okay.

Mr. Antonucci: And you can see, we've got the galvano next to the original '64 die. And you can see similarities. There are a lot of height-of-relief differences that are obviously very prevalent.

Here's where we scanned it and took the digital imprint of what was on the galvano. We matched the size to the die and moved it onto the die. And you can actually from the scan there's the date, 12/28/63, at the top of the die. It's actually an interesting piece of history.

So, one of the critical things was the '64 design, the basin design, was very different than what it is currently today. It's a spherical cross-section today. Back in '64 and probably up through the late 70's, it was more elliptical in cross-section. So, we went back to the original elliptical cross-section for the basin and that is the final design, '64 into 2014.

And what we're showing here are the heights of relief that we were shooting for. You can see into the fourth decimal place, we're right where we wanted to be. This goes right back to the '64 sculpt. So, we're getting all the fidelity out of the '64 sculpt that we possibly can.

Now, this animation, watch closely. Just watch Kennedy's face. You'll see it fade in. This is the new design and back to the old design. But look

at the difference in the sculpt. It's incredible.

Chairperson Marks: Steve.

Mr. Antonucci: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Only because this is going to be a premium product, if we do it, it might be fascinating to include a brief discussion of how you resurrected this design and ship it with the coin.

Member Olson: Similar to what you did with the UHR booklet?

Chairperson Marks: Yes. Yes.

Member Jansen: I know it would go a ton, in terms of the collecting community, to understand their --

Mr. Antonucci: Well, I think what will be interesting is when people see the date on that original coin, 12/28. That's going to blow people away.

Member Jansen: All this good stuff, you're feeding the beast if you're doing something like this.

Mr. Antonucci: And this is the gold version of the coin. Now, what I want to say is, we worked late last night to try to get this done. And we actually did trial strike the silver version of this coin and it looks beautiful.

Member Jansen: Want to show us?

Mr. Antonucci: No.

(Laughter.)

Member Jansen: Let me take you back to 1883. And most of the people in this room know the history and exactly where I'm going on this.

Chairperson Marks: Take us back there quickly.

Member Jansen: I'm going to take you back to 1883, when a nickel was published by the Mint with a V on the back, and bad guys promptly gold-plated them and put reeding on them and passed them as gold \$5 pieces. I want to make sure that we do something which makes it literally impossible for a bad guy to gold-plate.

And the date on the bottom of this with the dash too, that isn't good enough and the W mint mark isn't good enough.

Mr. Antonucci: So, what are we talking about here?

Member Olson: I think a bold inscription would help.

Member Jansen: Something to keep them from gold-plating a 2014 Kennedy half.

Member Olson: A bullion inscription on the reverse would help.

Member Scarinci: Eric, I'm not so sure that's a valid comparison, because, honestly, this coin is going to be, as a practical matter, most of them are going to find their way into slabs and it's degrading the service's authentication responsibility. It's not really ever going to circulate. It's never going to be used. It's a collector coin.

Member Olson: Fair point.

Member Scarinci: That's all it is.

Member Olson: Fair point.

Member Scarinci: Versus the situation in 1883, when they were gold, circulating coins.

Member Olson: Fair point.

Ms. Stafford: I think that's it from our side. Steve, thank you so much. I just wanted to note -- I know you're extremely busy in Philadelphia

with the work that's coming through your shop, but the fact that you took time to create this presentation for the Committee, we really appreciate it. Thank you.

Chairperson Marks: Outstanding presentation. Thank you. Okay. With that, we have 33 minutes to get through our comments on this, and I think that's totally doable. So I'm just going to launch into this quickly and then send this around the table.

A couple comments on the date, as a collector who focuses -- the thrust of my collection is half dollars. And when we talk about going back to the artist's original -- I know a lot of you will probably disagree with me on this, but I'm going to say it -- I don't like the dual date.

I can argue that the dual date on there represents 51 years, not 50. However, your retort would be there is not a 1975 dated half dollar. So there have actually been 50 dated issues from '64 until this year. So, I think if we want to go back to the original sculpt from Mr. Roberts, I think we honor that best by simply putting 2014 on the obverse, such as it is.

So then, if we go to the reverse, if we could look at that, we have the issue of this is a bullion coin or a 24 carat gold coin. I think it's extremely advisable we put an inscription on there noting the bullion weight and fineness.

Two suggestions there. I think if you look at the size of the font on In God We Trust on the obverse, that size of font would probably fit, I don't know, under the tail feathers there above the stars. Not sure, but if they don't, then I would say we need to do something with the font size of half-dollar and double-stack with the bullion inscription being a smaller font right in that space. I don't know how you should do it.

If we take Michael Bugeja's comment,

and if that's a serious possibility of something different on the reverse, I want to treat carefully on that. If we're trying to honor the half dollar, if there were something ready to go, something that the Mint had done for Kennedy in the past and you could draw from galvano or sculpts that exist, maybe that's a possibility.

And if that's such, then the whole bullion inscription could be totally different. I don't know. I think you might be able to get away with it, with a different reverse, because it's a special gold issue 50th anniversary thing.

So with that -- and I'll say this. As a half dollar collector and, if you want to produce this as a gold coin, absolutely, I think you need to increase the thickness of it so it is truly 1 ounce. I would not do fractional ounce coin. I think that would not be your best course of action. I would look for a planchet that will allow you to go to the full ounce.

So with that, Heidi, your comments, please.

Member Wastweet: I'm going to defer to the collectors.

Chairperson Marks: Michael

Member Scarinci: I can be the counterpoint, if you want.

Chairperson Marks: I'll wait with baited breath. I'm going to have Michael go and then give me the counterpoint.

Member Olson: You know this set has been collected for 50 years. Some folks, you read in the coin paper -- some people remember going to the bank to stand in line to get their first Kennedy half dollar and they only got two of them, because they were in such short supply.

Others picked it up over the course, but

the fact is this set has been around for 50 years. It's a relatively inexpensive set. The most expensive coin would be the '98 S Matte proof and that's under a couple hundred bucks.

The rest of them you can pick up for 50 cents at the bank. Nothing is going to cost you more than five or ten bucks. With that being said, I am in full agreement. This coin needs to be made. However, that has a couple of provisos.

I think it would be a mistake to make this coin in an exact size and thickness of a Kennedy half dollar, because some folks aren't going to be able to spend \$1,200 to complete their set. And, so, my view, which ties in with what Michael Bugeja has said and some others, it needs to be distinct in a way.

From a production standpoint, I'm not sure how expensive it would be to order special planchets that aren't product right now in that size that are less than an ounce. So, that would be one point in the favor of going to the full ounce.

The other would be marketability of the finished product. If you've got an ounce, people around the world, and he was certainly revered around the world for his accomplishments, they're going to understand 1 ounce. Okay. Here's what I'm paying for this coin.

So, it needs to look different. So, a reasonable collector, the guy who's saved up every penny and he's got a full set right now, we don't want to blow his chance, after 50 years. Now he doesn't have a full set. We need to make it so a reasonable person could make the conclusion that this coin can either be part of the set or not part of the set.

The more it differs from the original half dollar size and design, the better the case could be, because I think the Mint is going to get a lot of blow back if, all of a sudden, you can buy two complete

sets of Kennedy half dollars for what this one is going to sell for. And, if it looks too much like the rest of the coins, there's going to be a public outcry that now they don't have a full set.

Towards that end, I do favor the dual date, the dual date, possibly a designation of the fineness on the reverse, as has been discussed. One thing, I've made this comment a couple times in the run up to this meeting today in other meetings, the mintmark, in my view, if we're commemorating the 50th anniversary of this coin, the only place that mintmark should be is on the reverse, as it was in 1964.

The only year that the Denver mintmark was on the reverse or any mintmark for that matter, 1964. And that wouldn't cost any more to do that, would it?

Mr. Antonucci: No.

Member Olson: Is there any reason why that couldn't be done?

Mr. Antonucci: No.

Member Olson: And it would clean up the front, the obverse as well. In '64, the Philadelphia Mint did not have a mintmark, so you would be removing one element from this design to possibly clean it up.

It's maybe not to the point of the gold, but this coin has been produced and clad 40 percent and 90 percent silver. When you're looking at those other sets, that might be some things to look at, because whatever you make, you're going to sell a lot of, not only on the high end, but on the low end.

That's pretty much what I've got. Gary?

Chairperson Marks: Are you done?

Member Olson: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you, Michael. Donald?

Member Scarinci: Well, you've got me thinking about size. First of all, I definitely think I agree. It's amazing. I agree with Mike. It should be 1964-2014. So, now you know you got the right answer.

(Laughter.)

Chairperson Marks: That's a rarity.

Member Scarinci: If he and I agree, it's right.

Chairperson Marks: It's a rarity.

Member Scarinci: So, I do think it should be '64 to 2014, because that's the whole point of the coin. You know? I think it's not to strike a 2014 coin, it's to strike this coin. So, I like that idea.

I also like the idea of putting the W mintmark where it's supposed to be. You know, where I'm kind of vacillating is on the size of the coin. And you make a very good point that I hadn't considered, Mike. If we strike this in gold into the exact size of the rest of the series, a complete set includes it.

On the other hand, you know, just because it's an ounce, the completist is going to say, I've got to have that, too. So, you know, the completist is going to include this coin regardless of how much it weighs.

So, where I'm vacillating is, if there is a way to make it affordable, if this were the same size as the half dollar with less gold in it, it'll make it a little bit cheaper. I also don't know that it has to be 99.999 gold. I don't know what difference in price that makes.

But, you know, I would err on the side of

making it less expensive and probably err on the side of making it compatible in size with the half dollar, just because I don't know that it's going to matter. If it's an ounce, the completist is going to buy it and they're not going to feel that their collection is complete if they don't buy it.

Mr. Antonucci: I did some rough math this morning. At a 1-ounce size in gold, we're looking at roughly 120 thousandths in edge thickness, just about an eighth of an inch. If you come down smaller, it's going to get considerably thinner very quickly. I don't know what other issues that's going to cause for us.

Member Scarinci: It will cause striking issues.

Mr. Antonucci: Yes, exactly. We're going to have fill issues all over the place.

Member Scarinci: Right. Right.

Member Wastweet: You want to keep the depth.

Member Scarinci: You may have no choice. And the argument that they make about having as a 1 ounce gives it international appeal. So, you create another market for it as well as Americans.

Mr. Antonucci: Now, do you do a 1 ounce, but you do, like your UHR? Do you do it smaller in diameter and thicker? We could do that. I mean, currently, we're looking at gold planchets for this project just an R&D phase, about a thousand planchets. So, we haven't started that process yet.

So, if the decision is to go smaller in diameter, that way you can't gold plate anything, that takes away Eric's concern anyway. So, now, it's a different size coin.

Member Olson: When it's a different size, in my view, it ceases to become Kennedy half dollar.

Mr. Antonucci: Okay.

Member Scarinci: Agreed.

Member Olson: Which is a good thing to avoid. Like I said, this is going to cost as much as two complete sets of all the rest of them.

Chairperson Marks: I will respectfully disagree. It's still going to be a half dollar. Then it's going to be an oddball. So, if you're going to do a half dollar, please, I mean we changed the size of the half dollar once in its life, in the 1800s. It was about 1836 or '37.

Member Olson: It's bothered me ever since.

Chairperson Marks: Yes.

(Laughter.)

Member Olson: I'm finally getting over it. Please don't change it again.

Chairperson Marks: Are you done?

Member Scarinci: What I like especially about this, above all, is, it's just another step towards the demarketization of American coins.

Member Jansen: What do you mean by that?

Chairperson Marks: I'm going to pass right on by that.

Member Uram: And I won't call it either. And we're going to do the non-circulating silver as well, the silver is normal and it'll be dated 2014, that's the intent?

Chairperson Marks: I am not sure.

April?

Ms. Stafford: I apologize. I was --

Mr. Antonucci: The silver version of this. Is it going to be 2014 or 1964 2014?

Ms. Stafford: We have our sales and marketing representatives here. My understanding is that all of these considerations are still being looked at and there hasn't been anything definitive.

Chairperson Marks: I will interject here quickly. I would hope that, regardless of this, that you still produce the silver version of the Kennedy half dollar, especially for those folks who want to keep a complete set, but can't afford gold. Please give them a 2014 date.

Member Uram: That's what I was going to say. I think that's really what addresses the concern.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chairperson Marks: It will be a redo of the 2009 Silver Eagle issue, if you don't.

Ms. Stafford: Not a dual date?

Member Uram: No.

Chairperson Marks: Yes, the proof '09 Silver Eagle that doesn't exist, don't do that again.

Member Uram: Yes. The plain '14 normal would be ideal, because then that fills the book, fills what you need to do. And then the gold stays separate from itself.

Mr. Antonucci: So plan the silver to say 2014?

Member Uram: Right.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I agree. Gold is the 50th anniversary.

Member Scarinci: Really, the only one that should have the dual date, maybe, is this one.

Chairperson Marks: Yes, I agree. I agree. Tom?

Member Uram: That's what I said. That's it.

Chairperson Marks: Robert?

Member Hoge: My first question is is this really intended to be a half dollar? Are we calling it a bullion half dollar?

Chairperson Marks: It's denominated a half dollar, correct?

Member Hoge: Is it going to be denominated as a half dollar, since this is on the reverse?

Mr. Antonucci: That's a good question. I would think for the gold we'd take that off and put ".9999 Fine Gold" or something like that.

Chairperson Marks: Then it becomes a medal.

Member Uram: You have to give it something else.

Member Hoge: It could be a medal though with the coin design.

Chairperson Marks: Don't honor the half dollar and not call it a half dollar, please.

Member Hoge: Why not?

Chairperson Marks: My collector sensibilities are being offended really quick. Don't do that. There are thousands of me out there.

Member Hoge: It offends me to call it a half dollar, when it's a big, you know, bullion gold piece.

Member Jansen: I'm highly disturbed by a 5 ounce silver platter that says 25 cents, myself.

(Laughter.)

Member Hoge: That's my question. But I think the fact that we're going back to the original artwork on this is wonderful, because this was a special coin and with the great haste with which this thing was made. Gilroy Roberts works at extreme speed and, in order to make sure it was accurate, he took his original design to Jackie Kennedy and said, does this look like your husband.

And, you know, she said, well, you need to change this a little bit with the hair and so on and so on, which he did. And, so, this is a wonderful kind of enhancement to the entire series.

I like the idea of going with the diameter of a half dollar. And I think that is sufficient to tie it to the set as a half dollar-type piece. I don't like seeing half dollar written on it, because it could become a piedfort Kennedy half dollar, the extra thick blank in order to give it an ounce of gold. I don't know how much thicker it has to be. You say it's an eighth of an inch if it has an ounce of gold?

Mr. Antonucci: Just about an eighth of an inch. Yeah.

Member Hoge: I don't see the problem with that.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Antonucci: I don't even think three quarters of an ounce would be enough. I don't know. I'd have to do the math on that.

Member Hoge: I think an ounce of gold is very conservative.

Mr. Antonucci: I'm very concerned about the thinness of that. The issue is that the relief on that obverse is very different than what it currently

is. And we need to metal to fill that up. You start thinning out that blank, you've got troubles.

Member Hoge: I think going with an ounce might be a good solution to give it that elliptical sort of effect. I also had a question. Have you checked with the Gilroy Roberts Collection to see if there is any original Kennedy material in there?

Mr. Antonucci: Well, the folks that are on site in Philadelphia that are doing all the archiving, they've reached out somehow or other. We know, for all of our archives, we don't have it. We just don't have it. And, if you saw from the picture, it's a gigantic sculpt. We don't have many plasters that are that big.

Member Hoge: That's big.

Mr. Antonucci: It's about 14 to 16 inches.

Member Hoge: Good to go in Robert's collection, which is very extensive. I'm not sure where it is today. It just recently changed hands and was appraised. It used to be at the A&A on loan.

Mr. Antonucci: Really?

Member Hoge: Yes.

Member Scarinci: The A&A would know if that was included, though, in the collection. No?

Mr. Antonucci: There's now a Gilroy Roberts collection in Philadelphia, but it's not there. Somebody went and looked to see if we could find it.

Chairperson Marks: Are you done?

Member Hoge: Yes, I 'm done.

Chairperson Marks: Michael Moran, are

you on the phone?

Member Moran: Yes, I am.

Chairperson Marks: Would you like to make comments on this?

Member Moran: I'm sort of listening to it all. I'm a purist. I like the 2014 date. I like the mintmark on the reverse. I think it doesn't bother me that it says half dollar. You're probably going to have to put the fineness and the weight somewhere, but I'd put it on the edge. I sure wouldn't put it on the design of the coin.

Mr. Antonucci: It's a reeded edge. You can't do that.

Member Moran: I don't know that I have anything more to add to it. I think it's going to sell and it's going to sell well, regardless of how you do it.

But I think that it's important, having looked at some of the issues the Mint had with those gold strikings recently, that you make sure you get enough metal on it, which argues go with the troy ounce rather than something less than that, so that you have the metal to work with to bring that relief up.

Chairperson Marks: Thank you, Michael. Michael Ross, do you have any comments on this?

Member Ross: No.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Okay. Jeanne?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I'm just going to agree with some of the comments that have been made. I like the double date on this particular piece, because it does give it a sense of history, of what this commemorative is about. And I think, if we do put the fineness on the reverse, that would satisfy the gold.

What's been said about the thickness is important. I do think we need to go with a full ounce of gold. It seems silly to have a piece that's a partial ounce. It just seems like we could then have Kennedy bullion.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Eric?

Member Jansen: Has the bullion department weighed in at all, in terms of if this is a 1 ounce, just for a proposition, will it impact bullion sales otherwise, or is this an incremental product to the immense bullion sales assumptions?

Mr. Szczerban: It's not a bullion coin. It's a numismatic coin and it will be priced as a numismatic product. So, there will be a premium on it that will far exceed the underlying bullion content. I think the only issue that I see with it is the relative face value of our other gold coins vis-a-vis this.

Our American Buffalo 24-karat has a face value of \$100. American Eagle, which is 22-karat, is \$50. We've got a First Spouse, which is \$25 face value, that's a half ounce of gold. And that's going to be a full ounce of gold with a 50-cent face value?

Member Jansen: I think that's a technical question. I think it's a technical question that probably the Secretary of Treasury cares about, but the bullion market won't.

Mr. Szczerban: It's being marketed to the numismatic audience directly.

Member Jansen: So, then, that begs the question will it float price-wise with the repricing of bullion coins?

Mr. Szczerban: Bullion coins are priced daily, sold direct to authorized purchasers and that price changes daily. The U.S. Mint's numismatic gold products are priced weekly with the fluctuation of the price of gold.

Member Jansen: Against bracketing. So, will this move with the bracketing model?

Mr. Szczerban: Absolutely.

Member Jansen: Okay. I think this has to be the diameter of a Kennedy half. I mean, if the planchet has to be thicker, my quick math says it's 25 percent thicker, maybe 26 percent thicker. Okay? Is the reeding edge an absolute dogmatic given?

Mr. Antonucci: Oh, I think it's legislated.

Member Jansen: Is it legislated? Because I think it would be. I recall the technicalities of edge lettering and Schuler and waves and all kinds of disasters, which will only get 100 fold worse on gold. But I think it would be absolutely brilliant.

Mr. Antonucci: We did the ultra-high relief, which was done in West Point, with split --

Member Jansen: Triple power split coin?

Mr. Antonucci: Yes.

Member Jansen: I think it would be brilliant to perimeterize this "Ask Not What But". I think it would be brilliant.

Mr. Antonucci: That would be awesome.

Member Jansen: I think it would be brilliant in terms of the marketing. I think it would be brilliant in terms of the spirit that this contributes to American society. I think it would be brilliant in memory of the man.

Mr. Antonucci: I may have misspoke on the pricing of this product. If we adopt this limited window opportunity, the price may be fixed for this limited window. And so --

Member Jansen: Be careful you don't

put yourself in an arbitrage position where the market starts buying this versus other gold coins, because they get the same gold for a lower price.

Mr. Antonucci: Right and depending on the packaging, if we have to order more packaging and it's from overseas, the delivery of the product will be much later. What happens when the price changes between the time a person ordered it and when it was shipped?

Member Jansen: That's almost a Mint business decision. I'm not sure that's the purview of this Committee. But I would just argue, you've got to be really careful about the market arbitraging this coin, if it's priced to a different strategy.

Member Olson: I think you need to take a look at the UHR as the model for this. You sold 100,000 of those. I submit you're probably going to sell the same amount of these, if it's done well and if it's done right.

Mr. Szczerban: If it's a non-window, but just open ordering --

Member Olson: Right.

Mr. Szczerban: -- then it would change weekly with the gold price.

Member Olson: As I recall, the UHR went on sale a limit of one per household per specified amount of time and then you opened it up.

Mr. Szczerban: Right.

Member Olson: You know, what I don't want to see and I can tell you there's a lot of other people that don't want to see this either, is some way that a large dealer could get a bunch of these while everybody else is waiting to get theirs and we're watching them show up on TV.

Member Jansen: A major disaster.

Member Olson: That's the long answer.

Member Jansen: Major disaster. I agree with moving the W to the back side, to the reverse. Let's see here. I think it's really important that this isn't sold in a way that makes another piece of the Kennedy Collection unobtainable unless you buy it alongside this thing.

I'm looking back to the time we did, what, a special Jefferson nickel alongside a Kennedy half. And you get these oddball hard to find versions of an otherwise collectible set, unless you bought this super premium thing.

And, in one respect, I'd love to do that, because I think scarcity creates demand and demand creates collectors and collectors expands our market. But that's not our mission as a government agency to create scarcity.

So, one side of me says, God, wouldn't that be beautiful. But, on the other side, I think we have to respect our common-man mission here and be really, really thoughtful and careful in both defining the commemorative Kennedy set and then this gold item.

And, if you want to overlap them, just make sure there aren't any impossible-to-get coins in the overlap, because I think an overlap could be an interesting way of doing it, just so there aren't any non-obtainium kind of coins that go out with the gold coin.

Let's see. Oh, can you go to a reverse image here, because, you know, there was some discussion about laying the fineness and so forth underneath the tail, below the olive branch and below the arrows.

What if the portion of this sculpt inside the stars is shrunk say to 95 percent and lifted, in order to create a room around the interior perimeter of the stars at the bottom, above half dollar, to

make room for the 999 -- is it four nines?

Mr. Antonucci: It's four nines. Would anyone be opposed to putting it on the edge? If we're going an inscription on the edge, put it on the edge.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Oh, yes. I would think that would be great.

Mr. Antonucci: It's not going to be readable, but --

Member Olson: Oh, is this not?

Mr. Antonucci: Well, we were just discussing that.

Ms. Stafford: It hasn't been determined whether it's been reeded or not. Initially, we were looking at reeded, since the original half dollar is. But, if it's not required and it's on the table, I was actually going to ask the follow-up question. You were suggesting the quote, but the fineness and weight could be a consideration for there as well.

Member Jansen: There might not be room for it. Ask me not about what you can do is a lot of vowels and consonants.

Mr. Antonucci: I don't think it works with the --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Jansen: I put that out there as a method of not violating the design, per se, but making a really definitive designation of fineness and so forth right on the reverse.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I think you could still put it on there.

Member Jansen: I think we don't have definition on the sets. We don't have a call on the bullion sales. Oh, there was one more thing,

international. Will it affect the international market, if this is not 1 ounce? I think the answer is yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay, guys. We've got 20 minutes to bring this thing home. I hope these comments were useful to all of you. I know we aren't all on the same page about everything, but I think there's a general direction.

Ms. Stafford: Absolutely. I've been looking at our sales and marketing colleagues and getting lots from them.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. We may have to dispense with the annual report today. I wanted to look at the results of the America the Beautiful quarters and I'm pretty sure we're going to have some motions after this. So, with the 20 minutes we have left, I that's how we might need to use the time.

So, if you're all prepared, of the five quarters, we have recommendations for four. So, let's go through it.

On Homestead, Design Number 1 received one point. Design Number 2 received 19 and that would be our recommended design. Number 3 had 12. Number 4 had two. Zeroes for 5 and 6. Seven had three points. Eight had four. Zeroes for the balance of that quarter.

Kisatchie, Design Number 1 had 11. Design Number 2 had four. Design Number 3 had eight. Design Number 4 had 14. Five had three. Design 6 had three. Design 7 has 21 and is our recommended design. Eight had zero. Just for the record, with a full complement of the Committee participating, the threshold vote for our approval is 17 votes. We have to exceed 17 to decide Committee Rule.

Member Jansen: Seventeen or more.

Chairperson Marks: Seventeen or more

by our Committee Rule to gain our recommendation.

Moving on to Blue Ridge Parkway, Design Number 1 had eight. Two had zero. There is no 3 and 4. Design 5 had 27 and is our recommended design. Six had zero. And 7 and 8 both had two apiece.

Bombay Hook Design Number 1 had 20 and, this is a close call, but right now, that would be our recommended design. Two had three points. Three had zero. Four had seven and here's the close call. Five has 19. So, we have one point separating 1 and 5. With no further action by the Committee, Number 1 would be our recommended choice. We have 6 and 7 both with zero and Design Number 8 received 13.

Saratoga, we didn't get to threshold for this one, folks. Design Number 1 has nine. Design Number 2 has two. Design Number 3 has 14, which is the highest design to receive the highest point total for designs for this quarter. Four and five both had a point apiece. Design 6 had zero. Design 7 had seven. Design 8 has eight. Design 9 has 11 and 10 received zero.

So, with that, let's see if we can work through this methodically. There was discussion about Homestead and I'm angling towards motions here folks. Discussion on Homestead Number 2 that, if we recommended that one, we wanted to perhaps consider a motion that would ask for the removal of the stars and the insertion, where appropriate from the judgment of art staff, the words "Free Land".

Member Ross: I'll make that motion.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. That motion has been made. Is there a second?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I'll second it.

Chairperson Marks: Is there discussion? All those in favor, please raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. And Michael?

Member Moran: Aye on the phone.

Chairperson Marks: Eight. And all those opposed?

Member Scarinci: I'm not opposed, but I'm going to abstain, because I don't want to piss off the Indians.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Opposed anyone? So, we have seven with one abstention.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chairperson Marks: Eight with two abstentions.

Mr. Weinman: You have to abstain from every site coin for the remainder of your term.

Member Scarinci: I know.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Moving on, Kisatchie.

Member Jansen: Hang on a second. Mike is not with us.

Chairperson Marks: Yeah. So, we should have a total of ten. That's eight, five, two abstentions.

Ms. Stafford: So, that recommendation included the stars as well as the --

Chairperson Marks: Eliminates stars and, in the judgment of art staff, place the words "Free Land".

Ms. Stafford: Okay.

Chairperson Marks: Moving on to Kisatchie. Design Number 7 is our recommended

design. There was some talk about the background trees. I personally brought that up. I won't make a motion, unless there's someone that wants to go ahead with that.

Member Olson: I will.

Chairperson Marks: What would you like to say?

Member Olson: Just clean up the background and make the bird more prominent.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Keep the bird. More contrast with bird and the background.

Member Olson: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Everyone understand the motion?

Member Jansen: No.

Chairperson Marks: I'm seconding it or did someone already second it?

Member Jansen: I don't have a first yet.

Chairperson Marks: No. Mike Olson did.

Member Olson: We're going to remove some of the trees or whatever. Make the bird in the foreground more prominent.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Everyone understands? All those in favor, please raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Michael Moran?

Member Moran: Eight.

Chairperson Marks: Eight. Opposed?

Member Scarinci: Abstain.

Chairperson Marks: Abstain. Okay. Mike Olson, did you vote?

Member Olson: Yes, I did. I vote to go with it.

Chairperson Marks: I have eight and one abstention, who am I missing? Okay. The Motion carries. How would you like record yourself?

Member Wastweet: I just want to understand the Motion. By prominent, you mean just --

Member Olson: No, not changing the bird, just making it appear more prominent.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Stevens-Sollman: Wait a minute. Are you saying to remove the trees, when you say clean up the background?

Chairperson Marks: No.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Olson: Keeping two or three sets is what Gary said.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Because I think we need the trees.

Member Olson: Yes, trim the trees.

Member Stevens-Sollman: All right.

Member Uram: This is Kisatchie, right?

Member Olson: Yes. Contrast between bird and trees in the background.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. That is nine ayes and one abstention. Thank you very much.

Going on to Blue Ridge Parkway, which Design Number 5 received 27. Are there any motions concerning that design?

Moving on to Bombay Hook, our

recommended design in Number 1 with 20. Are there motions?

Member Scarinci: Would it make a difference to people if Design 5 eliminated the landscape and just had the birds?

Chairperson Marks: I would suggest you make a motion, Donald, if that's what you want to do. Make a motion that that be our recommended design provided that the horizon line is removed.

Member Scarinci: Okay.

Chairperson Marks: Or no, we can't do it like that. We're going to recommend Design Number 5 and recommend removal of the horizon.

Member Scarinci: Recommend Design Number 5 with the removal of the horizon.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. That's your motion.

Member Olson: Okay. I will second that motion.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Now, I want everyone to understand this motion. We will override the vote, which is fine, override the vote from Number 1 to Number 5 and we're going to go from the heron to the geese.

Member Scarinci: Right.

Chairperson Marks: That's the motion. Does everyone understand? Okay. Any discussion?

Member Stevens-Sollman: So, if you do not vote for this, then you don't override the heron?

Chairperson Marks: If you vote no on this, then you're in effect supporting, sustaining our original indication of Number 1. Okay?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay.

Chairperson Marks: Does everyone understand?

Member Jansen: I got you on the second.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. So, all those in favor --

Member Jansen: State you're recommending Design Number 5 be modified with what?

Chairperson Marks: Five with removal of the background horizon line. I want to clarify, Don.

Member Scarinci: So that all you're going to have are the birds.

Chairperson Marks: So, none of the foliage?

Member Scarinci: None of it.

Chairperson Marks: None of it?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Oh, no.

Chairperson Marks: I'll think you'll lose this if you do that.

Member Stevens-Sollman: You lose the swamp.

Member Scarinci: You want to keep the swamp?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I want to keep the swamp. Maybe not all of the swamp.

Chairperson Marks: Just the horizon line.

Member Scarinci: Okay, the horizon line.

Chairperson Marks: That'll clean up the birds.

Member Scarinci: It will clean up the birds, which is all we're going to do is accentuate the birds.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. I want to make sure we all understand now. There's going to be a swamp, but the birds will be isolated.

Member Scarinci: Swamp and isolated birds.

Chairperson Marks: Okay.

Member Scarinci: And a guy with a shotgun hiding in the swamp.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. I think we all are on board and understand that.

Member Wastweet: Can I make one comment?

Member Uram: I have a comment also. Go ahead.

Member Wastweet: I'm in favor of the least amount of design-by-Committee possible. That's my comment.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Tom?

Member Uram: My comments are more or less along the lines of I'd rather stay with the blue heron simply because I just think there's too many Canadian geese and I think it more defines this the actual records. I think it much more defines it.

Member Ross: I think it's true. This could be any New Jersey lawn where they get the goose.

Member Uram: Or golf course.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Or golf course.

Chairperson Marks: All those in favor, please raise your hand. One, two, three, four, myself, Michael Moran?

Member Moran: I'm in favor.

Chairperson Marks: Five. All those opposed? Four, five. We have a tie vote, which means the vote does not carry. So, we are back to Design Number 1 as our recommended.

Member Scarinci: How about a motion on Design Number 1 and see if we can create a compromise.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Go for it.

Member Scarinci: The fish is going to look like a bug on a quarter. It's going to be a microscopic thing. Could we remove the fish?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Member Scarinci: So, my motion would be to support Number 1 with the removal of the fish.

Member Uram: And, Don, could you say thinning it up a little bit? He's a little chubby.

Chairperson Marks: Already recommended by virtue of a vote. All you want to do is recommend removal of the fish. Okay.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chairperson Marks: Is there a second on the motion to remove the fish?

Member Uram: Second.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. So, Tom seconds that motion. We all understand the motion is to remove the fish. Everything else remains the same.

Member Scarinci: Correct.

Member Uram: Except the neck. I think we discussed the neck thing.

Member Stevens-Sollman: The neck thing has to be changed.

Member Hoge: What about the horizon, too?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Leave that.

Chairperson Marks: The motion is seconded motion and it's on the table and it's to remove the fish and only remove the fish. Do you have comments? All those in favor, raise your hand. One, two, three, Mike Moran?

Member Moran: I'm not in favor.

Chairperson Marks: All those opposed? Three, four, five.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chairperson Marks: We have three in favor and six opposed, one abstention.

Member Jansen: Was Mike Moran part of the nays?

Chairperson Marks: Yes.

Member Scarinci: How about we remove the horizon? How about that?

Member Olson: Keep the grass.

Member Scarinci: Could we keep the grass and remove the horizon?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chairperson Marks: Don has the floor.

Member Scarinci: Have we previously agreed to fix his neck?

Member Stevens-Sollman: No, not yet.

Member Scarinci: We're going to leave it as a fat bird or are we going to do that separately?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I think we need to fix the neck.

Member Scarinci: Okay. I think we need to fix the neck, too. I'm going to support that motion, too, but for now let's see if there's any support to remove the horizon line.

Chairperson Marks: Seconded.

Member Jansen: Second. Okay. What's my motion?

Chairperson Marks: The motion is to remove the horizon on Design Number 1 of the blue heron.

Member Jansen: Okay. I'm going to recommend that you add to your motion to address the --

Member Stevens-Sollman: No.

Member Jansen: Never mind. I was confused.

Member Stevens-Sollman: You were confused.

Chairperson Marks: The motion is the horizon.

Member Jansen: This is Design Number 1?

Chairperson Marks: Yes. Okay. Everyone understands the motion? All those in favor, please raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five. Mike Moran?

Member Moran: Six.

Chairperson Marks: Six. Opposed? One, two, three, four. Motion passes six to four. Anything else, Donald?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I need to make a comment on this and maybe I should have said this before we voted. But, when you remove that horizon line, which really isn't involving the bird at all, you take away the swamp, you take away that flatness. And I don't think that little tiny bit is such a problem as it is in like 06.

Chairperson Marks: I understand that, Jeanne, but the motion has passed.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I understand.

Chairperson Marks: We need to move on. Is there another motion?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I move to reconsider.

Chairperson Marks: See could move to reconsider, but I didn't hear that. Is there another motion?

Member Stevens-Sollman: I move to reconsider the last motion.

Chairperson Marks: Okay.

Member Olson: I second.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Let's vote on this again. So, it's moved and seconded to reconsider the vote we just took. So, all those in favor --

Member Uram: Okay. Just a comment. Jeanne, if we got rid of just this upper part, the top line --

Member Stevens-Sollman: I don't think you need to. I really think it's too much of an intrusion on what this artist has portrayed as a

swampland. We have too much swamp in 2. We have too much swamp in 6 and in 3.

Chairperson Marks: Folks, the motion's on the table, already seconded. We're not going to change it now unless there's a motion to amend.

Member Stevens-Sollman: No. Call for the question.

Chairperson Marks: I'm trying to get there. So, I want to make sure everyone understands how we are voting here. If you vote yes on this motion, you're voting to defeat what we just did. Okay? You're voting to undo. A yes vote is to undo. Okay?

So, all those in favor of reconsidering our motion to remove the horizon line, please raise your hand. One, two, three, four. All those opposed to the motion, raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five. Mike Moran?

Member Moran: Oppose.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Motion fails four to six. So, the original motion stands.

Okay. The record will show that that was a close vote. Okay? So, that says something for the opposition. Thank you.

Member Scarinci: Let's do your motion about cleaning up the bird.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Oh, I'd just move to have that bird's neck more articulated.

Member Moran: Gary, can you hear me?

Chairperson Marks: Yes, Michael.

Member Moran: We've reached a point of diminishing returns. I move we adjourn.

Chairperson Marks: Well.

Mr. Weinman: I second it.

(Laughter.)

Chairperson Marks: We have one more thing to consider and then we can get out of here in just a few minutes. So, with that, do we want a quick motion to clean up that neck of the bird or something?

Member Scarinci: I think Jeanne wants to do that.

Chairperson Marks: Let's do that and move on, because we're almost done.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I know. I know. Just making the bird's neck a little more articulated to represent --

Member Jansen: Does that need to be a motion or just instructions to the artist?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yeah, it's true.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. It's a comment. The comment is that we look at that neck and make it more -- what's that?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Articulate it more.

Chairperson Marks: Articulate it more.

Mr. Everhart: I will relay the message.

Member Jansen: Make it a little bit more "egretious."

Mr. Everhart: Could you please define that for me?

Member Jansen: As in, an egret.

Chairperson Marks: One more issue to address. We don't have a recommendation for

Saratoga. Do we want to let that stand? If we just let this stand, the letter I send to the Secretary will reflect that the design receiving the most votes was Number 3, but it failed to get the Committee's recommendation by Committee Rule. Is that how you'd like it to stand?

Member Jansen: I would say we might want to consider giving some rationale to that. Otherwise, it's going to appear as a no recommendation and the CFAs will carry the day.

Chairperson Marks: Well, it is a no recommendation.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Is it possible that we revisit that vote?

Chairperson Marks: Can we rally around 3?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Can we discuss 9 and 3, since they were the closest?

Chairperson Marks: Well, I would suggest for time's sake, because 14 was the highest, not by one vote but by three, if you wanted to entertain a motion to recommend Number 3, which in effect would be suspending our rule, you could certainly do that.

Member Ross: I make a motion we recommend Number 3.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I would second that motion. I second that.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. I will make a comment on behalf of the staff. They would love us if we did this and we could move on.

Member Olson: Now, there were some changes that were recommended for this and there's no way I'm voting to even recommend this, unless part of that motion includes removing or modifying the word "Surrender".

Member Jansen: I would concur.

Chairperson Marks: Would the motion maker consider a change in that word?

Member Ross: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: To what, "Victory" or --

Member Hoge: Put "British Surrender".

Chairperson Marks: "British Surrender".

Member Ross: "British Surrender".

Member Moran: How about "Triumph"?

Chairperson Marks: The motion maker says "British Surrender".

Member Ross: I'm going with "British Surrender".

Chairperson Marks: Is the second agreed?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. So, the motion on the table is to recommend Design Number 3 and, also, recommend a change in the inscription to "British Surrender 1777".

Member Hoge: Can we amend this also to include verify the sword? That's something that I would like to see, just to be sure.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. I would suggest that we just let that stand on the record. I'm not sure we need a motion for that. But I'm sure the staff will follow up, because they want it to be accurate, too. I don't think we need to make a motion on that.

So, the motion is to --

Member Jansen: Augment "Surrender" with "British Surrender".

Chairperson Marks: Yes. "British Surrender" with a recommendation for Design Number 3. All those in favor, please raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Michael Moran?

Member Moran: Nine.

Chairperson Marks: Nine and, Tom Uram is not in the room. So, motion carries nine to zero. And we have completed that part of our agenda.

Discussion of the 2013 and 2014 Annual Reports

The only thing left, how's everyone on time? I've provided to you copies of the fiscal 2013 annual report. I provided to you the recommendations section. There's a couple sections that we usually put on the back here that record the dates that we met and the subjects we addressed and, then, little bios on each of us. I didn't think I needed that for this meeting.

I'm looking for your approval of the fiscal '13 annual report. We've discussed this several times at several other meetings. There's nothing new in this document that you haven't already seen. But we do need the formal vote to approve, so we can send it on to Treasury for their review.

So, is there a motion to --

Member Scarinci: I so move.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. Moved by Robert.

Member Scarinci: Second.

Chairperson Marks: Seconded by Donald to approve the fiscal '13 annual report. All those in favor, raise your hand. That looks like a unanimous vote. Michael Moran?

Member Moran: Unanimous.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. It's 10 to 0 to approve the fiscal '13 annual report. I had wanted to talk about the 2019 Commemorative. There's one space open and Mike Olson has what I think is a very obvious choice that we almost have to do. And, if we want to debate it, I'm going to defer this to the next meeting. If this is a slam dunk, I'd like to do it here. Michael, you want to say what you think it should be?

Member Olson: Very appropriate, Gary, that you said there is a space, because there's really, in my view, only one choice, the commemoration of the moon landing.

Chairperson Marks: 50th year.

Member Olson: The greatest achievement in humankind and it's also an American achievement and it deserves commemoration. It's hard to believe. I think just about everybody in this room was sitting in front of a black and white TV when they landed.

Chairperson Marks: Do we have a consensus on that or do we want to talk about it? If we want to talk about it, I want to take it to another meeting.

Member Olson: No, it's enough.

Member Hoge: It's a no brainer. We vote for a consensus.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. There's a motion from Mike Olson, seconded by me, to recommend the 50th anniversary of the moon landing, Apollo 11, for 2019. All those in favor? Mike Moran?

Member Moran: Aye.

Chairperson Marks: Okay. That's a unanimous vote, 10 to 0.

Member Scarinci: Did we ever approve the firefighters?

Chairperson Marks: Firefighters was approved at the last meeting by a motion from Jeanne. Okay. We have concluded our agenda for today. I want to thank you all for cramming a lot of work into not enough time and I wish you God speed on your journeys back home. Thank you all and thank you to the staff. You did good work today. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting in the above-entitled matter was concluded at 2:34 p.m.)