

Title Page Info
United States Mint

Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee

Meeting

Tuesday
November 27, 2012

The Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee met on the Second Floor, Conference Room A at 801 9th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m., Gary Marks, Chair, presiding.

CCAC Members Present:

Gary Marks, Chair
Michael Bugeja
Robert Hoge
Erik Jansen
Michael Moran
Michael Olson
Michael Ross
Jeanne Stevens-Sollman
Thomas Uram
Heidi Wastweet*

United States Mint Staff Present:

Don Everhart
Ron Harrigal
Bill Norton
Greg Weinman

On the next page, you will find the Table of Contents list . Do not delete it or adjust it in any way. When you're finished creating the document, you will be able to update that page to show the correct Table of Contents by right clicking on the text, "Error! No table of contents entries found," and selecting "Update Field" from the context menu.

Contents

Welcome and Call to Order-Gary Marks, Chairman	4
Discussion of Letter and Minutes From Previous Meeting-Gary Marks, Chairman	5
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the Reverse of the 2014 America the Beautiful Quarters Program-Ron Harrigal, Acting Chief Engraver	6
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2013 American Eagle Platinum Program-Ron Harrigal, Acting Chief Engraver	78
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the Code Talkers Congressional Gold Medal (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe)-Ron Harrigal, Acting Chief Engraver	95
Discussion of the 2012 CCAC Annual Report	108
Conclude Meeting	134

Proceedings

(9:40 a.m.)

All transcript text should be assigned the "Normal" style, except for the Headings inserted to create the Table of Contents.

Type out each item that must be in the Table of Contents as it should appear on the Contents page, and use that line to mark the place in the text where the corresponding section of transcript begins. If the Table of Contents requires sub-levels -- such as a witness being sworn in, with Direct Examination, Cross Examination, Redirect, and Recross as subsections of that witness's testimony -- use the style "Heading 1" for the overall section (the witness), and "Heading 2" for each subsection (Direct, Cross, etc). When you update the Table of Contents, you will see that the lines marked as "Heading 2" are indented below the line marked "Heading 1". Do not use Heading 3+ unless you have a very complex agenda with multiple layers of subsections.

Do not adjust the text formatting in any way. Use only the assigned styles available in the "Styles and Formatting" bar, located in the Format menu. The transcript text should contain no names or words in capslock except for terms such as acronyms that are properly spelled with all capital letters. Delete all tabs and all extra spaces or paragraph breaks. If an internet address appears in the text, it should be formatted as a hyperlink, and should go to the webpage if clicked on a computer with internet access.

If you have any questions, please see your friendly neighborhood tech person. Thank you!

Welcome and Call to Order-Gary Marks, Chairman

Chairman Marks: Good morning. I'm going to call this November 27th, 2012 meeting of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee to order.

Good morning, everyone.

First item on our agenda is our welcome. So, I want to just note that we have a full contingent of the Committee less Donald Scarinci. We have Heidi Wastweet on the phone today.

Heidi, are you there?

Ms. Wastweet: Yes, I am.

Discussion of Letter and Minutes From Previous Meeting-Gary Marks, Chairman

Chair Marks: All right. Good morning.

The next item on the agenda is the discussion of the letter and minutes from the September 21st, 2012 meeting. Those items were provided to the Committee in our packet book.

Is there any discussion on those items?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Hearing none, may I have a motion to approve the minutes and the letters?

Mr. Jansen: Motion to approve.

Mr. Olson: Second.

Chairman Marks: Been moved and seconded to approve the minutes and letters stemming from the September 21st, 2012 meeting.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: All those in favor, please say aye.

Group Response: Aye.

Chairman Marks: Opposed?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Motion carries.

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the
Reverse of the 2014 America the Beautiful Quarters
Program-Ron Harrigal, Acting Chief Engraver

Chairman Marks: Next item on the agenda is the review and discussion of candidate designs for the reverse of the 2014 America the Beautiful Quarters Program.

Ron Harrigal is here present to provide us information on the program.

Ron.

Mr. Harrigal: Great, thanks.

Mr. Weinman: Just quickly, I just got a note they lost the conference. They were trying to get Heidi back on.

Are you there, Heidi?

(No response.)

Mr. Weinman: Well, not yet. Okay.

Mr. Jansen: Should we wait or - we have a quorum.

Chairman Marks: Yes, why don't you proceed.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. I just want to note that we've videoconferenced our Philadelphia sculptor-engravers there and we have - we have Renata Gordon, Phebe and Joe Menna off to the side there. So, we have three of the sculptor-engravers on the video conference.

They will be going in and out for coverage. And I did make a specific plea to have them here to hear the Committee, because the Committee's voice is very important.

And it's better to hear it in conversation than to read a transcript. So, I just wanted to note that.

Okay. 2014 America the Beautiful Quarters Program, the United States Mint's America the Beautiful Quarters Program is a multi-year initiative authorized by Public Law 110-456.

I'm sorry, who do we have online?

Ms. Dupree: This is Elizabeth Dupree. Heidi and I got disconnected. So, we're having to call back in.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. And I'll introduce Elizabeth a little later. She's from Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Hello, Heidi, is that you?

Ms. Wastweet: Yes, this is Heidi.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay, great, Heidi. I'm just reading the background information. This is Ron. So, I'll continue on here.

Okay. So, the Act directs the United States Mint to mint and issue 56 circulating quarter dollars with the reverse side designs emblematic of the National Parks or other national sites in each state, the District of Columbia, the U.S. territories, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa and the U.S. Virgin Islands and the Northern Mariana Islands.

The quarters are issued sequentially each year in the order in which the featured site was first established as a National Park or site.

In some cases, they were a national site before they became a National Park. So, the recognition date is the deciding factor there.

On the screen is the image of the restored 1932 portrait of George Washington by John Flanagan. The inscriptions are "United States of America," "In God We Trust" and "Quarter Dollar," and also features the Mint mark.

The reverse inscriptions are a designation of each site and the host jurisdiction, the year of minting or issuance, which is 2013, and "E Pluribus Unum."

And we're continuing to use the original template that was approved - reviewed and approved by the Committee earlier at the beginning of the program.

Okay. Moving on to the program here, Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Elizabeth Dupree, who is the Chief of Interpretation at Great Smoky Mountains is here. And I'll just ask her if she would like to make a few comments on what's important to the park before we go forward with the designs.

Elizabeth.

Ms. Dupree: Thank you. And Thank you for selecting the National Parks for this program. We're just real excited about it and very honored to be a part of the 2014 quarters that are coming out.

I think Leslie has given you information, basic information about the park, but it's a very special park due to the fact that we have such a diversity and abundance of plants and animals, mountain terrain, waterways and remnants of pioneer culture that were here when this park was first established.

And I think the designs that you have in front of you are very representative of what people see and expect to see when they come to the park and visit.

Of course we have our two favorites. The first one being the black bear. And the reason for that is because when you come to the park, you always get an opportunity to see wildlife. Whether it's deer or turkey, we also have elk, but our bear is the most popular. And there's a very good chance you'll see it especially if you go to Cades Cove during the summer and fall months. So, that's one of our big attractions that people come to the Smokies for.

Another really good representative of the park is going to be Coin Number 3, which has one of our

historic cabins situated in kind of a scenic view.

The park is very well known for its collection of pioneer log cabins. We have about 90 that we preserve in the park and we have a tendency to have them during the period of the 1800s up into the early 1900s. So, these are very representative of the park also.

So, that's really kind of my short, brief presentation. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

Mr. Harrigal: Are there any questions?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Thank you for your comments. It's very helpful.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I do have a question.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Are there more - are there many cabins in the park, or just one?

Ms. Dupree: We have several. We have 90.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: 90.

Ms. Dupree: And it's more than just cabins. We have churches, we have barns, we have corn cribs and associated buildings with the log cabins, but we have 90 that we're actually preserving.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Thank you.

Mr. Bugeja: I have another quick question. This is Michael Bugeja.

Can you tell me about a site at the park that you didn't expect? Because it seems to me that travel to - I'm segueing off your comment that this is what people expect to see, but I have always experienced the unexpected in state parks.

Have you personally experienced any unexpected interaction between animals or scenery or plant life?

Ms. Dupree: Unexpected. You mean negative stuff, or positive -

Mr. Bugeja: Oh, no, no, no, no.

Ms. Dupree: - or both?

Mr. Bugeja: For instance, I remember seeing a great owl coming at me with its face. I didn't expect to see that in a state park.

So, moments I think in state parks that we expect, have already been depicted and sometimes it's the unexpected or the view that is unexpected. So, that's what I'm kind of asking.

Ms. Dupree: Yes. Well, my unexpected experience was hiking in the back country where I actually came upon a bear. I was surprised.

He was eating blueberries. And of course I - they sometimes can associate food with people. So, that was my thought.

I had - I think I had a sandwich in my backpack and really didn't want him to try to take my backpack from me.

So, fortunately, I think I scared him as much as he scared me. And we just kind of went opposite directions.

Mr. Bugeja: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Ms. Dupree: Yes, you're welcome.

Chairman Marks: Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. Thank you.

Ron, please continue.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. We have four designs for the Committee's comments. The first design here features the black bear and a black bear cub standing on a rocky hillside on the mountain. Very typical of what you would see. The mountains in the background are visible.

Design Number 2 is - and, by the way, let me backtrack. The park's preference is of course they like the bears. So, this is the park's preference on this one.

We have the historic cabin on Design Number 2. This includes the Rosebay Rhododendron bush in the front.

Design Number 3 also depicts a historic cabin. A little more scenery involved here. And this is the park's second choice, and also the choice that the CFA gave for the series.

And Design Number 4 features the Red-Cheeked Salamander cradled in an oak leaf with the background of the Great Smoky Mountains.

So, I'll turn it over to the Committee for consultation.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Chairman Marks: Did we want to - I believe we want to go through all the quarters and then circle back.

Mr. Harrigal: If you want to go through all of them, we can do that.

Chairman Marks: Yes. Do we have a preference on - I think in the past we've kind of gone through them all. Then, we can have one pass through. I think that's going to save us time.

Yes, let's do that.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay.

Chairman Marks: I'm sorry. I should have been clearer.

Mr. Harrigal: That's okay.

Chairman Marks: I'd like to go through each of the five, and then we'll circle back and we'll ask the Committee members to comment on the whole, indicate their preferences for each park or place.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. That's fine.

And we do not have any of the other park representatives. So, I will go through a little more description on the others.

Shenandoah National Park is the second quarter that we're looking at. The Shenandoah National Park lies along the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains in North Central Virginia accessible to millions, the park consists of more than 197,000 acres of mountains, forests, meadows and culturally and historically significant areas.

Perhaps the most well-known feature of the park is Skyline Drive, a 105-mile scenic roadway planned and designated in the 1930s.

So, we have the first design here. The first design features a view from the top of Little Stony Man Mountain. Multiple layers of mountains are visible in the background. And the emblematic Skyline Drive is also available, as well as a hiker.

And I do want to say that hiking is a very important aspect of the park that the superintendent wanted us to highlight in the design. So, you'll see hikers in a lot of them.

Design Number 2 features a view of Little Stony Man Mountain and a black bear in the foreground. Skyline Drive is also in the background.

Design Number 3 depicts a hiker standing on a high ledge overlooking rows of mountaintops and Virginia's farmland in the valley below. This is a

very layered coin design here.

Design Number 4 features Little Stony Man Mountain in the central area of the park facing northwest and the Skyline Drive below, as well as the hiker on the edge of the Little Stony Man.

Design Number 5 depicts a day hiker taking the view from Little Stony Man summit. While it is similar to Four, there are subtle differences here. The hiker is located on the right side there.

This was the choice of the CFA. So, we had - and I didn't say Design Number 4 was actually the preference of the park. So, we had Design Number 4 for the park, and Five for the CFA. So, here we have the five designs for Shenandoah National Park.

The next design that we're looking at is Arches National Park. First established as a national monument in 1929, Arches National Park is located in southeast Utah. Arches is known for preserving over 2,000 natural sandstone arches, including the world-famous Delicate Arch located in the High Desert with an elevation ranging from 4,085 feet to 5,653 feet above sea level in southeast Utah.

Arches National Park contains one of the greatest densities in natural sandstone arches in the world. So, here we have seven designs for consideration.

The first design features the larger arch of Double O Arch, the second largest arch in the Devil's Garden area of the park.

This entire formation includes two arches. One large with a span of 71 feet stacked on top of a much smaller arch of 21 feet. This is the park's preference.

Design Number 2 depicts Delicate Arch, a 65-foot freestanding natural arch. It is widely recognized - it is a widely recognized landmark in the state of Utah, and the most famous arch found in the National Park.

It has been depicted upon postage stamps and license plates. Olympic torch relay from the 2002 winter Olympics passed through the arch. La Sal Mountains are visible in the background.

And I believe that that design - no, let me go back. Design Number 1, I'll go back, was the CFA recommendation as well.

Okay. So, we have Design Number 2 that we just talked about. Design Number 3 features in this design, Skyline Arch. In the foreground, the artist has a Blackbrush Bush in the flowering season. Distinct Arch can be seen from many places within the park and is an essential part of the Arches National Park photo collection.

Design Number 4 features a common side-blotched lizard sunning itself in the foreground of Northern Window Arch. The underappreciated lizard plays an important role in the High Desert ecosystem. We have two visible hikers on the design in the center of the arch there.

Design Number 5 depicts Skyline Arch, but without the flowering vegetation in the foreground.

Design Number 6 depicts Turret Arch named for the tower which ascends from one end of this distinct feature.

The arch found in the Window section of the park actually consists of three openings. The largest measuring 35 feet wide and 65 feet tall.

Design Number 7 as in Design Number 2, this design features Delicate Arch, but from a different perspective. So, we have seven designs for Arches.

The next park we'll be looking at is Great Sand Dunes National Park. The Great Sand Dunes was first established as a national monument in 1932, then officially as a National Park in 2004.

Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve offers

something for everyone. There are many types of recreational opportunities from hiking, to splashing in Medano Creek, to sandboarding, skiing and sledding.

Its uniqueness as a National Park lies in the park's centerpiece - I'm sorry. Its uniqueness in the park lies in the diversity of its natural features, the tallest dunes in North America are the park's centerpiece, and the diverse landscape of grasslands, wetlands, conifers, Aspen forests, alpine lakes and tundra.

So, for the seven designs we're looking at here, the first design focuses on the natural diversity of the Great Sand Dunes National Park.

The artist chose to use a stylistic technique in creating the design. Features a compilation of the river flow, the sand dunes and the mountain in the backgrounds.

Design Number 2, in this design the artist chose to feature an overview with two hikers walking towards an interesting sand formation seen in the background.

Design Number 3, this design features a view of a large sand dune in the foreground with a lone hiker walking along the side of the sand dune.

Design Number 4, this design features a father and son playing in the sand next to the creek bed. Distinctive mountains and sand dunes are featured in the background.

Design Number 5, this design features the sand dunes in the foreground and the mountains in the background.

Design Number 6, this design depicts the great sand dunes, grasslands, the sand dunes and the distinctive mountains. This was the preference of the CFA.

Mr. Jansen: Number 6?

Mr. Harrigal: Number 6, yes.

And there was a lot of discussion about the layering, but we'll go on to Seven here.

Design Number 7, this design depicts the same features as Number 6. However, the grasslands are shown in more detail.

The National Park Service initially preferred Design Number 4. But later in the process designs more accurate and appropriate, they did not include that as a preference. They did look at Number 6 as their preference as well.

Okay. Moving on to Everglades. Dedicated in 1947, Everglades National Park protects the southern 20 percent of the original Everglades.

Everglades National Park is the third largest national park in the lower 48 states and is visited on average by one million people each year.

In the United States, it is the largest subtropical wilderness and the largest congressionally-designated wilderness area east of the Mississippi River.

It has been declared as an international biosphere reserve, a world heritage site and the wetlands of international importance, one of only three locations in the world to appear on all three lists.

The first design here before the Spanish arrived in 1513, the region of South Florida that is now known as the Everglades was largely inhabited by the Native American people called the Calusa Indians.

Their villages were located at the mouth of the rivers on the coast along the inner waterways along 10,000 islands.

The design was inspired by the Calusa's use of the freshwater Everglades, or River of Grass, for hunting, travel and trade.

The artist created a design which features a traditional Calusa male dressed in a breechcloth using a pole to push a 15-foot-long dugout cypress canoe through the Sawgrass Prairie. A Roseate Spoonbill and two egrets are flying by.

Design Number 2 was inspired by the Snail Kite, which was listed as endangered in 1967 where there were fewer than a hundred individuals remaining.

The extremely hook-billed raptor is used - uses the bill to extract the apple snail from its shell. Their diet is composed almost entirely of apple snails. And, therefore, their survival depends on the hydrology and water quality of the surrounding watershed. This design features a side portrait of the bird with a snail in its bill.

Design Number 3 features an alligator, an American crocodile falling in a circular format to create a simple and clean design focusing on the primary subjects.

South Florida is the only place in the world where alligators and crocodiles coexist.

Design Number 5 inspired by the bird population in the Everglades, the artist has featured an Anhinga with outstretched wings on a willow tree with a Roseate Spoonbill visible in the mid-ground. Both birds are found throughout the Everglades National Park.

Design Number 6, this design depicts an open flat everglade with the area of the Sawgrass Prairie. A Roseate Spoonbill with outstretched wings and red mangrove are visible.

The alligator is visible in the background ready to slip in the water mid-ground left. This is the favorite of the National Park.

And Design Number 6, this design is somewhat similar to Five, but depicts a big rain cloud in the sky.

And on this one, Design Number 4 was the one that the CFA liked, but they recommended removing the cloud from the background in the design.

So, here we have the Florida candidates, and I'll turn it over to Gary for consultation.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Thank you, Ron.

Before we get into our discussion, I want to make sure that any technical questions are addressed. These don't go to your preferences, but rather just technical questions you have about designs, how they might be produced and so forth.

If there are any of those, please make those known.

Mr. Moran: Gary, I've got one. And it's on the Great Sand Dunes, the first one, which I would compliment the artist for an excellent sketch. At least it appealed to me, but the questions I have is for Don.

And that is, how does that coin up? It still looks okay when you put it down into the quarter-size format here. But, again, it's artful shading with a pencil.

And in a quarter with little or no relief, can you do that?

Mr. Everhart: Absolutely. What we would do is differentiate between the three basic layers on the design by using texture for the trees on the mountain in the background, it would be a smooth treatment of the sand dunes, along with the flowing lines and arabesque for the sand dunes.

And then you can show the ripples of the water, again, somewhat of a texture in the foreground.

So, I think there's going to be a good differentiation between the three layers and it will come out good.

Mr. Moran: Thank you.

Mr. Jansen: I had a similar question, although posited a little differently recalling some of the coins we've had in the past where we have kind of these angular mountain surfaces as a feature or background.

The - which coin was it that had the ram on it, Gary?

Chairman Marks: That's Denali.

Mr. Jansen: Okay. I'll use Denali as an example. Similar mountains in the backdrop. And when you coin them up, it just looks like a confusing array of triangles.

And I'm concerned - this was a typical design that concerns me that between textures and sculpting, that we really pay an extra amount of concern to these issues.

Because the comment I've had on so many of the quarters we've done is when it went through sculpting, we lost the contrast, we lost the message, we lost the eye control, we lost all of those things. And it really, really concerns me.

Mr. Everhart: Well, I think that when you're sculpting, of course it's not going to look like the drawing.

Some of these elements that you're speaking of in the mountains will kind of, you know, blend together more just through the process of sculpting itself.

And we can also make a note of that and, you know, make sure that we try to, you know, instead of having a whole lot of geometric shapes that maybe don't relate and have them blend into each other.

Mr. Jansen: I'd also encourage us to, you know, we weren't all happy with how the Hawaii experiment went, but I'd like to see us experiment somewhere

in here with as much as production value will allow us stretch our relief palette as many hundredths of an inch as you can.

Mr. Everhart: We always want more relief.

Mr. Jansen: We always want more relief, that's right.

Now, if we end up going back up to a couple hundred million quarters on each of these designs, obviously that puts more pressure on flattening the thing out, but I can still ask.

Mr. Harrigal: Erik, I can say one thing that we coin for maximum relief. And typically we go through three and four trial strikes and end up lowering relief to get fill on the dye.

Mr. Jansen: Yes, yes, yes.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay.

Chairman Marks: Are there any other technical questions?

Robert.

Mr. Hoge: I have one, yes.

Is there something in the legislation calling for this program that requires everything to consist of a circular vignette of some kind with the name of the state and E Pluribus Unum reading outwardly at the bottom along with a date and the name of the park at the top?

Is this part of the requirement, or is this -

Chairman Marks: I think requirement, and the staff can respond to that. I know that the template that was approved for the program such that all of the - ultimately all of the coins produced would share a relationship that kind of tied them together as a set. I think that's the thought with that.

Mr. Harrigal: That's correct, Gary.

And we did want to differentiate from the 50 States Program and have something that looked different as a series.

Mr. Hoge: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Marks: So, we're kind of married to that template.

Mr. Hoge: No, I kind of figured that, but I just wanted to clarify.

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Any other technical questions?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm going to start off with remarks today. First, I want to say that I think it's been said before that doing a series on National Parks and national places is a difficult one.

And I think the artists who have kind of lived through this now probably appreciate that more than us.

And I think what makes it difficult is that the obvious direction you want to go with it is to show scenery, because a lot of these parks and places are some of the most beautiful places that we have in our country.

And so, when we talk to the folks who are involved with these parks and national places, their immediate response I think we've seen, is that they want to have scenery. And it's kind of like trying to put a postcard on a coin.

And the way we've approached this, you know, Robert just addressed this idea of the template. We've got this outer band. A quarter is about one inch in diameter. But when you take the outer band off of it, I'm guessing we've got about 7/8ths of an

inch left to put images on it.

And so, before we really start drilling down on preferences for the designs presented to us, I wanted to pass around to the Committee some examples. Some from this park series of quarters that have already been produced, and then a few from the State Quarter Program, to illustrate some of the issues that we end up with.

I'm going to start off with the Glacier National Park quarter from the National Park Series.

And for those of you who were on the Committee at the time we reviewed the designs for Glacier, you'll recall that I was very excited, even ecstatic, about the design that was ultimately chosen that shows the ram majestically perched up with the mountain range in the background.

And I was caught up with the seven-inch drawing, which we have examples here for the current batch that we're looking at. And I was caught up with the shading and the black lines and all that, that helped give definition to it.

What I'm going to do here is I'm going to pass around a circulating version, and then the proof version of what actually resulted.

And, sadly, when you look at the business strike there that I just gave Erik, and then you look at the proof, because we have so much in the way of scenery and background, that it really robs from what I think should be the focal point, which is the ram. We rob any pop from it, and it kind of melts into the silverness, if you will, of the coin.

In the proof version, it just becomes part of the white frost with everything else.

Then also in a similar vein, we looked at Olympic National Park and we have a Roosevelt Elk again juxtaposed against a scenic background.

I'm going to start it this way. There's a little more negative space in that one in the proof version, a little more mirrored, but still the animal which from my interpretation of design, should be the focal point.

I think you have to agree with me that for the average American when they get that coin in change at the grocery store or a teller slides it across to them at the bank, it's not really obvious quickly what they're looking at.

And I have a couple examples from the State Parks Program that I think make a little better use of a balance between the devices and the negative space.

The first one I'm going to pass down the line here, a business strike and a proof of the Montana state quarter, which I was on the Montana committee that went through all these.

That wasn't my first choice, but I think you see immediately that the bison skull on there pops out at you and it's readily obvious.

There's a balance of the negative space that helps the viewer readily discern what we're looking at.

And then I brought along the Oregon state quarter, which I think is maybe the best use of a scenery view on a quarter with Crater Lake.

And there's a good use of negative space juxtaposed against the raised elements on the design.

And I show these - oh, also I wanted to pass around the latest of the Native American for 2012. Again, there's a nice balance of negative space along with the device.

And then also one I think is near and dear to Don Everhart, is the reverse of the Presidential Dollar. You see the Statue of Liberty, I think, as another

example where it's readily obvious because of the balance that was provided between the image and the negative space that it's easy for the viewer on a small planchet to understand and interpret visually what they're looking at.

I go through that exercise just now to hopefully put in context what we're looking at here today with these designs.

And I want to encourage the Committee to look for those designs that make good use of negative space and help the viewer understand the image they're looking at.

And on the first park here, Great Smoky Mountains, among the designs presented I like most Design Number 3. However, if you look at Three and you look at the thumbnail, the one-inch aversion at the lower right of our tear sheet that we were given, we've got a lot of scenery in the background. And I'm afraid that the cabin which it should be the focal point, is going to get lost on this small coin that really essentially has one color in a business strike, and that's silver.

And in a proof, maybe you've got two colors; frost and mirror. And on the proof version, the cabin and the scenery are all going to be white.

And it reminded me of what we did with the first aspect of the 2009 Lincoln penny where we put the cabin on there. And I've got an example of the - I don't have the actual coin here. But in my red book here, the scenery that might be there in back of the cabin was not put on the penny, and the cabin pops.

I'll pass that down. It's the first image on the left. So, there is an example of a cabin where on a coin even smaller than a quarter, that pops. We know when we see that, that that's a cabin.

I fear that although Number 3 would be my choice for Great Smoky Mountains, that we're disadvantaging that design or disadvantaging the

viewer from understanding it, because we put a lot of scenery.

Again, this is a very challenging series, this National Parks, but I wonder, you know, if the creativity of our artist could find a way to introduce more negative space into these designs. Do we need all of this background?

Moving on to Shenandoah, Design Number 2, I think, is another example of something similar to the Glacier design with the ram. It's similar to the Roosevelt Elk on the Olympic quarter. And it's similar to the image on the Denali quarter. I'm afraid the bear is going to be lost in the scenery on a 7/8ths-round image.

My favorite for Shenandoah with those provided to us, would be Number 5. And if Number 5 were selected as our recommendation, I would either ask or I would make the additional motion that some of these background hills that we see here presented in kind of a hazy format, that some of those be eliminated.

Maybe the first three rows of those near the top so we would introduce more negative space. Maybe even the first four rows, and keep the image on the lower left with the road, which is important to the Shenandoah Park folks.

We could keep that. But if we eliminated the rest of that, we would really help this rock formation pop better with a lot more negative space surrounding it. It would be, I think, more readily discernible that it is a rock formation.

Moving on to the Arches, I live in the state of Idaho, which is next door to Utah. And we have many Utahns who travel to our state. And their license plate features the Arches National Park on it.

And the image that Utah felt was significant at the Arches is the formation shown in Design Number 2.

This is an example where we're getting a little more negative space. I think at least the top part of this arch would be something that you can readily see on a 7/8ths-inch space provided.

And if you look at the smaller image at the lower right corner of Image 2 that was provided to us in our packet, you can see that that arch does jump out at you, if you will. And it's - I think it's easily discernible what you're looking at there that it's an arch.

And I don't know from some of you in the east, who live in the east, I'm not sure if these images are familiar to you. But as a westerner, these arch images are familiar to me.

And the most familiar one to me, the most iconic, if you will, is Number 2 just from my personal experience.

Some of the other images we have of the Arches like Number 7, I really like Number 7, but the illustration of the formation in the background robs the arch.

We fill in the middle circle almost completely with detail, which is going to be a raised image on the coin. And it kind of steals the whole idea of the arch.

The dark, black lines we see around the inner part of that arch, don't let that deceive you. That's not going to be there.

Sure, there will be an edge, but it's not going to be as pronounced as you see there. It's going to be gradations of silver that is all that you're going to have for your eye to look at.

Going on to the Great Sand Dunes, this one is really challenging. I wish that maybe we could have had some other theme or iconic image that we could draw from.

I went on the website for the Great Sand Dunes National Park and immediately read that it is the - they claim to be the most biologically and geologically diverse park in the United States. So, that tells me that there's got to be some interesting animals.

I'm also understanding that there's some species in this park that only exist in this park anywhere in the world.

And yet, we're challenged to look at images that are filled up mostly with raised images. Very little negative space provided for us.

Some of the hikers that show footprints - don't look at the big images, folks. Cover that up. Look at the small images at the lower right of your tear sheet.

Those people, they shrink to ant size or less. Number 3 is or less. And I don't know - I don't know that I'm ready to recommend any of those for Great Sand Dunes.

I don't think that's the artist's fault. I think it's a very challenging subject to portray, but I would like to have maybe some other themes or maybe identify some images maybe of animals or what have you that maybe could be rendered with a little more pop to it.

The Everglades, Number 2, I think, is a good example of something that would show well on a small quarter-size coin, the Snail Kite on it.

The only thing I don't know, I'm certainly not one who's vastly familiar with the state of Florida or the Everglades. For me as someone who lives in the west, I wasn't aware of the Snail Kite species. So, you know, intuitively I don't interpret that as something that belongs to the Everglades.

Some of the other animals that are shown like the Anhinga, I think that's something that as just a citizen of the United States, I've seen those in

images of the Everglades. Also, the Spoonbill species that we see in Five and Six.

But with those images, Four, Five and Six, again, more so in Five and Six, we've got these majestic birds, very interesting birds that would, I think, make good subjects for a coin. And then we crowd the image by putting brush, we put images right around those wings for the bird that will steal the pop from it.

And when you look at it in a small, silver image, it's going to be hard to discern just exactly what you are looking at.

If we had freed the bird and put negative space around most of it, I think we would have had something.

Number 3 is an interesting one. This might be an example of going too far in the other direction with the amphibians.

I don't know. To me, the balance is -

Mr. Moran: They're reptiles, by the way.

Chairman Marks: Or reptiles. I'm sorry. Reptiles. I don't know. I'll look forward to what the other Committee members have to say about Number 3. I am challenged with that one. I'm not quite sure why I feel the way I do on that one.

But anyway, I hope what I've had to say is helpful. I, more than anything like everyone involved in this process, I really want coins that are beautiful and that are successful in carrying off the mission of the program.

And I think probably the biggest challenge is to work on our balance of images and negative space and see if we can't do better with what we have to work with.

So, those are my remarks. And I think I'll go to Michael Olson.

Are you prepared?

Mr. Olson: Sure.

Chairman Marks: We'll ask you for your comments now.

Mr. Olson: Okay. On the Smoky Mountains, number one, I agree with a lot of what Gary said here.

When you look at these things, the coins, the final production, it is difficult to see some of those images. So, in many cases less might be more. And a lot of what we have to look at here today are going to replicate what we've seen on the coins that have been passed around.

With that being said, there's a lot of good artwork here. It's just - it's not clear that it could be easily translated to a coin the size of a quarter.

On the Smoky Mountains, the - my preference would be for Number 3 simply because it does show the cabin.

Maybe there could be some effort taken to eliminate some of the brush behind or minimize some of that to maybe make the cabin stand out a little more.

The bears are cute. I kind of like the bears, but they look like somebody just said "cheese." And that's probably not a natural setting to have them both looking at you like that, but it's a nice image.

I think as far as children go, children would definitely appreciate the bears on a coin. So, it would more lend itself to some popularity there rather than a cabin.

Number 4 with the salamander, I understand that that is a species that's very prevalent there. But in looking at that if you weren't aware of that and you didn't really pay attention to the Great Smoky Mountains, you might think that that's a Puerto Rico coin or a tropical type of setting.

So, just from that even though that is accurate, I would probably lean towards going away from that one simply for the fact of maybe confusing people.

So, the majority of my support will go for Number 3. I may throw a vote or two towards the smiling bears.

Moving on to the Shenandoah, there's a lot to look at here. Number 1 and Number 2, really don't have a lot of interest there.

We're looking at the back of the hiker on Number 1. And the Committee in the past, has expressed that we don't really like to view the backsides of human figures. The bear on Number 2 would, I agree, would also blend right into the background.

With the road being important to the folks from Shenandoah, I take a look and my direction is really focused towards Number 4 and Number 5.

The road is certainly more prevalent in Number 4 than it is Number 5. I do like the way that the rock formation is depicted in Number 5.

And, Don, I don't know - is this a difference we're seeing in the drawing, or could that be a difference that would also show up in the finished product?

Mr. Everhart: The difference in what?

Mr. Olson: Well, the way the rocks are depicted in 5 versus 4 just the way they're visually presented.

Mr. Everhart: I think it's just a difference in the artists' styles.

Mr. Olson: Okay.

Mr. Everhart: I think it's from the same viewpoint.

Mr. Olson: So, it would look essentially the same when it translated onto the coin?

Mr. Everhart: Essentially -

Mr. Olson: Okay. Well, with that being said, Number 4 would be my preference simply for the fact that it does show the road more predominantly.

And I agree with Gary that possibly some of those upper layers of terrain might be eliminated to create a little more dead space.

Mr. Harrigal: I do want to make one comment here - this is Ron Harrigal - that the CFA talked about that we didn't quite get the vanishing point right on the roads that - they called it the tangential vanishing point.

And on this one, you can see that that road in the background there should be more narrow as you get further away. So, we just - and that would add a little more depth to it.

And, you know, so you don't confuse that with the Shenandoah River or something like that. Just wanted to bring that up.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Olson: And the Arches, there's a couple of really neat-looking designs, in my opinion, here.

Number 1 is interesting because it shows the dead space inside of that arch. And it shows a little bit of depth there.

Again, with the relief that you have to work with, it may not show up as nicely as it may otherwise, but that's a nice design. In talking with some folks from Utah that are very familiar with the park, again I'll echo what Gary has mentioned that Number 2 is the one that you see the most that appears to be most prevalent.

I understand it's on their license plates. I didn't know that the Olympic torch passed underneath this arch, but that would very well lend itself to being commemorated on a coin if nothing else other than that fact.

Some other good designs here, I think Number 7, though, with the effort to put the little hiker down by that arch if you look at the coin size, it's a spec of dust.

So, with that being said, I think my support will primarily go to Number 2, and maybe a vote or two to Number 1.

Chairman Marks: Are you done?

Mr. Olson: The Sand Dunes and Everglades to go.

Chairman Marks: I'm sorry.

Mr. Olson: Okay. On the Sand Dunes, there's a couple of these that could very well be the same as we've seen in many other parks that have mountains depicted. I really would like to look at something different than that.

I'm going to take a little bit of a different viewpoint and maybe it's been expressed before. I kind of like 2 and 3 with the footprints.

We've been asking for something different, and these show a different perspective. They actually show some action

There's hikers. And even though, again, these folks are walking away from us with the footprints, I think it adds a little bit of interest.

Number 3 especially. You're walking across and you can tell even though that's a flat surface, you can tell that there is some curvature to that dune.

If one of these was selected, I guess I would recommend that some of the background dunes farther back in the setting be eliminated to maybe take away or add some dead space.

But I'd like you to maybe take a look - take a look at Number 3. If you took everything away from that other than the dune, the hiker is blocking that.

That might be a striking design there. A lot of dead space. But, again, it's not the same - you're looking at a mountain-type scene that we've seen so many times before.

So, I would ask maybe the Committee to take a look at 2 and 3 with maybe a sharper eye towards 3. And maybe, you know, that's similar to the Hawaii, but not maybe as risky, but a different perspective.

Everglades. There was not a lot here that I really cared for. I think one of the things, as Gary has mentioned, is there's too much going on with the birds.

These are all very-well executed designs. Very nice artwork, but does it work on a coin?

And I think if we see a number of these make it onto a coin, 4, 5 or 6, we're going to have the same problem. Especially with Number 5.

Number 3, I was a little surprised to see that we just had two alligators sitting there looking like they were on display without much explanation or anything else within that scene.

An interesting design as I looked at these that I thought might have drawn some interest, is maybe have a scene where you've got Everglades, river of grass. Maybe you have an eye and a snout of a crocodile or an alligator kind of in close perspective looking at you like you're ready to strike.

Something along those lines would have a lot of interest, I would think, at least as far as I'm concerned.

I agree with Gary. This bird that's on Number 2 not being from Florida, but having been there a few times, that would really mean nothing to me.

I think when people think Everglades, they think alligators. They think grass, water.

Number 1 is - with the Native American there does show some interest. I guess I'd maybe take a look at portraying that in maybe a little bit different of a light, but I'm really working hard to try to find something I like in this set of designs.

That's all I've got.

Chairman Marks: Thanks, Mike.

Jeanne.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I'm not going to take the time to speak to each design. Although, I think we have some great drawings here.

I'm especially taken by the, you know, Number 4 with the little salamander. However, I don't think - I don't think we can - or I don't identify that with the Great Smoky Mountains. I like that little design, but it's - I think it would get lost in coinage.

And I love the bear. Of course I love the animals in Number 1. But, you know, I live in Central Pennsylvania and I see a lot of bears. And I do see them on my walks. And they kind of - this is a very sweet bear.

(Laughter.)

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I'm sorry. But, you know, I kind of go in the other direction when I find this.

And it's like I think if the bear were bigger and if the cub were not so innocent, you know, we might have a more successful design.

I don't know if I can really - I have to listen to my colleagues on these designs.

My preference, I kind of don't really have one for this group. Although, I lean more towards this bear if it were a little more challenging.

And the Shenandoah Park, I think it's important that we address the Skyline Drive somehow. And I like

that fact that, you know, 4 and 5 are - do, do that.

I don't know, although I have to agree with Gary, we need these things to pop. I think if you take away too many mountains, it's not going to really look like Shenandoah.

If you've ever stood up there and looked down, it's kind of nice to see those layers.

I'm not sure - I don't know, Don, if we can pop that Little Stony Man Mountain a little more.

If that hiker were more to the left as it is in Number 5, I would really go with Number 4. I think 4 and 5 are my choices in that group.

And Arches, I have to agree with Gary and Mike. Number 1 is really exciting because, you know, it's a little off center. But when I get to look at the coinage, the little representative that we have, I think it would get lost. There's something about that abstraction.

I'm not sure if it's going to read "Arches." And so, I have to go with Number 2 because of its simplicity.

And, you know, I didn't know that was on the license plate. And I think that's a great thing to be able to say, you know, this is - I like this, and everybody else likes it. So, this is my choice of those - that series.

The rest of them, I think we just have too much information, you know. As I spoke earlier, I think we do need to address less is more.

The Great Sand Dunes, this was really hard for me. I like the information of knowing that it is such a diverse park. And so, Number 7, to me, shows that diversity.

It's too much information. I think when we get it down to the coinage, it's going to be maybe even less recognizable, but it does show us the diversity of the park and - as opposed to Number 1 where we

have kind of like a Baked Alaska technique. I think I would prefer Number 7.

And, Mike, you know, the footprints in the sand dunes is kind of exciting and interesting. But as it gets down to the coinage, I think we're not going to understand what those little footprints are and the hiker gets even less. I'm not sure if there's some way to improve that. I guess in my finalization, I enjoyed the diversity of the park.

And the Everglades, again, this is such a hard park, as all of them are. The drawings are extremely beautiful, absolutely.

I think that I have to go with Number 4, because it's the strongest image. The anhinga stands out. I think even though there's a lot of information in there, a lot of background, I think that bird really represents the Everglades.

If you've been to Florida, that bird is just so iconic to the area. And having a little spoonbill in the back, you know, that's good. It doesn't have to be. But I think of all of them that reads, this tells me this is the Everglades.

Number 2, I loved - first of all, I didn't know it was a snail. It took me a while to figure that out.

And I think it's a beautiful bird, but I'm not sure if it really says to the rest of our citizens that this is the Everglades. And so, my choice is Number 4.

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Jeanne.

Michael.

Mr. Bugeja: Thank you, Gary.

Before I begin and go through all of them, I thought it might be of some help to talk a little bit about - expand on Gary and what Gary said not so much from a numismatic perspective, but from an artistic perspective.

The problem that I see in state parks is that we continue to get postcards of things we already know, and that's not the experience in a state park. So, how can we look at some artistic concepts that can invigorate future designs?

I think one concept is orientation. What are the devices? How are they opposed to each other?

For instance, if we took a look at the bear picture in the Great Smoky Mountains and we - actually, this cannot - in my opinion, cannot really be fixed.

But if we took the encounter that was explained to us that a bear with - a mother bear with its back to us eating blueberries, and then the cub facing the blueberry - the body - a back picture of the mother and a cub, but the cub's face turned to look at the viewer of the coin, we all know what that is. That's an encounter that we don't want to have in a state park, but that's what we expect in the state park.

The viewpoint of a bird and the cabin in Number 2, what does that - what does that indicate?

And I would like this to be actually - if someone could explain these concepts when Ron - Ron, unfortunately, has left. It would be important for him to understand some of these.

The bird's viewpoint in Number 3, for instance, that gives you a whole different perspective. A peak experience that you might have, something that the body remembers from the state park.

We had, and this is a little further back, we had a father and a son on a sand dune looking - building sands.

Well, that's interesting, but it's the find of a fossil that's the peak experience. And the epiphany, something that we remember that we take away from the park that has changed us in some way.

And finally, the theme. We distinguish a topic from

a theme by saying, what's it about? Alligators and crocodiles. What's it really about? If you say alligators and crocodiles, you have no theme. These are five very important artistic concepts.

Now, I want to give you an example of something that I encountered at Custer State Park. And then that will illustrate this a little bit more.

My first experience in Custer State Park was looking up at a rock ledge. And my wife who is a native of South Dakota said, don't go up there or you'll find a rattlesnake on the top.

So, I climbed up that ledge, and sure enough there was a rattlesnake right on the top.

The interesting thing about viewpoint for the artists here, and I do want Ron to get a transcript of this, he needs to hear it, is that if you have - what's the viewpoint of the snake upon seeing a face coming up just with the eyes on the ledge with the rattle in the back? That's called the encounter. And what we have in the state parks, what we take away is the encounter.

Too often in these designs we have someone experiencing the encounter of another. In other words, we're removed from the encounter. Like the person who's on the top of a ledge looking down, we're removed from it. And what we need to be is included in that design.

And you can have, for example, my experience at the Custer State Park, you could have the viewpoint of the snake. Change the viewpoint of your devices.

Number 2 is peeking over the ledge, the orientation. The peak experience is fear. The epiphany is, this is not my habitat. This is the snake's habitat.

And too often what I see in the depictions of the state park is the humanization of the state park.

We go to state parks not to encounter what we have

out in the street. We go to state parks to encounter the unexpected interaction of nature and the feeling that we are no longer in control of that scenery.

And then finally, you have to ask yourself what's the theme of each of these designs?

We're getting drawings instead of art. And what I - art is all about theme. What's it really about? And the theme connects to peak experiences and epiphanies and gives us that iconic feel of what a coin should be.

So, to answer Gary's initial question about the crocodile and the alligator, there is no theme to it. It's just a drawing of a crocodile and an alligator.

But imagine of all the different animals that we will see in a state park, the viewpoint and orientation of a croc is absolutely fearful, because all you see is the eyes on the surface of the water.

So, with that in mind as I go through, and I'll go through very quickly some of these designs, I really do want the artists in the room to understand those five elemental concepts.

State parks is about the encounter. So, give us the viewpoint. Keep changing the devices. Keep changing the viewpoint. You'll come up with a different coin. Keep changing the theme. You'll come up with a different coin. Those are the artistic concepts that undergird the finest numismatic images.

As for the Great Smoky Mountains, I don't have any preference whatsoever. We've seen cabins before. I'm not sure what kind of bird that is.

The bears look like something we'd find in the Hallmark section. So, I don't really have a preference there.

If we go to the Shenandoah, I said I'll be doing this real quick, most often we get the experience of

someone witnessing the encounter of another.

And to be a mountain climber or a hiker, and I don't do that anymore, but I lived and was educated in Austria and climbed the Alps, you have a total spiritual experience up there. I just see drawings again. So, I don't really have a preference there.

On the Arches, what I really like is Design Number 1 only because the circular - there is a kind of depth of field here with the coin, and then the rim, and then the circular viewpoint that appealed to me very much.

Although, there are others here to commend themselves, I don't want to take too much time away from Heidi, so I'll continue. The people in here are so small that I don't know if they would appear well in coinage.

When you take a look at the Great Sand Dunes, some of them look like - well, Number 1 looks like a waffled coin. I'm sorry, but that's the first thing I saw it as. I thought it was a reject from the minting process.

You've got to be real careful with waffles. I actually have no preference whatsoever on those coins.

When we go to the Everglades, we are finally getting a real set on some of these that show the interaction.

Number 2 actually does show an unanticipated encounter. The encounter of someone viewing a bird that has to survive on habitat that is distinctly not human, but may be affected by humans. That really spoke to me.

The, you know, Number 4 - and all of these except for the alligator which has no theme, or the Native American which has no theme, the theme of orientation is evident in 4, 5 and 6.

Notice how the birds are looking, what their faces

are doing. There's some very interesting artistic work going in there.

That's all I really have to say, Gary. Thank you.

Chairman Marks: Thank you.

Heidi, are you prepared to give us your comments?

Ms. Wastweet: I am.

Chairman Marks: Please proceed.

Ms. Wastweet: Can you hear me all right?

Chairman Marks: Yes, we can.

Ms. Wastweet: All right. Well, a lot of really excellent comments have already come around the circle.

And I think that if the artists are really listening to our comments, they would know exactly what we're looking for in the future. It's just a matter of listening to our comments, because I think we're communicating very well what we want. A lot of excellent observations already.

To the Smoky Mountains, 1, 2 or 3, to me, are about equal. I don't - nothing new to add to those.

Number 4, I'm really against this design. I don't want to see fog on any of these designs, because that's just not something that's coinable.

On Shenandoah, I really don't like any of these. Number 4 is the closest one that works. Because the gesture of the hiker is recognizable at such a small scale, it works. But I still wish I could just zoom in on this design and it might work. Nothing here is really winning me over.

As I went through the series and I made notes on here to myself, I found myself writing the same note over and over on many of these. Too small, too small, too small.

These characters and images in the pictures are just simply too small and we've got too much going on for quarters.

On the Arches, I want to make a comment on Design Number 1. I believe this was a CFA preference; is that right?

Mr. Jansen: Right.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, it is.

Ms. Wastweet: Yes. The way that the image is orientated on the coin here is going to be a fabrication and coinability issue, because the mass of the arch is off to one side of the coin and it's touching the rim.

It's going to cause some metal flow issues. And to deal with that issue, the Mint is going to have to make the sculpt shallower to get the strike up. And of course we don't want to see shallower. We want a lot deeper.

So, my main concern with this piece is not so much the design as the metal flow and coinability. So, I recommend not going with Number 1 for that reason.

I agree with their other comments. We've already turned around about Design Number 2. I think it's iconic. I think it's coinable. It has good negative space. I think Number 2 is going to work well.

Skipping ahead to Sand Dunes, again I don't like any of these. The hikers are way too small to be visible on a quarter. Some of the drawings are nice.

If we were painting a mural, these would be great, but we're looking at a quarter. And I would rather see more flora and fauna rather than these vistas.

Number 1, I'm interested in the fact that it's stylized. It shows a variety of texture. The birds in the sky are ridiculously small.

It's on the right track. We're asking for stylization, and here we see stylization.

So, if I had to pick one of these, I would go with Number 1 for that reason. I'm not totally won over.

On the Everglades, finally I see here in Number 2, I see a design finally instead of just pictures.

We've been saying repeatedly we don't want storyboards, we don't want pictures, we don't want postcards. And here in Number 2, we finally have a design.

The elements are arranged in a very attractive fashion and this is very coinable. It has great negative space. Number 2 would be a fantastic design.

My only reservation is it's not very iconic to me as the Everglades. The alligators as has been mentioned before, much more iconic of Everglades.

So, I love the design of Number 2. The bird itself is a bit obscure. We have a chance for education to make people aware of this bird, and so that's interesting.

On Number 3, I like the subject matter. But as Michael Bugeja so well said, it's just not done well.

And then the Designs 4, 5 and 6, simply too much going on. And even though CFA likes Number 4, they had to resort to saying remove the cloud, which just shows that there's too much going on there.

The design might be okay without the cloud. It could be okay with that. I would rather have just seen that bird isolated by itself with some decorative grasses around its feet.

I think that was all the comments that I had.

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Heidi.

Before we move on - I'm going to ask Michael Ross to go next. But before we go on, just a program note that as soon as we're done with our comments here, I'm going to ask everyone to do their scoring.

Then, we're going to take a break and we've got some work to do offline downstairs with our passes.

So, anyway, with that, I just want to make the Committee aware of what we're doing next.

Michael Ross.

Mr. Ross: I would like to reserve my comments to the historical matters, and there's not a lot in these. So, I'll just quickly a comment on the Everglades, Coin Number 1, with the Calusa Indian.

I did not - I wasn't here during the narrative phase of this program, but the Native American tribe that I associate most closely with the Everglades are the Seminole who fought a tragic war with the U.S. military from 1835 to 1842 during the Indian Removal Act where the Choctaw and the Chickasaw and the Seminole and the Cherokee were removed from the south to Oklahoma that the Seminole didn't actually lose.

And I - my concern would be not that anyone would be looking at the narrative on this, but they would want to know what tribe that represents.

And by picking the Calusa, you're making the political statement, perhaps, that you're whitewashing American history to remove this tragic event by focusing on a tribe that just kind of disappears into the mists.

So, that's my only commentary.

Chairman Marks: Thank you.

Robert.

Mr. Hoge: My first observation is that we're seeing a series of beautiful drawings and poor coin designs,

just as a general observation.

I had a few things I'd like to note about some of the specific images, but -

Mr. Jansen: Use the mic.

Mr. Hoge: Okay, sorry. Pardon me.

I had mentioned that I see beautiful, beautiful drawings, but fairly poor coin designs as a rule here. I'd like to make just a few specific comments on each of the various Park series.

For the Great Smoky ones, I didn't find any of these particularly appealing. I think that Number 3 probably would work best if the size of the structure was reduced and the mountains were enlarged a little bit, and some of the busyness of the forest and the fence were perhaps reduced somewhat as well.

I agree with Heidi. It's not a very good idea to try to show fog or clouds and that sort of thing.

I think my personal view of the Great Smoky Mountains from what I've seen of them, is that you get an impression of vast distance from these great heights of mountains over a large, expansive territory.

And historic buildings are interesting, but really they're a series of shacks. And in Number 2, it looks like just like a little storage shed or something.

I know these are interesting and important to preserve, but I don't know. It doesn't say what it is.

The next series, the Shenandoah, these would really look just like the Great Smokies, except that the artist apparently has been instructed in each case to use the same perspective, essentially. Because all of these seem to show the same road and the same geographical features, but from slightly different angles and distances.

So, there's really not a lot to choose from here. I agree with everything that has been said about the problems with differentiating the textures of the foreground and the background, the mist and so on.

I would like to call attention to the fact that there's got to be some kind of problem between Numbers 4 and 5. One or both of them are out of drawing, because you see you're much closer to the subject in Number 5. And yet, the road is much farther in the distance.

And in Number 4, you see a much larger segment of highway even though the perspective is the same.

I look through all the designs for each issue in this entire project without reading the descriptions, first of all. I wanted to see it simply as a visual impact.

And my initial view was that, oh, well, this is Shenandoah. That must be the river.

In reading it over again I say, oh, now I understand why water is flowing upstream, because it's not the river. It's the road.

So, we have to bring a little bit of background information to interpretation of these.

I think perhaps 4 or 5 would work best if we have to select these, but I'm not too thrilled with any of them.

I wonder if there's only one point in the Shenandoah Valley that gives the perspective that is the feeling that seems to be what the park would suggest with these proposed images or the artists all felt there was only one area that should be explored.

For the Arches, I do agree with all my colleagues here that the negative space issue is very important.

I think that Number 2 is the strongest of the designs and that would receive my vote.

But, again, as far as the geology is concerned, I think all of these are really very attractively done.

For the Sand Dunes, actually being from Colorado, I tend to take exception to this program a little bit in the way it has been treated.

Number 6, for instance, looks to me immediately like the Clinton Inaugural Medal. This is a slightly different version.

Number 1 looks extremely stylized and it has so much black ink in it. I wonder what would be done to make that appear properly in an actual coin presentation.

The footprints of the characters in Number 2 seem to be suggesting that the hikers are aliens.

(Laughter.)

Mr. Hoge: They kind of duck walked.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Hoge: It's almost like they become very minuscule, and then their bodies become huge right afterwards. So, they must be walking on pinpricks of feet.

2 or 3 would both look better with no human images in them, I think. But then, again, the footprints would appear so small on an actual coin that it would be fairly pointless even to try to suggest them.

So, I really couldn't vote for any of these.

Mr. Hoge: I felt all the Everglades series ones were quite attractive drawings. I think the strongest of them was probably Number 3 simply because it is limited simply to the two reptilians.

My immediate problem is that, oh, great, this is an image of a crocodile and an alligator together and can see the anatomical differences. But then I

thought, wait a minute, some people may think that one is just incorrectly drawn as a version of the other.

So, this one would require a little bit of explanation as to which species is which.

But at any rate, I really like the idea that Mike had about showing the eyes of the crocodile or something like that. It is uniquely found in America in the Southern Florida region.

So, a crocodile - and of course the alligator is iconic for the Everglades and much of the south as well. So, I think something better could be done utilizing the reptiles.

Mr. Harrigal: Well, I'd like to interject one thing here that these two species, these two animals would not be found in the same environment.

So, they pulled us away from showing them in a natural habitat. That's why you have more of an abstract look here.

Mr. Hoge: Right. Well, I think rather than attempting to show them together, you can show something in a little bit of an environment maybe with some of the sawgrass showing and the eye and the nostril of the creature.

I like the idea that Michael Bugeja suggested, this idea of perspective. Maybe something a little bit more from the visual perspective of the reptile, one or both, could be a powerful image.

Number 2 is probably the best designed one of all of these. And yet, unless you have the explanation for this, this is just a poorly drawn version of the national bird turned into a Dr. Seuss creature that has a long proboscis hanging off its beak.

Just imagine this with a little bit of wear on the face, the bill or the snail, and you end up with something that looks preposterous.

So, whereas it's a beautifully drawn biological image, it might end up as a coin design that looks kind of ridiculous over time.

And people might just assume, oh, that's just a funny-looking eagle. It just doesn't look right for the American bird, because eagles aren't called for, of course, on our natural coinage - it would be a natural assumption to think that this is not a kite, but just a poorly done eagle.

A better choice for bird representation to be rendered more powerfully could be either the anhinga or the roseate spoonbill, I think, as shown here, but, again, they need to remove a lot of this busyness.

If the animal was shown from a somewhat different perspective perhaps closer to the water and even within the tip to show a reflection in the water of the legs of like the spoonbill, perhaps, something like that might be more effective maybe with a little bit of sawgrass. But, again, something that's very characteristic of the Everglades like the crocodile or the alligator.

And, again, I have to agree with Mike that showing the Indian, although it's a beautifully done Indian, this is something imaginary from 500 years ago. You're not going to go see this in the Everglades today.

That's it.

Chairman Marks: Okay, thank you.

Tom.

Mr. Uram: Okay, thank you.

The Great Smoky Mountain, I do like all of the designs and so forth. And with Number 3 there, I like it and I agree.

But when I think of the Smoky Mountains or you think of any parks, you think of cabins. So, I think

there's a lot of parks with a lot of cabins and maybe it's important for that in that particular area.

But I gravitate to the bears, but I agree with what Jeanne said, you know. A couple of my dogs look a little bit meaner than this bear.

And, you know, I think we're looking for maybe more of a Kodiak-type-looking bear and, you know, quite frankly maybe don't even have the cub, you know, maybe that's a way.

But when I think of the Great Smoky Mountains, I think of the bear. And I think if you could mean him up a little bit, I think you got it.

Mr. Olson: I know. Have him fight an alligator.

Mr. Uram: On the Shenandoah, my eye tends to gravitate a little bit better to Number 5. And being that I have a lazy eye, I use that jestingly.

But Number 5, I like the idea of the hiker coming towards the focal point. When I see that, envision it, I see the focal point being both the road and that perspective of reaching the top versus Number 4 where the hiker is already there at the pinnacle, my eye draws into the hiker and I don't see the rest.

So, I just like Number 5 from that perspective a little bit better. And I agree with the depth perception and so forth on the road and so forth.

On the Arches, I think it did come down to, I mean, they're all super in what we're trying to appeal to here, but I like Number 2 in regards to the historical factors that everyone has addressed as well.

The Sand Dunes, well, I agree with everyone in particular on that. It's tough to put into a coin the depth and the perception and so forth.

But if anyone has the depth and if it can be worked out, I do like Number 3 with the footprints and the person moving out a little bit further. I think I get a little bit more depth out of that one than I do any of

the other - it shows the vastness a little bit greater for me than the other ones do.

It's a pick that's tough on any of these, I think, but that was my reasoning behind that one.

And then moving along to the Everglades, I really liked 4, 5 and 6. And then I go back to Number 4 and I think not only would it be great on the coin itself, but if you could just have the two birds in the foregrounds and even take that other part of the Everglades out and the cloud, that whole back part and just have those two images with a little bit of foreground, I think it would be really nice looking on a quarter.

Chairman Marks: Thank you.

Michael.

Mr. Moran: Thank you, Gary.

I think maybe a preface before I go into these is in order. I really was disappointed with most all of the work.

There's only one design to me in the whole batch that pops out and really deserves to be implemented in its present form.

I'm discouraged when I see errors that I consider technical in nature that I don't think should reach us in the review process or the CFA, for that matter.

The highway being out of perspective in the Shenandoah Valley rendition, I think it's Number 4, is a good example of that.

I think that the little tiny people in the Arches areas that are stuck in there, will polish out on the dye quickly enough, but they don't need to be there to begin with.

And I have real reservations that these footprints in the sand are going to look like anything more than insect tracks running across the coin.

And another thing that completely frustrates me, we keep going in and seeing these designs, I've been on this committee now for a little more than a year, that are entirely, entirely too complex.

We've hit you today about restricting the design elements. The one on the Smoky Mountains with the salamander, the rushing water, the fog, the dogwood blossoms, dah-dah, dah-dah, dah-dah, it's gong to die on a quarter.

And looking at this one right here which is going to get my vote in Florida for the Everglades, you're going to have to reduce the vegetation underneath that bird or it's just going to blend in with the feathers on a quarter unless somebody puts their glasses on and really looks at it or it's a kid that still has eyesight. You've got to be aware of that.

And the clouds up there, I'm concerned that by the time you get through the engraving, they're going to be more dominant than they need to be. That being said, let me get into each one of the individual ones.

Returning to the Great Smoky Mountains, the bears. If you just had the two bears without the trees and the outline of the mountains in the background, it would work.

It's not exciting, but we've had some comments today about, well, we need a more fierce bear. By the time you get it down on the quarter, it's lost anyway.

But that's a design that tried to do too much and could have done so much with a little bit of effort. And as a result, it just doesn't work.

When you get into Numbers 2 and 3, I've been to the park and I understand about Cades Cove. It is spiritual there. It's quiet. It is beautiful, but Number 2 doesn't get it done. It looks like a shack.

It's not going to stand out on the coin, because it's

not set against negative space.

Number 3 comes a little bit better. But my eye when you look at this on a quarter, is drawn to the hawk, quote/unquote. You won't know what it is by the time you actually get it down on a quarter, but it should have been a crow, not a hawk.

The foliage behind the cabin if you drop that out, the cabin might pop a little more.

I understand the comments about the fence in the front. A little artistic license, it doesn't have to be an exact rail fence. Cut some of the rails out.

And I know the artists can do this. They understand that it's going on a quarter, not a silver dollar coin.

4 I've already beat up. I'm not going to beat up anymore. My vote is Number 3 with reluctance.

I don't like any of the Shenandoah coins. And of the ones that are up here, 4 frustrates me. I mean, it's a river flowing uphill. I'm not going to be able to get away from that from here on if the Committee actually picks it.

5 is a logical choice if we're not too heavy handed in engraving the silhouettes of the ridge lines behind Old Stony Mountain here. It is at least acceptable, and it does pop this rock formation out pretty well.

On the Arches, Number 2 is clearly, I think, a stellar design. I don't care that we've already had an arch on the state quarter. I don't care that it's been on their license plate. I've hiked the Delicate Arch three times, which I know is irrelevant, but it is a beautiful arch.

It views it from the right point. You're looking away from the bowl within which this arch sits and you get the silhouette against the negative space.

I like the way they've thrown it off balance. I'm sure Heidi will tell me it doesn't coin up, but I think it will, and it gets my vote, but let's go back and

take a look at Number 4.

What are we doing with the two people there? I mean, good grief. That is, to me, a frustration I have with the Mint staff that the artists don't get input as to this is not going to work and get it out of there.

We don't need to be even wasting our time making these kinds of comments. It just needs to go away before we see it, or the CFA.

(Off mic comments.)

Mr. Moran: Okay. Sand Dunes, I'm like Heidi. I'm sucked in by Number 1, the Baked Alaska version of the Sand Dunes.

I have no - I asked Don whether this would coin up in a way that it would look good. I'm sitting here squirreling around in my chair. I think it probably will in proof version.

I'm afraid that there's no way it will coin up in standard circulating format, but I'll probably give it some votes and just - but after that, the footprints in the sand are like ant tracks. The father and the son playing in the sand, it doesn't - it just doesn't get it for the Dunes. So, next.

The Everglades, I skipped right by the Indian. Number 2, I love the drawing in large scale, but my eye just deceives me. When you put it on a quarter, it looks like a bird with the damndest bill I've ever seen.

And I know that that's what the general public is going to look at it like that. That snail shell becomes an extension of the bird's beak.

And it's probably, as Robert said, not unique enough in its drawing to be recognized as an icon of the Everglades, even though it is. So, I've got to hesitate on that vote.

Then, you go to 4, 5 and 6. Forget the alligators,

guys, or alligator and croc.

Again, this one gets my vote, because the bird is reasonably well-silhouetted against negative space.

I think the artist needs to be aware there needs to be more silhouette so the bird pops. The spoonbill in the background as long as it's not overly engraved, is good.

I think you thin those horizon lines of the vegetation both in the foreground and in the background. The clouds need to go away, but let's look at 5 and 6.

How in the world are you going to show that on a quarter? The alligator is useless in the background. The trees would just camouflage the bird's beautiful wings.

If you did the bird by itself without all the trees, it would show and it would get my vote.

It frustrates me that we're seeing these kinds of flawed executions at this late stage in the process and having to choose and make these kinds of comments. And Number 6 is as bad as Number 5.

So, I'm sorry to be that negative with this, but it just - it deserves these kinds of comments.

Chairman Marks: Okay, thank you.

Erik.

Mr. Jansen: My comments are really going to focus on a few simple ideas. So, if you're scoring these as I talk, or have scored them, I'm going to ask you to just revisit the following thought: We don't have to make a recommendation.

So, if there's something you're defaulting to, don't give it a three. Give it a two or a one.

And if we come up shy, we have reinforced our statement, as I just heard, that maybe we're not totally happy with the artistic awareness of the full

mission here, that is, what's coinable and appropriate for the charge.

The messages I would also like to reinforce to the artistic participants is I hear continuously here, create some more negative space, use it for eye control, use it to pop the image and certainly it makes for a better proof.

Second of all with all due respect to the sculptor on these respective coins, I think there is a limit to what texture and variation in the relief can accomplish.

I just heard a discussion about a bird's wing, a beautiful Roseate Spoonbill, the bird's wings disappearing into the grass.

And if you are fearful of that effect, I hate to tell you Baked Alaska is never going to happen well.

Third of all, and this is an area where perhaps we as a Committee I know we aspire to, and I'd like to find the vehicle to accomplish it, and that is rather than supplying the artist with a simple handful of images, photographs as I think Shenandoah demonstrates, three of those drawings all came from the same photograph, clearly, because the contours in the rocks are identical, I think we can help by perhaps brainstorming or being part of the creation of the package to the artists by maybe listing 10 or 12 ideas for iconic or key images as opposed to here's a picture we want you to render in metal.

Having said that quickly to the Smoky Mountains, I end up with Item Number 1 for a simple reason. Our audience is going to go "Bears," and they get something from the image.

On the other ones, they don't get anything but a cabin -

Automated Operator: Please pardon the interruption. Your conference contains less than

three participants at this time.

If you would like to continue, Press star 1 now, or the conference will terminate.

Mr. Jansen: There we go.

Gary made some comments early on that we've already got the cabin on the back of some of the Lincoln pennies and I'll just stick with that.

I'm sorry that we're going to compete with the CFA on this one. Number 3 is artistically okay, but it's just not going to coin up. There's just too much there.

Is that an image of a bird flying? Is that an image of a cabin? Is that an image of how to build a hewn log fence?

On the next park, I'm going to - I'm going to reiterate this concept of can the Committee come up with a process to brainstorm some iconic ideas prior to the charge going out to interested artists? I think we would end up with totally different drawings in this case.

Did anybody notice that Drawing Number 3 has a farm in the distance? No. It disappears just as the road does.

I am less concerned with the road in Image Number 4 perspective-wise. I love the fact that we've got a hiker at the top. We don't see the perspective from the back. It's an action - active, energetic side profile and he's contrasted.

And I'm fine with the road down there. Put a stripe down the middle. It's not a river then.

I wish I could go with Number 5, but the hiker is - he contributes zero energy or pop to the coin.

Moving next to the Arches, it's between Two and Seven in my mind. When you look how Design Number 1 coins up, I'm sorry, but it's just weird-

looking.

I've got a circle of an arch competing with the roundness of the coin. It's off center. I'm glad to hear it won't coin up well, because I think visually it's kind of a disaster.

As Gary, our token Idahoan close to the area, described, that is an iconic arch in Two and Seven. It's the same arch from opposite sides.

I like the negative space of Number 2. If I could do one thing to Number 7, it would be to lower the profile of the mountain.

You almost could just pick up the graphic behind it and lower it to the same halfway point that the horizon line strikes across the arch in Number 2.

And I think you have a better coin in Number 7 that way, because the background is more consistent with canyon lands.

I think relief is absolutely key whether you go with Number 2 or Number 7, because it's going to be the difference between an arch that pops or just a confusing space visually.

Moving on, I - hmm. I would love to have seen a simple profile of a curvaceous crest of a dune.

If you were to look at Image 2, look at the way the dunes are cut in curvaceous ways along the top.

If we just had one of those, it would be, I think, an iconic design. We don't.

I go for Number 3, and it will look shabby in a proof coin, because there's no negative space whatsoever. So, let's change that.

Could we create the footprints in negative space so as to make them pop? Because footprints and maybe the curve is a little off, maybe we'll ask the artist to revisit that, maybe we ask the artist to lower his sideline a little bit to give us a touch of

sky, but footprints across sand, I know what that feels like. That's a hard hike.

Finally, in Florida, now here we have the - this is like the battle of the icons.

I wasn't for Number 4 until I heard the comment that the Anhinga is the iconic bird of the Everglades. The Spoonbill is kind of cool. You ever seen a bird like that? Heck no.

But the Anhinga hanging in the trees and the branches drying their wings, that is a strong image.

I wish I could go for Number 3. Symbol, negative space. It's a curvaceous S space, but can't do it.

Number 2, the bird, hey, it's a nice drawing of a bird. But when you shrink it to a quarter, it becomes a bird with that funky-hanging break. Somebody's going to think that's a broken dye. It pops great. It's just not an iconic image for the Everglades.

So, I would say go with Number 4 and love the fact the artist did not try to texture the water. We get the water by the ripple around the Roseate's legs.

Pull the cloud. Pull the horizon foliage. Pop the Anhinga, but give him some legs, will you? I don't see any legs on that bird. Maybe I'm crazy.

Thank you.

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Erik.

That completes our comments. We've had extensive comments. We've been going at it for pretty close to an hour and a half.

So, I'm going to take the dare that we've said all that can be said at this point. I'm going to ask everyone to fill out their sheets with their scores on them. When you're done, if you could pass those in to Erik.

What we're going to do now is we're going to - and, Heidi, I'm going to get your scores here in just a minute. So, hang there with me for a minute.

Once you've passed in your sheets here in a moment or two, I'm going to adjourn the meeting. And I think we should get with Greg and he'll have further instructions for what we need to do in our recess here.

And when we come back, we should have some scores on our assessment here on the quarters. We'll go through those, and then we'll move on, on our agenda.

We are in recess - oh, Heidi.

Ms. Wastweet: Yes, how about if I just call Erik and give him my score?

Chairman Marks: Okay.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 11:29 a.m. and went back on the record at 12:02 p.m.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. We're all here. Okay. We're coming back into session. We have our tallies on the quarters.

For Great Smoky Mountains, Design Number 1 was the highest score at 13. By Committee rule, we need to get to a majority of 50 percent plus one, and that would be a score of 16.

It seems that we have a possible high score of 30. So, Number 1 had the highest score. Didn't make the threshold of 13.

Design Number 2 received zero. Design Number 3 received 11. And Design Number 4, zero.

So, you know, let's do this orderly. Now that I've read off those scores, I want to ask the Committee to look, I mean, is there anything you want to do? Do we let this stand with no recommendation?

Do you want to approve one of these with changes, or do you want to ask for different designs?

Mr. Moran: Gary, I've got one observation on this. To the extent you tweak a design, I'm okay with it. That option is always out there.

But to the extent we have any major revisions, we've really crossed the line from our review function and I have problems with that and I'll vote against any major revisions.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I agree with that.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Well, can I have a motion then, I mean, if we want to stay without a recommendation, I'd like to have something productive come out of this, some feedback to the staff. Perhaps that feedback is, please give us different designs.

Is that the direction that we'd like to go?

Mr. Jansen: I think there is a common element of all four of these designs which came up a lot, and that is too much information, too complicated, not enough use of negative space to coin up well.

Chairman Marks: And that brings me back to my question and actually it kind of reveals my position. And that is, what do you think, folks? How about a motion to ask for more designs?

Mr. Hoge: I'll so move.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Olson: Second.

Chairman Marks: So, it was moved by Robert, seconded by Michael Olson, to request the Mint provide us different designs.

Could I ask the motion maker to include in there a request that we be provided more designs illustrating more balance between images and

negative space?

Mr. Hoge: Yes. I propose that.

Chairman Marks: I think that might be more helpful for follow-through. I mean, specifically, that's specifically what we would like, not simply more designs.

Male Participant: Less fine detail.

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Gary, since Number 1 received the majority of the votes, is it possible to recommend if they do come back with something, that they're going to come back with maybe a bear image?

The park supervisors seem to think that's important to, you know, the Great Smoky Mountains.

So, is it possible to suggest that if we have a revision, that it's a revision on that subject matter?

Chairman Marks: I think certainly there's a universe of possibilities on how the artist could respond to this, including the idea that they could come back with an image of a bear or bears.

We're just asking for whatever the artists come back with that they give us more balance between the images and negative space.

I don't think we want to get too specific in directing how the artists go about responding to our request for more designs. Simply, we want more designs with more balance in them and more, you know, we want simpler designs that fit better on a small planchet.

I think we want to leave all the possibilities in play, but certainly I - personally I would welcome more bears. I would welcome other animals or even buildings if they wanted to show us those buildings with more negative space.

Mr. Hoge: I like that too. I'd be careful with bears, because, you know, when you think of Smokey the Bear, well, that's not iconic for the Great Smoky Mountains.

Chairman Marks: Right.

Mr. Hoge: That's actual bears out of New Mexico.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, we've already had our discussion on it. I won't ask for more. I'll ask for a show of hands, and then I'll ask Heidi for her vote.

So, the motion is to request new designs giving more balance between the images and negative space and less fine detail.

So, all those in favor of that motion, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

Chairman Marks: And that is all yes's in the room.

Heidi.

Mr. Jansen: She may not be on. Let me -

Mr. Weinman: We just asked if she was on the call and it says, Erik was supposed to text me when the break was over.

Chairman Marks: Oh, oh, oh. Okay. That motion carries. We'll collect Heidi's vote when she gets on the line. We'll have to bring her up to speed. Meanwhile, I'm going to move on to the next quarter which would be Shenandoah.

Design Number 1 received zero. Design Number 2, zero. Design Number 3, two. Design Number 4, 12, and we have a winner. Number 5 at 17 just breaks over our threshold of 16.

So, with that one, I'll weigh in right away and I would like to have a motion to remove the hazy hills in the background so as that we still retain the

hillside that bears the road. But if we do away with the rest of the hazy mountains in the background, what we're doing is we're giving the rock formation a lot of punch.

And then the suggestion at the break was we ask for the hiker to be moved up more towards the top of the rock formation.

If there's an agreement on that, I would like that motion.

Mr. Olson: So moved.

Mr. Bugeja: Second it.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Moved by Michael Olson and, I'm sorry, who was the second?

Mr. Bugeja: I second.

Chairman Marks: Michael Bugeja was the second.

Heidi, are you on the line?

Ms. Wastweet: Yes, I'm on the line now.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'll bring you up to speed on the current issue. Then, I'm going to circle back on something we just accomplished.

We're on Shenandoah. Shenandoah, the only design that broke over our 50 percent threshold was Number 5 with 17 points. We needed 16 to get to threshold.

And so, we now have a motion on the table to recommend that the misty hills in the background, everything above the hillside that contains the road, be eliminated so that we have negative space all around the upper part of the rock formation.

And then, we would move the hiker up more towards the - going towards more of the top of the rock formation and that's the motion on the table now.

So, we're about to vote. Is there any further discussion?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Yes. I think that we need to reconsider that suggestion of moving the hiker.

I like the fact that the hiker is not the object of the design, but the rock is. And by having him to the side, I think we have made that distinction.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Bugeja: The problem that I have is that the hiker is too close to the tree. And I would like to eliminate - if we keep the hiker where he is according to Heidi's suggestion, I'd like to get rid of the tree.

I think it's superfluous, it's not going to coin well, it's going to look like an extension of the hiker.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Is the motion maker in agreement?

Mr. Olson: Yes, I'll modify my motion.

Chairman Marks: Okay. The motion and the second agreed to -

Mr. Olson: Eliminate the -

Chairman Marks: - to keep the hiker where he is. Eliminate the tree that surrounds him.

And so, then the motion is simply to remove the hazy hills and the tree. Leave everything else as is.

Mr. Hoge: Gary, can we make one additional point in this motion to obtain a clarification on the correct proportion of the size of the hiker is included?

Because if you look at Number 4 and compare that with Number 5, it looks like there really might be a problem there. What is the perspective of the actual size?

Chairman Marks: Simply to ask that proportions be

verified?

Mr. Hoge: That proportions be correctly verified.

Chairman Marks: Okay. The motion and the second, do you agree with that?

Mr. Bugeja: Yes.

Mr. Olson: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, the motion is to remove the hazy hills, the tree, and to ask that the proportion of the hiker to the rock formation be verified to be accurate.

Okay. We're all clear on that and I think - well, is there more discussion?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. Hearing none, Heidi, I'll get your vote in a moment. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. We got all yes's in the room.

Heidi.

Ms. Wastweet: Abstain.

Chairman Marks: Abstain. So, the motion passes with nine aye, and one abstention.

Heidi, we'll circle back here quickly for you. We had a motion on Great Smoky Mountain. On Great Smoky Mountain, Image Number 1 with the bears received 13 and that was the highest score.

So, of course it didn't make threshold. So, we had a conditional motion - wait a minute.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Chairman Marks: Yes - or, no, no. I'm sorry. I'll back up.

The motion was to ask the Mint for new images that offered more balance between images and negative space and less fine detail.

And that motion obtained nine ayes in the room, and you were not on the phone. So, I'd like to collect your vote on that.

Ms. Wastweet: I'll add my aye to that.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. So, that's a unanimous ten, zero.

Okay. So, let's move on now. We've got Heidi caught up. We've done Great Smoky Mountains, Shenandoah. We're going to Arches. This is the bright spot in today's quarters. I'll just start with Number 1.

Number 1 received six. The recommendation goes to Number 2 with 28 of 30 possible. So, that scored very high.

Design Number 3 received one. Design 4, zero. Design 5, one. Design 6, one. Design 7, four.

So, with Number 2 of the arches as a recommendation, are we standing - Pat.

Male Participant: We have no modifications.

Chairman Marks: I personally don't believe any are needed. I'm not seeing any from the Committee.

Okay. Then we are going to move on to Great Sand Dunes. Great Sand Dunes did not reach threshold on any of the designs.

Design Number 1 received three. Design Number 2 received four. Design Number 3 received nine. Four and Five both received zero. Six and Seven both received two.

So, the high score was nine for Number 3. So, we don't have a recommendation unless there is a motion to do something else, or we could also have a motion to ask for new designs.

Mr. Bugeja: I put forth a motion to ask for new designs.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Moran: Second.

Chairman Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded for new designs.

Does the Chair presume that we would have the same detail to that motion as Great Smoky Mountains in that we want more balance between objects and negative space and less fine detail?

Michael, is -

Ms. Wastweet: We could add to that to see some flora and fauna instead of the postcard scenery.

Chairman Marks: Well, it's up to the motion maker.

Mr. Bugeja: My motion is clear. I don't want any recommendations. I want new designs. I don't care for any of them.

Chairman Marks: You don't want to clarify that you -

Mr. Bugeja: No.

Chairman Marks: - want more negative space?

Mr. Bugeja: Oh, negative space is always good. The way you -

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, you want more balance between objects -

Mr. Bugeja: More balance.

Chairman Marks: - and negative space?

Mr. Bugeja: Yes, absolutely.

Chairman Marks: Less fine detail?

Mr. Bugeja: Yes, just the way you said it the first time.

Chairman Marks: Okay, but you don't want to deal with the flora and fauna.

Mr. Bugeja: No, no.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, the motion is simply new designs seeking more balance between negative space and objects, and less fine detail. Okay.

Mr. Moran: That's good for me.

Chairman Marks: And that's good with the second, okay. So, that's the motion, folks.

What comments do we have?

Mr. Olson: I just have a comment on Number 3. I'd just like to explore if there might be any interest in recommending a modification of that to gain support.

Chairman Marks: Okay. You know what I'd suggest, Mike, in the event that this motion passes -

Mr. Olson: Right.

Chairman Marks: - you might want to go on record how you might change that design. So, even if this motion were to prevail, it would be on the record for the artist to know of some thoughts.

Because I know thoughts you have, that there are others on the Committee who kind of share those thoughts.

So, why don't you enlighten us with your ideas on Number 3?

Mr. Olson: You know, I like Number 3 with changes.

It's a little bit out of the box, which we've been asking for. Again, the entire circle is filled with images, which I don't particularly care for.

The thing I do like is it's Great Sand Dunes. In defense of the artist, that's a tough assignment to crack. It's sand dunes.

Here, we've got a scene where you've got a hiker hiking across the Sand Dunes.

And my opinion, I think those footprints while they are somewhat out of perspective, they're a nice touch. And if they could be modified to correctly display the way that they should look in a sand dune, granted they are a small item and it may not make that much difference, that would be a neat coin, in my opinion.

To get rid of the mountains in the background, make the hiker a little bigger, maybe decrease the amount of footprints so you've got some perspective there, that's out of the box. That's something that I think would -

Mr. Bugeja: I'm going to share my comments to Mike when he tries to promote those ideas that I'm totally in disagreement with that.

First of all, the footprints don't have the elevation and geometric perspective of the rise and fall of the dunes. It looks like rim damage from a reeded edge of another coin in a bag. And I just think that it's off - actually, this is out of order. We should vote on -

Chairman Marks: Just having a discussion. Your motion is on the table.

Okay. Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Hoge: I'd also like to add really if you eliminate the mountains, that's going to take this out of Colorado. Because the setting for the Sand Dunes is - they're very much in the mountain.

Chairman Marks: Okay. All right. I'm going to call the question. Heidi, I'll collect your vote in just a moment.

All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

Chairman Marks: Six ayes. And those opposed.

(Show of hands.)

Chairman Marks: I've got one.

And, Heidi, what's your vote?

Ms. Wastweet: Aye.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, we've got - what do we got? We got seven - okay. We're missing -

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I abstain.

Chairman Marks: All right. We have two abstentions. Okay. The vote is seven aye, one nay, two abstention. Motion carries.

That takes us on to Everglades. We have a winner here and I'll just run in numerical order.

Design Number 1 received zero. Design Number 2 received three. Design Number 3 received one. Our recommendation goes to Number 4 with 20 of 30 possible points.

Design Number 5 received five. And Design Number 6 received one. So, I'll ask the Committee to turn their attention to Number 4.

Based on our discussion earlier, I'm making an assumption that you'd want to have a motion to ask for some changes here similar to our - maybe similar and maybe expanding upon our CFA colleagues.

Mr. Olson: I agree with Erik. It doesn't look like that bird's got any legs.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm going to suggest we get - can we get a motion on the table, and then we can discuss it at further length?

Mr. Olson: I make a motion to eliminate the clouds in the background, the excessive foliage and add some limbs to the bird.

Mr. Uram: Second.

Chairman Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to remove the clouds, excessive foliage, and what was the last part?

Mr. Olson: Legs.

Chairman Marks: And put legs on the bird.

Let me ask you when you say "foliage," do you mean the horizon image that kind of cuts across the bottom of the bird's throat?

Mr. Olson: I'm more concerned with what's underneath the bird.

Chairman Marks: Where?

Mr. Olson: Underneath the bird.

Chairman Marks: That foliage there?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I think you need to keep that foliage.

Male Participant: I think you need to get rid of the other.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I think the top foliage -

Chairman Marks: Okay. The idea here - let me ask this. I want this to be clear to everybody and to the artist.

What the motion is trying to do is to clarify the bird and give it more pop, right?

Mr. Olson: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, maybe the motion could simply be to remove the clouds and adjust the surrounding images to give the bird more prominence and maybe surround it with a little more negative space.

Is that where we're trying to go with it?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Can I just add one more thing?

I think the suggestion was to remove the foliage around the bird. I'm assuming in the lower part of it.

I think if you put legs on him, I think he needs those branches to balance on, stand on.

So, I would try not to address that foliage.

Chairman Marks: Yes, I think that foliage adds -

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Yes, I think we need that.

Chairman Marks: - some much needed -

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Yes. It's the horizon, you know, underneath the cloud. That one thing could be, I think, eliminated.

Chairman Marks: Well, I mean, you could add legs to this bird without messing too much with the foliage.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Exactly. Oh, exactly. I think so.

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Mr. Harrigal: I'd like to address the issue of - sorry, I turned my mic off.

There are no legs on the bird intentionally, because it's taking flight. So, its legs are tucked in at this point. That was intentional by the artist and

verified by the park.

So, I mean, if you want to make him look like he's standing on the island, we can do that, but it's intentional to be that he's beginning to take flight there.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Okay. Thank you, thank you.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Was that your motion?

Mr. Olson: I don't even know what it was now. I mean -

Chairman Marks: Yes, there was a motion and I was trying to get it clarified.

Mr. Olson: To add legs to the bird. But if that's what he looks like when he takes off, if that's an accurate representation, then it -

Chairman Marks: Okay. Then we just want to do something with the background that kind of subtracts from the pop, if you will, of the bird.

Mr. Olson: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Without getting too detailed about that, I think certainly that includes we want to get rid of the clouds.

Mr. Bugeja: Gary, I have a very brief suggestion -

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Mr. Bugeja: - on it and you people don't have to like it. It's just an artistic suggestion.

If you could switch "Florida" and "E Pluribus Unum" on the coin, you can do something to accentuate flight by having the wing, the right-facing wing go over the rim outline.

I've seen that done on some Mint coins where it not only pops out, it pops out over the frame.

It would give the - you can't do it because it would

block "Unum." But if you switch "E Pluribus Unum" and "Florida," there would be white space where that right wing is.

And if you just put the tip of it over the rim, it would not only give it pop. It would be flying out of the frame.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Michael, I appreciate what you're saying. I would ask that maybe we handle that as a separate motion -

Mr. Bugeja: Okay.

Chairman Marks: - after we're done with this one.

Mr. Bugeja: Sure, sure.

Chairman Marks: That's a fundamentally different question, because then we're changing the template -

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Template, right.

Mr. Bugeja: That's fine.

Chairman Marks: - that the whole series has been compliant with. So, let's deal with that. I don't want to sweep that under the rug at all. Let's deal with it, but I'd like to go ahead and act on this motion to kind of clean up some of the background information and help clarify the bird.

So, I don't have a second on this motion yet.

Mr. Uram: I seconded.

Chairman Marks: Who did? Tom.

Okay. Are we clear on the motion?

Mr. Jansen: Repeat it so I can get it right.

Chairman Marks: Okay. The motion is to remove the clouds and then generally to address the foliage in the background horizon such as to emphasize the bird in a more contrasting way.

Mr. Jansen: Okay. And that's the horizon foliage.

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Mr. Jansen: Not the foliage under the bird.

Chairman Marks: Not the foliage under the bird.

Mr. Jansen: And are we giving this bird legs, or is he flying?

Mr. Bugeja: He's flying.

Chairman Marks: I think he's flying.

Male Participant: Just make sure that it's corrected then.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, that's been clarified.

Mr. Moran: We're open for comments?

Chairman Marks: Go ahead, Michael.

Mr. Moran: I am, in theory, in favor of the motion. However, I think that we are trying to, again, micromanage this design a bit too much.

In looking at the bird and shutting out of my eye the foliage down there and realizing that there are no legs, it just looks a little unnatural to me.

I really think that the better approach to this is to ask the designer to go back and give us two or three more renditions of this emphasizing an increase in the negative and let the designer work this out rather than trying to do it by Committee motion.

Chairman Marks: Okay. That's a different approach if -

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I sort of disagree with that. I think what we have in front of us is quite nice and very elegant. And if we just recommend the buzz in the background there to drop out, I don't think we have to ask for a new design.

Chairman Marks: Okay. You know, we need to deal with the motion on the table. So, I'm going to try to dispense of that now.

I want to make sure I don't run over anyone. If there's no further discussion, I'm going to call the question.

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. And, Heidi, I'll collect yours in just a moment.

All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand. We've got one, two, three, four, five, six in the room aye. Opposed, one. One opposed. And do we have abstentions in the room? We have two abstentions in the room.

Heidi, your vote.

Ms. Wastweet: Abstain.

Chairman Marks: Abstain. Okay. Motion carries on a six to one with three abstentions.

Okay. That completes our review and recommendations on the America the Beautiful quarters for 2014. We're going to break for lunch now. We're going to budget into the schedule an hour and 15 minutes for lunch, which means that we will be back here at 1:45.

Please be back promptly. We've put ourselves in good position for the afternoon to deal with the platinum and the code talkers. And then I hope to have a thorough discussion on the 2012 annual report.

So, please be back here promptly at 1:45 ready to go, and have a good lunch. We are in recess.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 12:28 p.m. for a lunch recess and went back on the record at 1:50 p.m.)

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2013
American Eagle Platinum Program-Ron Harrigal,
Acting Chief Engraver

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm going to call this meeting to order now that I have a quorum.

Next item - oh, actually, before we go on to the next item, I have a note that somebody left their coat on the fifth floor. That must be from our admin meetings.

So, if you're missing your coat, see Carol for retrieval. So, there you go.

All right. Next item on our agenda is the review and discussion of candidate designs for the 2013 American Eagle Platinum program.

Mr. Harrigal.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. Thank you, Gary.

Okay. The legislation that authorizes us to mint these coins, 31 USC 5112(k), grants authority to the Secretary of Treasury to mint and issue platinum bullion coins and proof platinum coins. The specifications and design are left to the Secretary's discretion.

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

In 2009, the U.S. Mint introduced a new six-year platinum proof coin series that explores the core concepts of the American democracy by highlighting the preambles to the United States Constitution. The program examines the six principles of the preamble.

In 2009, to form a more perfect union. In 2010, to

establish justice. 2011, to ensure domestic tranquility. In 2012, to provide for the common defense. In 2013 which is what we're reviewing this meeting, to promote the general welfare. And then in 2014, to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Okay. I have the obverse on the screen. The obverse of both a bullion and the proof shown in the proof finish.

The reverse designs for this program have been inspired by a narrative prepared by the Chief Justice of the United States for each principle.

Previous designs on the reverse have featured eagles supporting the American Eagle brand. And to balance the goals of brand identity and artistic freedom, the American eagle privy mark appears on the reverse design of the coin.

Design concept in 2013, we are looking to promote the general welfare with the required inscriptions, United States of America 0.9995 platinum, \$100 in numeral form and one ounce.

So, let's look at the designs. Okay. We have four designs we're looking at here - we actually have more than four.

These are the previous ones that we had for the previous four years; the more perfect union in the top left; establish justice, top right; domestic tranquility, bottom left; and the common defense on the bottom right.

Okay. These are our design candidates we're reviewing today. Design Number 1 features two American bald eagles in the process of constructing their nest.

And we have a series here with the representation of young America looking into the unforeseeable challenges of the future as she contemplates the balance of power between the states and the

national governments.

This is the first version. CFA recommended this with removal of the stars and the background image there.

Design Number 3, a variation of Two with young America contemplating the balance of powers with the - symbolized by the gears with 13 stars and other interlocking gears.

Design Number 4, a variation of Two. A sculptor down in front of the design there in the foreground area symbolizes the people shaping and forming the government.

Design Number 5, Liberty is shown with a full cornucopia to the eagle. Design Number 6, Liberty is shown with a cornucopia to a studious child cradling a book.

Design Number 7, two people carrying a basket laden with fruit. Design Number 8, an apple given to another symbolizes the promoting of the general welfare for all.

Design Number 9 is the stylized version, five figures representing the ideas that collectively define the phrase "promoting the general welfare." The standing figure holds wheat for prosperity. The seated figure holds a cornucopia and a dog, abundance in peace. And three small figures that are engaged in activities of personal interest, content and knowledge that they are safe.

Okay. So, we have nine designs we're looking at. The coin specifications are 1.287 inches in diameter. 0.9995 platinum. And with a weight of 1.005 troy ounce.

Gary, I'll turn it over for -

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Ron.

Do we have any questions of a technical nature or interpretive nature as far as the images that we've

been presented with?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Nothing? Amazing.

Okay. Michael Ross has asked if he could start off our discussion today. I think he's got something interesting to enlighten for us.

So, I'm going to start with Michael. And then what I'm going to do is I'm just going to work right down the line here. Heidi, sometime between me starting and me ending, I'm going to work you in.

So, go ahead, Michael.

Mr. Ross: Thank you.

Aside from that, students of history who look at this page are going to take away a somewhat different meaning.

Ms. Wastweet: I can't hear you, Mike.

Mr. Ross: How about now? Can you hear me now?

Ms. Wastweet: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Ross: Students of history are going to take away a somewhat different meaning from this, because the cause to promote the general welfare appears twice in the Constitution, the Preamble and in Article I, Section 8, where Congress was given the power to tax to promote the general welfare.

And that phrase set off a titanic struggle, a founding of the nation in Washington's cabinet between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton who had very different visions for the country.

And Hamilton viewed the phrase "to promote the general welfare" as an empowering phrase that will allow the government to fund industries, to build a national bank, to build a mighty army.

And Thomas Jefferson saw it as a qualifying phrase

that meant that they could only tax for things that everyone agreed was for the general welfare and not special interests like industry or banks or finance, et cetera.

And when you look at these designs, you see about half of them - oh, and the other point is, is that Jefferson - where Hamilton wanted a nation of cities and factories and a standing army, Jefferson wanted a nation of farmers, of yeoman farmers, of agriculture. He hated cities, didn't want a standing army.

And when you look at these designs, half of them seem to be celebrating the Hamiltonian vision even though these interlocking gears might be viewed by some people as people pulling together.

If you see to promote the general welfare and the interlocking gears and the gentleman with the hammer, that's industry. That's Hamilton's vision, the vision that eventually won for the government.

And the second half are all agricultural and promote the general welfare that's celebrating a Jeffersonian vision for the country.

So, I don't know if the artist had a Hamiltonian versus Jeffersonian battle down in the art room, but that's what's coming out on this page.

So, know as you're voting if you're voting some of these, you are endorsing the Hamiltonian vision. And on some of them, you are endorsing a Jeffersonian vision.

Any of the bottom three would be explicitly Jeffersonian. The last one combining elements of the New Deal, the Soviet Arts and Japanese Anime, but they seem to be coming at it from those directions.

Number 3 and Number 4 would be unmistakably a Hamiltonian to promote the general welfare.

So, that's my textural comments.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Michael, Thank you. And before we move on further, what I want to do is I want to go through the process that we're familiar with and see which ones we want to really drill down on.

And if there are some of these designs that there just is no interest on the Committee, then I think we can use our time more efficiently and identify those now.

So, you know the drill. As I hold up each of these, I'm going to ask for a show of hands or an indication, at least, if there's interest in further consideration.

So, Number 1. Okay, we have interest.

Number 2, interest in that?

Yes.

Number 3, I'll say there's interest in Number 3.

Number 4, yes.

Number 5, I don't see an indication on Five. So, we'll set that one aside.

Number 6, okay. We're setting Six aside.

Number, 7, yes, interest?

Mr. Ross: Gary, can I get Five in too? Sorry.

Chairman Marks: You want Five?

Mr. Ross: Yes, I'm sorry.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, so far we've only eliminated Six. Okay. So, we've got Seven had interest.

Eight, interest in Eight? Going, going, gone.

And interest in Nine, okay. We're setting Nine aside also.

So, we are left with One, Two, Three, Four, Five and Seven. So, I'll ask the Committee since we've already done this drill, that we focus on those that we indicated we are interested in.

So, with that, I will now ask Robert for his comments.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Mr. Hoge: I think the eagles in Number 1 are a replay of items which we've seen on U.S. coins in the past.

Number 2 and Number 3 have the same image, both with what could be an attractive backdrop.

I think Number 4 is a horrible thing. It looks like some kind of a nasty-looking primitive surgeon spiking this woman in the behind.

(Laughter.)

Mr. Hoge: Number 5 and Number 6 are extremely classical. If anyone is devoted to the classical cornucopiae, you know they're very jejune. They show Liberty wearing a Phrygian cap rather than the Pilea, which is the truth symbol cap of liberty from the Roman Republic.

The basket of fruits I think is probably my favorite of these. And that's it.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Thank you, Robert.

Tom.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Chairman Marks: Are you on?

Heidi, do you hear Tom?

Ms. Wastweet: No, I do not.

Mr. Uram: That did it. All right. You're terrific. Magic touch.

Ms. Wastweet: That's good.

Mr. Uram: Well, speaking of engineering, I guess I'm going towards Hamilton here. I do like Number 2 and Number 3.

I'm leaning more towards Number 3. I don't know if its because I'm a Rotarian and that kind of takes care of the lions and the Rotary, but I'll just suffice to say that I like Number 3.

Chairman Marks: Okay, Michael.

Mr. Moran: Being from Lexington, I'm going to support Henry Clay and the American Plan, which is the offshoot of Hamilton.

But, anyway, I like the drafting of the woman in Two, Three and Four. I'll pass on the sculptor there and what he's up to.

But, again, I like Number 3 above all. I like the gears. To me, they symbolize turning and progress. And with progress comes promoting the general welfare. You always have to have growth.

So, I'm for Number 3.

Chairman Marks: Erik.

Mr. Jansen: Well, this coin is obviously at the very top of what the Mint produces. And so, I think in my mind it's always a battle between classic and regal.

Obviously, Two and Three are both kind of the classic approach. I would argue we've got to do something about the rendering defect in here.

If you look at the junction of the skirt and the rock outcropping, I don't think that's the most attractive of all. I think there's an artifact of either the rocks or the skirt when the artist used his tools to merge

them.

So, if we end up on Two or Three, for that matter, Four, I would just like to say let's make that a little more attractive than it is now.

I don't really go for Number 3. It's very busy and I personally don't really see the symbol in the gears. It's very industrial-looking.

But the industrial portion of it strikes me as, quite frankly, in conflict with the classic nature of the portrait. The two just don't work in my head.

The graceful, windswept chiffon or other material she's wearing versus the hard, greasy gears, geez, it just kind of doesn't work for me.

On the regal score, there's something about Number 1 that I like. Now, at the back of the head, it seems to me that the left-right dimension of the head on that eagle is just kind of awkward, but maybe that's the artist's rendering.

I would have made the head a little bit shorter and cut the left portion of the head just a little bit shorter.

I also happen to like Image Number 7. I think the symbology of being fruitful with two hands coming down may be a symbol that works for me.

That feels kind of modern and regal, or modern and gracious, which I think this coin deserves.

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Erik.

I suppose I have a technical question I should have asked earlier. I'm going to focus on Number 3.

I'm assuming that the letters that are juxtaposed over the raised elements like the U in "United," the one ounce 0.9995 and the P and L are all going to be incused, no?

Mr. Everhart: Raised.

Chairman Marks: Pardon me?

Mr. Everhart: Raised.

Chairman Marks: Raised. Raised against - oh, okay. All right.

Mr. Everhart: If they were incused, they would be black.

Chairman Marks: Well, I know, but I just didn't know if it was given to us accurately.

Mr. Harrigal: I think during the coining phase in that we may have to take a look at that one way or the other. Because in the proof version if you can't read them as raised, we're going to have to revert back.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: We didn't want to do that up front right now or commit to it.

Chairman Marks: Yes, you get no objection from me. I think that would be a beautiful contrast.

So, I want to talk about Number 3 and focus my comments on Number 3. Whoever did this one, thank you. I think this is absolutely gorgeous.

I think that with all of my pleading for allegory and devices that kind of carry the message without having to have text on a coin, I think you really got it here.

I see the harshness between the elegance of the woman and the industrialness of the gears, but I see that as the visionary of the young country opposed to the reality and the grit of getting the job done.

The gears as I look at the text, symbolize the inner workings of state and local government with the federal government, with the gear with the stars on it being the federal government, and those gears

working together to serve the people and address the general welfare.

The young America image looking out to the future, that fact that we've got the rock outcropping that breaks the border here along with the drapery in her hand, I'm going to ask the Committee to envision this in a proof with these negative spaces being the mirrored and these other raised images being a wonderful white frost.

This is a gorgeous coin. This is an iconic, truly American image that portrays something important about who we are and does it in a very artistic and very original way.

I love this. I love this design and I'm going to ask my colleagues if you're vacillating between Two and Three, please, if I can twist your arm, would you please just go to Three?

(Laughter.)

Chairman Marks: I would like to have this be the one that we do so that I can then recommend it for our examples of coin excellence and put it in our catalog that we have of coin design excellence, because I feel very strongly about this one.

Mr. Jansen: Where did you have lunch, Gary?

(Laughter.)

Chairman Marks: Yes, well, I know I'm disagreeing with you on this one, but I think the contrast like you were talking about, the harshness of the gears and so forth, I think the contrast there is wonderful. It really speaks to the reality of the vision as opposed to the hard work and I get into this one, obviously.

The others are fine. A lot of good artwork here with all of them. Compliment the artist on all of these designs. I think good work was done here. There's lots of negative space, which we really talked a lot

about ad infinitum with the National Parks, and here we have it.

So, this is good stuff, but I'm going to be supporting Number 3. So, with that, Mike Olson, before I go to you, I want to ask Heidi if she can weigh in.

Ms. Wastweet: Well, I'm going to first off say that this was an extremely difficult subject matter. It was very difficult to portray.

And I'm going to agree with you, Gary. I like Design Number 3. Artistically, I think it's really beautiful. Envisioning it as a coin, it's going to look even better than the drawing. That's what I'm looking at.

I, too, like the contrast of the softness of Liberty versus the harsh gears. I also love the interesting negative spaces here, the fact that it's not a scene, a picture. It's symbols and design. So, artistically, I love Design Number 3.

Design Number 2, I think, is too obscure. I think it doesn't have enough message. I don't know what - she's just looking off into the future and it's not really enough for me.

Design Number 1, I like the symbology of the nest, but you really can't see the nest. And that bothers me that you can't - you just see branches and I don't really get nest from that.

Design Number 4, I don't think, gets the message across as clearly as Design Number 3.

Number 5, I like the idea of the cornucopia, but the gesture here is not working for me. The Liberty looks like she's keeping the cornucopia away from the eagle. And the eagle is not happy about that.

(Laughter.)

Ms. Wastweet: So, a gesture is very important. And so, I am not in support of Five.

Number 7, to me, is too strong in the agricultural message. And, to me, says charity rather than general welfare.

When I think of general welfare for the country, it is more of a progress, industrial, roads, buildings, jobs. And of course job creation is the hot topic currently.

So, that brings me back to Number 3 symbolically, as well as artistically. I'm on board with that.

I think that's all I have.

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Heidi.

Ms. Wastweet: Oh, I just want to say that - I just want to say one more thing. There was a comment about the way the rock met the drapery of her clothes.

I think that's not going to be a problem once the sculptor puts their finesse there.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Thank you, Heidi.

Mike Olson.

Mr. Olson: Okay. Promote general welfare. The eagle is there. A lot of what Heidi said, I know she's many miles away, but she must be reading my mind today because a lot of the comments she made are very similar to my thoughts.

Number 1 is a nice design. I just don't get the message from that.

Number 2 is a very nice design as well, but it doesn't tell me anything about general welfare or promoting general welfare. My preference would be for Number 3. You've got ideals that the country aspires to. You've also got the hard work and the things that actually need to be done, which sometimes aren't easy things to do and is a clear path, which represents the gears, getting it done.

I share the vision that I think that coin would be very awesome when it's rendered in metal. Especially in the proof version, which it will be. I think it would be very attractive.

Number 4 looks scary to me. That's a creepy-looking coin. Not much more I can say about that.

Number 5, I share Heidi's concerns that it looks like the food is being kept away from the eagle, but it also looks like that's a pet eagle. And that's not the way I'd really want to see an eagle on one of our coins.

Let's see. The other one, Number 7, again I agree strongly with Heidi. It's a basket of fruits and vegetables. It does not really convey what it is.

And, again, as she stated, it would appear if you knew somewhat of the theme of this coin, it would appear to be charity rather than industrious working and building like Number 3.

So, my main support is going to be going for Number 3, with the provision that something be done with the robes as has been previously stated.

Chairman Marks: Jeanne.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Thank you, Gary.

I'm in agreement with what's been said already. I think the eagle is beautifully rendered, but I don't think it really addresses what we want to do.

And that really is an eagle's nest, I think. They do build their nests kind of wildly and strangely. So, I'm not opposed to that. It's just that I think that Number 3 really is a better medal.

I like the fact that the figure Liberty is really centered, you know. She's there. And I think that the gears around her are, you know, they are kind of working toward the future there. They're kind of mobile.

It reminds me more like of a train or a locomotive or something going forward and I like that very much. I like that she's in the center.

I also think to address what Michael said about Jefferson and Hamilton, to me this medal combines the two of the strong industrial imagery, as well as the agricultural imagery.

So, she tends to give me a little bit more agrarian feeling and brings the two together. So, I like this coin very much.

The others, certainly the basket of fruit is lovely and well-rendered, but, you know, I don't think that this is for - good for this purpose. And I do agree with Heidi with the pet eagle and the cornucopia kind of like a dog.

So, I am going with Number 3. It's quite an interesting medal.

Chairman Marks: Michael.

Mr. Bugeja: As for Image Number 1, we've done that three or four times in the Bald Eagle series. So, I have no use to see it done again. We even had baby eagles.

For a historical factor while I agree with my colleague Michael Ross, I would also point out that Jefferson and Hamilton were interpreting Benjamin Franklin, the 1854 Albany Plan, when he really shaped our civic values.

Our civic values is concern for those who come after us. That's definitely Franklin. Some societies have no concern for those who come after us.

The majority rules, but the minority must be heard. No one is above the law. These are all Franklin ideas.

And I think that when you look at it in that light without the politics of Jefferson versus Hamilton, you can actually put some of these designs into a

more unified social context.

If the CFA on Number 2, if the CFA's choice is chosen, which it very well might be because that is a beautiful, elegant design, it's not my favorite.

I'm going to talk about Number 3, which is my favorite. But I want to point out something on this if it is indeed the chosen design.

If you take a look at Number 3 and the framing of Number 3, you have - if you can go to Number 3, you see how the cloth comes under the U and there's a frame in there?

Now, if you take that, if you get rid of the stars in particular and if you get rid of that island, then I would try to take a look at that with a frame.

In other words, you see this right here, this frame right here where it goes like that? And then you have the overlap there.

If you just take that and put it on Number 2 and you get rid of the stars and all, it will actually be - have more of a depth of field, but that's just for the Mint to consider a variation of that.

I like Number 3 a lot. The things that are interesting to me is that if you - if Michael Ross hadn't brought up Hamilton and Jefferson, to me it would have looked like the gears of a timepiece. And I'm not so sure that that's what those are.

The gears of a timepiece with her looking forward actually do represent the fullest extent of concern for those who come after us and provide for the general welfare. So, I really like this design for another reason. I saw that as a timepiece.

It might be interesting in terms of depth of field to soften those gears a little bit. Because I think from an artistic perspective basis, that it almost - I don't see any depth of field.

In other words, it seems to me that the gear on the

left is bigger than the gear on the bottom right, except the gear on top of that bottom right is two-dimensional.

And if it's meant to give a 3D effect, you might want to take a look at shading and see if that can do it.

As for on Number 4, sometimes when you're dealing with iconic images and you include too many more of that, that looks like the Greek half man/half horse although you can't see the horse.

You also have a man sculpting a woman, and there's something about that that just grates me, in keeping with the metaphor, the wrong way.

As for the others, I just don't think that they encompass concern for those who come after us in providing for the general welfare.

And the apple, for instance, you know, has everything from a biblical image, the unbitten apple being offered, to - it is also symbolically inconsistent with what we're trying to portray.

That's all.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I think that brings us to a conclusion.

Did we have any quick follow-ups? And I do mean quick.

Mr. Jansen: Relative to Design Number 2 if you like that, does it need a horizon line continued to the left of the portrait as well?

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Chairman Marks: Perhaps I would suggest that we go ahead and do our tally of Number 2 as the chosen design. Then, let's take up that issue. Otherwise, it's moot.

Okay. So, I'm going to ask all members to tally your scores. Pass them in to Erik. And when he

has a total, we'll report back. And then maybe if there are any motions at that point, we'll take those up.

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the Code Talkers Congressional Gold Medal (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe)-Ron Harrigal, Acting Chief Engraver

Chairman Marks: So, with that, that brings us to review and discussion on the candidate designs for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Code Talker Congressional Gold Medal.

Yes, Heidi, do you want to call Erik, or do you just want to tell us?

Mr. Wastweet: I'm texting him right now if he'll have his phone on.

Chairman Marks: Okay. It's in the text.

Okay. So, if we could move on to the Code Talker medal, Ron.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay. They're bringing it up now. One second. Okay. All right. We've got it.

Okay. The legislation Public Law 110-420 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike congressional medals to recognize the dedication and valor of Native American code talkers to the United States Armed Services during World War I and World War II.

These gold medals will be produced for each Native American tribe that had a member who served as a code talker.

Silver duplicate medals will be presented to the specific code talkers or their next of kin. And bronze duplicates will be produced for sale to the public.

The process that we used on this and are using is

these. The Deputy Secretary of Defense prepared a list of identified code talkers, which will be continuously updated as new members are identified.

To date, the list has grown from 22 to 25 tribes. And from 180 individuals to 200 individuals.

Each tribe was contacted to establish a design concept and an appointment of an official liaison who worked directly with their tribal historian and other experts for design reviews.

The Department of Defense designated the U.S. Army Center of Military History as our liaison.

This team completes historical accuracy reviews of the military uniforms and equipment seen on the obverse designs.

And the obverse design concept is representative of code talkers' dedication to military service.

And the reverse designs feature iconic symbols or elements unique to the tribe, including their tribal seal or selected elements from their seal.

There is no legislatively required inscriptions. However, for design consistency the obverse designs feature the tribe name, Code Talkers and, if desired, a language inscription unique to the tribe.

The reverse inscriptions are "World War I" and/or "World War II" as applicable, and "Act of Congress 2008."

Today's meeting, we will review the obverse and reverse designs for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.

So, the obverse designs, we have three candidates. They all feature similar items here.

Inscriptions "Lakota Code Talkers" and "Standing Rock Sioux Tribe." And they feature the code talker transmitting on a radio.

So, the first one with a silhouette backdrop of the soldiers, the second one with two code talkers there, which is the preference of the tribe, and the third being a single code talker.

As far as the reverse designs, we have two versions of the seal and seal elements. The tribe prefers Version 1 here, which is more representative of the seal. Number 2 with the silhouette of riders and buffalo. And here's an image of the seal.

I'll turn it over to the Committee for comments.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, the tribe prefers Obverse 2 and Reverse 1.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Are there any technical questions?

Mr. Hoge: I have one.

Chairman Marks: Go ahead.

Mr. Hoge: What is the object in the middle of the tribal seal supposed to represent?

Mr. Harrigal: That's a good question. I don't have an answer for that. It is their tribal seal, and we replicated it. I'm not familiar with the design details.

Chairman Marks: Any other questions?

Mr. Harrigal: It's a version of a teepee, I believe, in the center there, but I don't know the significance. I'm sorry, I don't have that answer.

Chairman Marks: Others?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. What's the preference of the Committee? At the last meeting when we looked at Code Talkers, there were - some of the medals - we had more than just one the last time.

Some of them we wanted to have discussion. Others, the Committee, I think, kind of felt like the preferred images from the tribe were obvious and - or perhaps we didn't have much of an input and we went by simple motion.

So, does the Committee want to go through its traditional discussion, or is this something that we can act on?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: I think we should talk about Number 1.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, we're going to go ahead and have a discussion. I think, let's see, this time we're going to start with Michael down at the end of the table. And we'll just work down in the opposite direction we came from - that we did on the platinum.

Mr. Bugeja: I actually find all three obverse designs alluring. I think the Number 1 would actually coin well. I mean, the metal form would look very nice. It's got great depth of field.

My preference is also the Number 2. The reason why Number 2 is my preference is because it shows communication both written and oral and electronic.

I just think that it's got every single element of communication in there, which really impresses me, actually. And the balance in the fields are very well done.

Number 3 also has a lot to recommend it. I mean, there's an optical line of sight from the boot all the way through Standing Rock Sioux.

But as far as what we're trying to communicate the emphasis or theme being on communication, Number 2 has electronic, oral and verbal. And to me, that's one of the best designs I've seen.

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Michael.

Jeanne.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Thank you, Gary.

I have to agree with Michael. I like Number 1 in that it is a little different. We have, you know, the silhouettes we don't see very often, and I think that's very attractive.

However, the communications in Number 2, you know, the soldier on the right is actually listening, you know. He's not just writing. He's listening. And I think that's very intent and very well-articulated in this drawing. I think it's a very successful piece.

And Number 3 I just don't feel like this is a Native American. I don't care for this particular one. So, I think that in the end, I would go for Number 2.

Chairman Marks: Are you done?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Thank you.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Michael Olson.

Mr. Olson: Okay. I like Number 1 and Number 2. And I understand the preference of the group is Number 2.

However, Number 1 has a couple of things that lend well to maybe considering that one.

Number one, it is a good design. It is something we haven't seen before. I think it would strike up well with the terrain there and the lettering.

The one thing I want to comment on as far as communication goes, we've seen a lot of these medals that have pretty much what we're looking at in Number 2, a radioman, and then an assistant taking notes.

But when you take a look at Number 1, the purpose of communication in battle is to employ your forces more effectively than the enemy.

This is the first one I've seen where we actually see what we hope to be the results of that

communication going on in the background.

And I think Number 1 is just - is really great. And that's the one that I would tend to support more than the rest.

Chairman Marks: Number 2?

Mr. Olson: More than Number 2 or Number 3. We're not doing the reverses yet, are we? Okay.

So, that's how my - we are?

Chairman Marks: Well, that was my intent, but I don't think the others did the reverse. Okay, we're doing the obverse.

Mr. Olson: Okay. So, that concludes my comments. I'd just like to just encourage everyone to take another look at Number 1 and maybe consider that one.

Chairman Marks: Okay. On the obverse, One and Two are both nice images. I don't know if I have a preference between the two. They're both good. And without a preference, I'll support the tribe's pick with Number 2.

Erik.

Mr. Jansen: I very much like the use of the shadowing in Design Number 1. It gives me a sense of urgency, importance, energy, risk is being managed. So, I like that, but I somewhat am indifferent given the tribe's preference for Number 2.

The comment was made that the support guy with the pad is listening. And I think the artist here has done a great job of taking the energy out of the eyes and putting them on the ears. It's really, really well-done.

For our historian, we're headed towards a World War I and a World War II indication here.

Is this the uniform that we want to use? Because this looks like a World War II uniform to me.

Any thoughts? The helmet certainly, and the collar line. Maybe Officer Olson can help us there as well.

Mr. Olson: It looks like World War II to me.

Mr. Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Ross: Yes, that doesn't trouble me in that the living descendants most likely remember the World War II -

Mr. Jansen: Okay. Well, we had that discussion previously and I just wanted to raise it as an issue.

So, quite frankly, One or Two. I'll probably score them both equally. I don't care for Number 3.

Oh, one more thought. Only looking ahead to the reverse regardless of which one we go with, we are going to be repeating the same language that appears at the bottom four o'clock, six o'clock, seven o'clock position here, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.

So, whether that's something we might want to embrace later, or this time, I just bring that up as a point of awareness.

Thank you.

Chairman Marks: Thank you, Erik.

Michael.

Mr. Moran: I'm going to respect the tribe's choice in Number 2. However, I would hope that we would see Number 1 in the future as we have many more of these to go. And it is an excellent design and surely somewhere somebody will choose it.

Chairman Marks: Tom.

Mr. Uram: I would basically concur with that. I think both are outstanding. I would default to the tribe's

choice here, but Number 1 certainly does have a place down the road.

Chairman Marks: Thank you.

Robert.

Mr. Hoge: While the drawings are nice enough, I think that, again, all these represent a missed opportunity for suggesting something that would be a little bit more in keeping with Native American art forms and personify the people.

Ms. Wastweet: We can't hear you, Robert.

Mr. Hoge: These are just World War II soldiers. They don't really have anything to do with the Native American peoples. The designs are okay as they go.

I'm curious on Number 1 whether the soldiers are intended to represent individuals from different eras of warfare. It looks as though the person on the left has a different uniform from at least one, if not both, of the figures on the right.

Perhaps it's World War I, and then World War II, and then a more modern soldier on the far right represented on the horizon line, which is kind of an interesting take if that is the case. I'm not sure if that's so.

Mr. Harrigal: I think that's coincidental, because I don't think that was the artist's intention.

Mr. Hoge: Well, I notice they're carrying different weapons.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes.

Mr. Hoge: And the helmets are different styles. So, the artist may not have been aware of what he was doing. I don't know.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, and then one of the rifles has a sling, and you can't see it in the others. So, it's

probably there, but I understand.

Mr. Hoge: On the reverse as if I might just sum up my opinion on that, too, at this time, I think they're both very sad in terms of what's going to go on a Congressional gold medal. They're just utterly flat things.

They duplicate the inscriptions on the obverse.

Chairman Marks: Michael.

Mr. Ross: Defer to the tribes.

Chairman Marks: Okay, and Heidi.

Ms. Wastweet: I agree with the comment about Obverse Number 1. I like this design very much.

We've been asking over and over for the artist to give us something more creative, a little more modern, less literal, and it's been given to us.

And for that reason, I hope that we would give it support to give a message back to the artists that they are listening to us and to respond to that. This gives an added dimension, added interest.

While Design Number 2 is drawn very, very well, I agree. I like the elements of the writing, the listening, the talking. I like that, but it's going to be a design that's easily overlooked by people looking - I imagine them in the gift shop looking in the case. Their eyes are going to go right past this, because there's nothing special about it.

It's very much like what we've seen before whereas Design Number 1 is adding something new.

While I support Obverse Number 1, I think that it would be interesting to pair it with Reverse Number 2, because we have an interesting connection between the Indians and the buffalo being in silhouette with the soldiers being in silhouette. And I think that would be an interesting combination, but it would also work with Design Number 1 on the

reverse.

And when we get there, yes, let's talk about the duplication of the lettering.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Thank you, Heidi.

Do we want to comment on the reverse also?

Mr. Weinman: Mr. Chairman, if you're interested, the Worldwide Web provides an answer to your earlier question as to what's in the middle of the seal.

Chairman Marks: Oh, please.

Mr. Weinman: It is actually the standing rock on a pedestal. Which according to legend, the standing rock was the wife of a Lakota Warrior with her child who had been turned to stone.

The stone was considered holy by the Sioux people. They transported it wherever they moved. Carried it on a lavishly-decorated travois pulled by a specially-adorned horse.

When the Sioux settled on the current reservation, they placed the standing rock on a brick pedestal outside the reservation's agency office where it remains to this day. This is a depiction of the stone on its pedestal.

Chairman Marks: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Ross: Greg, did you use the term "worldwide web"? I think I need a code talker to translate that for me.

(Laughter.)

Chairman Marks: So, do we want to have individual comments on the reverse? Do you feel strongly about what we've been given here, or do you want to do it by motion?

Mr. Bugeja: Do it by motion.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm not seeing that we're jumping to do individual comments.

Mr. Jansen: I have a technical question on the reverse.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Jansen: If you take what is essentially the center portion of One, move it to Two, and then put it off center, does the typeset for that circle, long soldier, cannonball, et cetera, become too small to practically produce?

I'm looking down in the corner on a three-inch medal and I don't think it's my presbyopia. I just think it's gone.

If you look at six o'clock it says "Running Antelope." And then "Canal."

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Aren't these the soldiers that were actually in the wars? Are these the names of the soldiers who were in the wars?

Mr. Jansen: Well, I'm fine with that. I just want to see - are they going to be legible?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Oh, I see.

Mr. Jansen: Yes, I'm not taking issue with the historical nature. I'm just trying to make sure that they come through and is there a workaround.

Okay. So, the workaround is a relay out. Well, Number 1 should work, but Number 2 amplifies what's already kind of marginal in Number 1.

I mean, gosh. Those letters in Number 2 even in a three-and-a-half-inch medal, you know, they are four mils, five mils high.

Mr. Weinman: Mr. Chairman, may I comment?

As a general rule, we don't include names in these designs, but I'm not sure that's what these are.

With your permission, we can look into it.

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, definitely. And part of the problem is I think the representative - but if you have - if they're specific for individuals and we determine that there are more later, then it becomes a problem. So, we definitely need to -

Mr. Weinman: I have the answer.

Mr. Harrigal: You do, okay. From the worldwide web?

Mr. Weinman: Around the disk are the names of the eight districts in red starting with the 48th district at the top.

Mr. Harrigal: Okay.

Mr. Weinman: So, they're actually the eight districts. They're not individual names.

Mr. Jansen: No, my question is the type size. Can he produce this medal with that type size?

Mr. Harrigal: I think when we get down to inch-and-a-half, it's going to be very difficult to see.

Mr. Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Harrigal: But in three-inch, you'll definitely see it.

Mr. Jansen: Okay. That's good.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm going to ask the members to score the obverse. And if there is a motion on the reverse, I'd like to take that.

Mr. Olson: Move to go with Number 1.

Mr. Bugeja: Second.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm sorry, did we get a second to that?

Mr. Bugeja: Right here.

Chairman Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to recommend Obverse Number 1 for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.

Mr. Olson: Reverse.

Chairman Marks: Reverse, I'm sorry. Reverse Number 1 for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: All those in favor, please raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven.

Opposed. Abstaining. Two abstentions. And, Heidi, your vote.

Ms. Wastweet: Yea.

Chairman Marks: Yea as in yes?

Ms. Wastweet: Yes.

Male Participant: She's excited.

Chairman Marks: Okay. We have eight ayes and two abstentions. The motion carries.

Okay, thank you. And if you can pass your scoresheets down to Erik, it will give us a tally on that.

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2013 American Eagle Platinum Program-Continued

While you're doing that, I'm going to update you on the platinum, the American Eagle Platinum coin. And I'll just run through numerically on the designs.

Design Number 1 received four. Again, a possible 30 here with a 16 needed to be recommended.

Design Number 2 received five. Design Number 3 is our recommended design with 28 of 30 possible.

Design Number 4 received zero. Design Number 5 received two. Number 6 received - we weren't considering Six, were we? One point. And Number 7 received four points. And then Eight and Nine of course were zero, because we had excluded them previously.

So, is there any further discussion on the American Platinum coin?

Mr. Ross: Hamilton carries the day.

Chairman Marks: Yes, it appears so.

Discussion of the 2012 CCAC Annual Report

Chairman Marks: Okay. That takes us down on our agenda to the discussion on our 2012 annual report. I have some materials to pass out to you.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Chairman Marks: Heidi, I'm sorry I can't get this to you, but we'll try to communicate what we're looking at the best that we can.

What I've provided to you -

Ms. Wastweet: That's fine.

Chairman Marks: - are the first three pages of our fiscal year `11 annual report the Committee approved very recently. And what we're trying to do is get caught up.

Historically, we've run behind in trying to get out our annual reports. And I am fixed on the idea that we're going to get caught up and I think it's within reach right now.

So, what I want to do is I want to try to walk through all of the elements of as far as recommendations go for our 2012 report. And there's like basically three sections we need to go

through.

And the first section is our circulating commemoratives. And then we have the numismatic commemoratives. And then we have our other category which includes bullion and metals. That's how we've categorized these in the past.

And what you'll notice in the document I've passed out to you is I have bolded and underlined - you know what? I don't know if the staff wants to see a couple of these. Pass those down.

I've bolded and underlined where programs show up that we've recommended. So, I want to start with the circulating commemoratives.

And the first circulating commemorative - actually, I think it's the only one. Yes, it's the only one in our 2011 recommendations, was for the American Liberty Commemorative Coinage Program.

And I think most of you are aware of what this is, but this is basically a program where on an annual basis each of the denominations starting with - which one did we start with - with the cent and then progressing each year after that, each of these coins would for one year bear a Liberty image and would co-circulate with the Presidential image that is ingrained into our circulating coinage at this point in time.

The idea here is to remove the fear that we're going to get rid of the Presidential images, but also give the Liberty image an opportunity to come forward for everyday Americans to experience these images in their pocket change.

This is not a proposal that would envision using previous images of Liberty. This would be an opportunity for our artists, our sculptors, to develop designs that show Liberty in a modern and new way maybe with ethnic emphasis or, you know, elements of strength or conviction or courage or however you

want to look at it. What does Liberty mean to America in our generation?

And so, over the course of - well, you'd have the cent, the nickel, the dime, the quarter, the half dollar and a dollar. Over a six-year span, each of these would circulate through. And by the time we were done, we would have produced a Liberty image for each of the denominations.

This was proposed in our last report as beginning in 2017 and ending in 2022 with the dollar coin.

So, is this something we want to stay with?

Mr. Moran: Oh, yes. Yes, absolutely.

Chairman Marks: Looks like we're getting a lot of affirmative on that. It would be nice if this could get traction somehow.

We've recommended it for the last few years, but I think I too - I'm the one that authored this in the first place. I feel very strongly about this and would hope that we could at least keep it in our report, because I think it does represent something that could be a very important contribution to numismatic art for the United States.

Mr. Moran: Gary, I think it's a very innovative program. Innovative idea. I would hope that the people in numismatic press, particularly the ones that are monitoring this meeting, would pick it up and go with it, run with it in some editorial so we can get the collectors in the United States behind it.

Because otherwise, this won't happen.

Mr. Jansen: For the time frame that we're talking about I don't want to pile on here, but is Liberty the right, I mean, I love the concept of a circulating commemorative that rotates through.

Is Liberty the right concept? I have a sense that given our times, Unity might be an interesting concept. It might strike a chord with the populace,

perhaps, that isn't quite as stilted as Liberty can become.

Also, if we don't end up with a current set of circulating coins, that is to say if the penny were to go away or something and the nickel or the dollar changed status, does it make this - does it affect the workability of this map?

Chairman Marks: I think if a denomination goes away, it just goes away from this program. I think that's all that means and it truncates by one year.

For me, the Liberty image is iconic. That's an iconic American image particularly in coinage. And that's something that historically has been very much a part of our coinage particularly through, oh, running up through mixed in the 20th Century, to about the halfway point where it kind of disappeared completely.

But certainly at the beginning of the 20th Century, everything was a Liberty image.

So, I don't know. With that familiarity and the history with coinage, I would like to stay with the Liberty image.

Mr. Olson: I agree. And the other key point to this is, is you want to start out with the lowest denomination currently in circulation.

It does you no good to start off on the dollar end or the half dollar, because people aren't going to be able to get those.

It's got to start out with something that everyone can get. And I agree collectors all look back a hundred years ago for what's great.

We, I think I speak for the entire Committee, we'd like to see some great things now that people a hundred years from now will think are great.

And I know it can be done, but we have to give people a taste of it. And I think what Gary is

proposing here is a great idea, because it doesn't take away from anything that's currently in circulation. And it also doesn't involve a big, massive program all at once. It's one coin a year.

And I really think that whatever forces need to come together to give this thing a try, really need to be marshaled and let's give it a try.

Mr. Bugeja: A circulating commemorative is an excellent idea. The Liberty theme I would support fully. We have unity in the United States, the "United" and "E Pluribus Unum."

I think we're concerned about unity because of Congress right now. And I think Liberty is a theme numismatically that will go over extraordinarily well.

I think that if we do this program and if it gets traction, you'll see it will be extended after 2022.

Chairman Marks: I'll just say that my opinion that with the elimination of production of the dollar coin from a circulating point of view and the loss of seigniorage for the Mint, I think this is a moneymaker.

This is a big moneymaker, because a lot like what we've seen with the state quarters and even with the - I'm sorry - the Lewis and Clark nickels - what am I trying to - Westward Journey nickels, those were coins that just kind of disappeared from circulation.

That's because folks like us and ordinary Americans for that fact who weren't necessarily coin collectors noticing something different, they pulled them in and they kept them.

Mr. Olson: How many Lincoln cents from 2009 has anybody got back in change?

Chairman Marks: You don't find many.

Mr. Olson: They're all gone.

Chairman Marks: You don't find many of the nickels. I mean, the quarters were made by the millions and kazillions. So, you still see those in circulation, but the National Park quarters you don't see so much. And I think the ones that do get out there, those are being snatched up too.

So, I think this is an opportunity for the Mint to make some money and show some positive gain on their ledger sheet too. Not that that should be the guiding point of why we do programs, but I certainly don't believe that this would be anything but a benefit financially for the Mint and for the Government. And meanwhile, be a celebration of some iconic images that we haven't seen in a circulating way for a long, long time.

Mr. Olson: Gary, I've just got one more comment to that.

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Mr. Olson: Take a look at some of the designs that we've resurrected and put on gold and silver coins. The buffalo nickel. The walking liberty half dollar. The Saint Gaudens 20 and the gold eagle. Maybe I'm missing a couple here.

Those are all successful programs, but they are coins that cost a lot of money for somebody to go acquire. \$40 at a minimum on a silver dollar.

This is something anyone can acquire at face value that they can probably put in their pocket.

And the success that we've seen with the designs that we've gone back to from the past, I think that should be a good indication to the Mint and everybody else that if we come up with something new and appealing, that it's going to go over well.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, without objection, I think we're set on maintaining the American Liberty program in the circulating section.

Okay. Before we move on from circulating commemoratives, are there any other ideas that we need to talk about?

Mr. Bugeja: Gary, would it make any sense at all or is it included in this particular report, to have a formal vote on a resolution somewhere in this session along the lines of we resolve that the U.S. Mint, U.S. Treasury Department support the idea of a circulating commemorative coinage program with the iconic them of Liberty, put ourselves on record, or is this record enough?

If you want it in numismatic press, I'm making the occasion for it by bringing it on the table.

Chairman Marks: I don't know where to go with that. I would like to have Greg's input.

I'm trying to remember in my five years on the Committee if we've ever done a resolution of that sort.

Mr. Bugeja: A resolution is simply - doesn't have any weight of law or action. It's just a unified expression of belief and that this is - that you want them to have traction and it's nice that it's said at a public meeting. But if you want it to be news, I'm making it so by making a resolution.

So, it's about how serious you are about doing it.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'd be pleased to talk with the Mint staff between meetings. And -

Mr. Bugeja: Sure.

Chairman Marks: - when it's appropriate, bring it back on as an agenda item.

Mr. Bugeja: I'll give this to you. I got to catch a plane to get home by midnight.

Chairman Marks: Oh, okay.

Mr. Bugeja: Okay. Sorry about that.

Chairman Marks: Yes. So, yes, you know, if it's something that we feel we can do, then we can certainly put it on for -

Mr. Bugeja: It's a great idea, Gary.

Chairman Marks: - future agenda. Okay. Thank you, and safe travels.

Mr. Bugeja: Thank you so much.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, are we ready to move on from circulating?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, that takes us down to our numismatic commemoratives.

I've passed out for you an additional handout that shows the commemorative programs that have been enacted into law over the next five years.

I think most of you are aware that by our statute that created the Committee, that our annual report is to contain any recommendations that we think are appropriate for the five-year period extending beyond the current fiscal year that our report bears.

So, that's what I've done here is to show you what has been enacted. And then to give you a little bit of a background on what might be in the works for those slots, if you will, in those out years that have not seen an enactment occur yet.

And for the record, the statute also limits the number of numismatic commemorative programs to two a year.

So, you'll notice for 2013 we're familiar with the Girl Scouts and the Five Star Generals. 2014, Civil Rights and the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

2015, the U.S. Marshal Service has been approved. We have not received a second enactment for 2015.

Last year our committee recommended the 150th anniversary of the 13th amendment to the Constitution, but also we know that working its way through Congress right now is a bill putting forward a 2015 commemoration of the March of Dimes. So, we might want to look at what we might want to do in that area.

2016, the Mark Twain Commemorative Coin Act just passed through Congress. I'm not aware if the President assigned it yet, but I would be surprised if he did not.

So, that leaves one opening for 2016. And the last report, I think we're familiar with the recommendation we made for the 150th anniversary of the ASPCA, and also the 90th anniversary of Route 66.

Also, though, pending in Congress right now and seems to have momentum, is the Pro Football Hall of Fame Commemoration for 2016.

Also recently enacted for 2017 is the Lions Club International Century of Service Commemorative Coin Act. That leaves one opening for 2017.

We've not made recommendations for that year yet, because that's the fifth year out.

However, for those of us who have been on the Committee for a while when we've gone to summer seminars and we've asked for public input, the overwhelming feedback we've gotten as far as commemorative programs is that we ought to do something to commemorate World War I.

Specifically, often has been mentioned to commemorate or honor the veterans of World War I.

It's been noted that an American coinage as far as commemoratives go, there has not really been a formal commemoration of World War I. It's absent from the coinage.

So, there probably are other ideas. I ask the - Bill, did you have that copy?

(Discussion off the record.)

Chairman Marks: So, we all have this copy here, which is a more thorough presentation of bills that are in Congress.

So, what I wanted to do for the commemorative - for the numismatic commemoratives is to look year by year. I want to start with 2015, and let's talk about what we want to do.

Now, I will remind us all that during our last discussion for the 2011 annual report, that we eliminated the fallen firefighters commemorative program proposal so that we could instead do the 150th anniversary of the 13th amendment. And we felt that the fallen firefighters was not a year-specific commemoration, but with the pledge that we are going to bring that back.

So, I'm not sure how that fits in here, but I want to make sure that we're thinking of that also.

So, this would be the time for 2015 knowing that the marshals are already there, Committee, what do we want to do with 2015?

Mr. Moran: Gary, I think we need to recognize reality that the March of Dimes are going to get it.

I think what we really need to do is urge that the law or the proposed law be amended to include a circulating dime commemorative in addition to the half dollar and dollar that the proposed legislation calls for.

Chairman Marks: So, we'd make that part of our recommendation. Go with the March of Dimes. And in that, call for a dime.

Mr. Moran: Absolutely. I think that gets big numismatic press and maybe the impetus to get it done.

Mr. Jansen: Yes, I would echo those words requesting that we might add enough commentary so that the Mint really gets some flexibility in terms of the numismatic product sets they could sell.

So, perhaps there's a clad circulating dime, and a silver one that they could use to mix and match. I want to give the Mint as much opportunity to market any of this stuff as possible.

Chairman Marks: Others?

Mr. Olson: Yes, I think if you do a March of Dimes silver dollar and you don't do a dime, there's going to be multiple letters to the editor in all the coin papers that, what the heck? Where's our dime at?

And, really, it's appropriate because the dime is what was placed into those little cardboard holders. I remember them.

There certainly needs to be a circulating design, and there also needs to be, in my view, a 90 percent silver design not approved, but an uncirculated as it was when they first were used.

Mr. Jansen: And just to complicate things, I might add consider perhaps a bimetallic version or the -

Automated Operator: Please pardon the interruption. Your conference contains less than three participants at this time.

If you would like to continue, press star 1 now.

Mr. Jansen: The inner slug might carry the diameter of the dime so that we could elegantly strike a dime and the outer perimeter content at one stroke.

Chairman Marks: I can appreciate the idea. I'm not sure that - we're kind of whistling in the wind on that one. I don't know, guys.

I think to some extent we've got to keep this in the arena of something we think might actually happen.

Mr. Olson: Now, correct me if I'm wrong, but the Mint without any congressional authority, could strike 90 percent silver dimes of the same Roosevelt design at each mint, couldn't they?

If Congress would not act and do a commemorative dime with a special design, you could still do something on the commemorative side with just make 90 percent dimes at all of the mints.

Mr. Harrigal: As long as we don't change the metal composition, we're authorized to make the silver versions of the dime.

And Congress does not tell us where to make the coins. So, we would be free to make them wherever we would have the capacity.

Mr. Olson: So, at a minimum it there was support -

Mr. Harrigal: At least on this one.

Mr. Olson: - you could do a West Point, Denver, San Francisco, Philadelphia. Maybe package that in with the silver dollar and make a set.

(Off Record Comments.)

Mr. Olson: That would be a fallback position.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, I would suggest to keep this simple that if we want to kind of go in tandem with what's in Congress right now that we recommend a March of Dimes commemorative, that that - let me back up first.

In the legislation, Bill, do you know is it just a silver dollar, or is it - it's not multicoin? Just a silver dollar, okay.

That we recommend a silver dollar, and then also just some general verbiage about encouraging the incorporation of a dime in some fashion be it by a change of design or maybe just inclusion of a Roosevelt dime in a set or something of that nature.

Mr. Harrigal: Typically, Gary, what we would do would be to have the Marketing Department do an outreach to find out if there's really a market for something like that where we can make it at no net cost to the Government.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Harrigal: And then that would give us the opportunity and then we would look at the capacity issues that we would have at the facilities and -

Chairman Marks: Intuitively, I know the answer to that.

Mr. Olson: If you take a look back to 1996 -

Mr. Harrigal: We still need the study. That's the thing, you know.

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Mr. Olson: In 1996, there was a dime commemorating Roosevelt that was minted at the West Point.

Chairman Marks: The 50th of the Roosevelt dime.

Mr. Olson: And those - what are those worth now? 25 bucks. The answer is, yes, there would be - people would buy them.

Chairman Marks: So, anyway, okay. So, are we talking about just a Roosevelt dime, or are we talking about like a reverse design change?

Mr. Olson: It would be nice if there was a circulating dime with the reverse change. But if we can't get that at a minimum, something that they could do without Congressional approval.

Mr. Norton: That would take legislation if we wanted to change the reverse.

Chairman Marks: It, what?

Mr. Norton: It would take legislation.

Chairman Marks: Right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Chairman Marks: Well, I know. But although the law says you can change it after 25 years, I have not met anybody who wants to push on that door.

Mr. Olson: But the only thing on the reverse is a torch. That's probably not anything anyone has an affinity to. Try taking Roosevelt off there, and you have a fight.

Chairman Marks: So, anyway. Okay. So, if I come back with a writeup that talks about the commemorative program inclusive of a circulating dime and just leave it at that, is that going to meet the mark?

Mr. Olson: And other numismatic products as the Mint -

Chairman Marks: Well, I want to be careful about us recommending products, because that's not really what we do.

But I think some mention of inclusion of a dime, I mean, you can interpret that to be a design change, or you could interpret that to be simply including the dime in the commemorative program, but maybe that's just the Roosevelt dime.

Mr. Olson: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Okay?

Mr. Olson: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Okay. If you think we need motions on this, let me know, but I think the discussions probably for my purposes of drafting this are probably good enough, because we are going to bring this - I will bring this back to you for approval before we pass it on to Treasury.

So, Tom.

Mr. Uram: Gary, thanks.

I think the March of Dimes thing is a great idea and so forth and is probably going to happen, but I did also want to have the Committee aware that it's the 300th anniversary of the sinking of the 1715 fleet, which there will be a lot of festivities or commemorations in the Florida area and so forth.

So, I wanted to just pass this out and maybe have it on the table for some - maybe another time. And if the March of Dimes maybe doesn't progress through, we have this on the table as well.

So, I'll pass this down for review.

Chairman marks: Okay. So, let's -

Mr. Uram: Certainly coin-oriented.

Chairman Marks: Move on to 2016. Last year, like I said before, we did the ASPCA and Route 66. Congress is looking at pro football. The Pro Football Hall of Fame.

So, what's your pleasure?

Mr. Olson: Route 66.

Mr. Jansen: Yes, that's good.

Chairman Marks: Well, what we recommended was two. We only have one slot right now because in the intervening time, Mark Twain got approved.

So, we've got to kill one of our babies.

Mr. Jansen: Didn't Lions get -

Chairman Marks: Lions is the next year. 2016 are we going to do ASPCA, or are we going to do Route 66?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Oh, we can only do one or the other of those two?

Chairman Marks: Pardon me?

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Only one?

Chairman Marks: We can only do one. We only have one opening because of Mark Twain.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: But 66, is that a -

Mr. Olson: It's the 90th anniversary of the founding of -

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Couldn't we do that like in a hundred years?

Chairman Marks: We could.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: So that where the ASPCA is 150 and that's a set -

Chairman Marks: It's a rounder number numismatically, yes. So, I don't know. What's the thoughts of others?

Mr. Moran: I vote for 66.

Chairman Marks: Others? 66, or animals.

Mr. Jansen: Route 66 was anticipated to be a silver dollar, and the eight states half dollars each?

Chairman Marks: No, no. No silver dollars, just clad half dollars.

Mr. Jansen: Just eight clad half dollars.

Mr. Olson: Yes, something that would have a common obverse and a state-specific reverse.

And I brought some materials here. There's definitely lots of cultural material, popular material that you could draw from. A lot of images. A lot of architecture along the road.

This was the Mother Road, John Steinbeck route Dust Bowl to the land of plenty in California.

It travels through eight states. Which means you've got 16 senators and I don't know how many

congressman. But if the word could get out, again, the numismatic press if we could get the word out, this would be a very popular set not only with Americans, but worldwide.

There are foreigners that come from around the world, some of them bring their Harley Davidsons, they have them shipped over, or their Porsches, specifically to drive the 2400 miles of this road that's still there.

These coins would sell and it's a fun series, you know. A lot of times we do things that are serious. We do the military. We do events in history. This is a fun one.

There's really no downside to commemorating this. Everybody knows what Route 66 is. It's a part of our culture, and it has been for many years through world war and depression.

So, I really feel that if the word could get out to the constituencies in these states, they'd probably get a lot of sponsors in a big hurry.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I have one indication for ASPCA. I'm hearing others say Route 66.

Anyone else want to weigh in? It looks to me the scale weighs towards Route 66, what I'm seeing here on the Committee.

Ms. Stevens-Sollman: Now what?

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, what I'm going to do is I'm going to come back to you with Route 66 in that slot.

That takes us down to 2017. We've already got the Lions Club there in one of the two slots. We have one more slot to fill. I've already discussed the World War I idea.

We don't have to do that. There could be something else.

Mr. Jansen: What year did World War I end?

Mr. Moran: 1918. I'd rather commemorate the end of the war, not the start.

Mr. Jansen: Yes.

Chairman Marks: Well, I would offer you this that my intention is to get this report done within the next few months. And then we are going to get on to the discussion of the fiscal year `13 report, which would include 2018. And, wow, we'd be on time for once with our annual report.

But anyway, the opportunity, I think, is coming soon. We wanted to do something in 2018.

Mr. Moran: I do have one consideration for us that we haven't focused on and that would be the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Midway.

It was a major turning point in World War II in the Pacific. It actually was the turning point. There are veterans still alive for that one.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Moran: I just think it's more appropriate than the start of World War I.

Chairman Marks: Okay. And then I would go on record and I will remind all of you that I was a good boy and willingly sat back and said, okay, we will ditch fallen firefighters, which is very important to me, and that we were going to bring it back in this next report.

I'll remind you, too, that in 1997 we did the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. I worked side-by-side with firefighters on a daily basis. I have great respect for what they do as first responders for us. And I think it's way overdue that we give them commemoration.

And since the Law Enforcement Memorial was built, there has been a memorial built in Maryland for

fallen firefighters. It represents those folks on a nationwide basis.

I think it's wholly appropriate and fitting that we insert that back in 2017.

Mr. Jansen: I wouldn't disagree. 2017 is the 150th anniversary of the Seward's Folly, purchase of Alaska. Which I think has a number of constituencies out there that would, I think, stand behind commemorative in '17 for that. Not the least of which would be the energy industry, both coal and oil and natural gas.

The Native Americans, there are seven or eight - Mr. Historian, seven or eight Native corporations out there which would all stand for coin, which would also include the diversity of their cultures.

And the other natural resources out there, which would be the timber industry and travel and fishing.

So, I think there is quite a large community out there that would be interested in a commemorative of that Alaskan purchase only because we rarely see them.

It also would, I think, open up the palette to some symbols and images that are very, very uniquely Alaskan and not often seen on our coinage.

Chairman Marks: Okay, folks. What do we want to do? Want to vote this one out?

Mr. Jansen: Do we have to narrow it down now, or can we kind of just mention our shopping list kind of like we did before?

Chairman Marks: No, I need to draft a report and bring it back to you at the next meeting that has recommendations to fill the slot - a recommendation. So, I think we need to decide.

Mr. Ross: Because my sense is that I'm a little fatalistic about this that nobody listens to us on this point.

So, if we throw out a bunch of ideas, maybe someone will read it and say, hey, that's a good one.

But, you know, if we take a formal vote, we're narrowing down on the chances that someone somewhere might say, hey, that's a good idea.

Chairman Marks: I'm not following you. We've got to have -

Mr. Ross: I understand what you're -

Chairman Marks: We have to have a recommendation or we pass on it. We can pass on it and not recommend anything, I suppose.

Mr. Ross: But you think it should be a single recommendation, obviously.

Chairman Marks: Yes.

Mr. Olson: Well, we typically - we can only recommend two, right - well, they only make -

Chairman Marks: We can only recommend as many slots are open in a given year.

Mr. Jansen: Yes, the Lion's Club has already got one.

Chairman marks: Yes.

Mr. Olson: And he's got to get it done now so we can move on with this and get to the next one.

Mr. Jansen: Not that I'm against fallen firefighters. I don't think anybody in this room is. But that one is almost could be a floater in the sense that we could carry it into '18 along with World War I, but anniversaries come and go.

Chairman Marks: You know what? A deal is a deal, folks. I made a deal last time.

Mr. Ross: Gary, I say fallen firefighters.

Chairman Marks: I'm intent on holding you to the deal.

Mr. Ross: You do a lot of work here. Fallen firefighters.

Chairman Marks: Let's say this. Let's say this. Let's do fallen firefighters for 2017. And let's move rapidly through this report. Let's get it done and then we can talk about 2018 where we've got two slots open.

Mr. Jansen: I object to that. I feel like I haven't been heard. In fact, I've been steamrolled by a backroom deal.

Chairman Marks: It wasn't backroom. It was in this very room in full view of the public.

(Laughter.)

Mr. Jansen: Is it in writing?

Chairman Marks: Yes, yes. It's in the minutes.

Mr. Jansen: I would strongly stand for an anniversary issue. 2018 could easily carry the two ideas that Gary put forth just now with the firefighters and World War I, which I think is a good idea.

But as I said, anniversaries come and go. And we have a lot of constituents, as I described, that I think would stand by an Alaskan issue.

As we know, the panel for ANWR is something that comes back every year. And I think it would - I think it would sail through Congress.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm going to settle this real quickly. This is not a formal vote, but all those who want to pursue the Alaskan idea, would you raise your hand?

One, two - you lose.

(Laughter.)

Mr. Jansen: I've been steamrolled by the chair.

Chairman Marks: Okay.

Mr. Jansen: Yes. I mean, I went down with -

(Laughter.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, I don't mean to steamroll.

Mr. Jansen: You did though.

Chairman Marks: Yes, sorry.

Male Participant: Deck chairs on the Titanic.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, are we going to go with the firefighters? Is that what I'm sensing?

Mr. Jansen: That's what you're saying.

Chairman Marks: I had a deal. Okay. So, that's what we're going to do. Fallen firefighters for 2017.

Okay. That takes care of Section 2 of our three. Let's look at other recommendations in that handout I gave you.

Mr. Jansen: I know I'm out of order.

Chairman Marks: Yes, you are.

Mr. Jansen: On circulating coins, are we going to do anything with a Kennedy anniversary, since anniversaries don't count anymore?

Chairman Marks: You know, at this point I think, you know, that's next year as far as the half dollar goes, right?

I think that message has come through loud and clear to me through some correspondence we have received and the Mint is aware of that.

At this point, I think it's more of a marketing issue

than anything we're going to accomplish in a design way and marketing is not our purview.

Mr. Jansen: Well, it's a lot like the Roosevelt - it's a lot like - in fact, it's identical to the Roosevelt dime commemorative in that it's commemorative of the coin's beginning.

Chairman Marks: Well, what's the Committee want to do? I wouldn't want to be accused of steamrolling.

Mr. Olson: I think it's a good idea. Something should be done.

Mr. Jansen: You're guilty. You're not accused.

Chairman Marks: What's that?

Mr. Olson: Something should be done. It's a popular coin. It doesn't circulate now, but there are a lot of people that remember standing in line to get one of those.

Kids have grown up -

Chairman Marks: That would be a circulating commemorative. Do we want to circle back and put something in there about the Kennedy half dollar? Is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. Jansen: I think we'll get a lot of pressure to do that.

Chairman Marks: What does that mean, folks? Do you want to put something in here, or not?

Mr. Olson: If we're allowed to, yes.

Chairman Marks: We can recommend whatever we want to for circulating. It doesn't mean it's going to happen, but we can do it.

Mr. Olson: It would be a commercial success. There's no question about it.

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm not seeing any

objection to it. So, I would be inclined to write something up and bring it back to you as part of the next report. I would be happy to do that.

Mr. Jansen: Just a placeholder.

Chairman Marks: See, there's a win for you.

Okay. Let's look at other recommendations. Item 4 on Page 3 of the handout I gave you.

We have two in there from last year. One was the redesign of the silver eagle. And what this is, is just a recognition that in 2011 we hit the 25-year mark as far as statute prescribes that you could legally change the design.

The statute that instituted the silver eagle back in 1986 requires an obverse design symbolic of Liberty, reverse design of an eagle. It doesn't prescribe the images that are on there right now.

The way we proposed this in the past was that we would stay with those images, stay within that law and just simply recommend that we do something new and modern with the liberty image and with the eagle.

Is that something we want to stick with here, or do we think this is a lost cause and let it go? It's up to you guys.

Mr. Jansen: So, are you advocating changing the obverse, or the reverse?

Chairman Marks: I'm not advocating anything at this point. I'm telling you that prior year we advocated that.

Mr. Ross: Why not just leave it in?

Chairman Marks: Leave it in?

Mr. Ross: Leave it in.

Chairman Marks: Okay. The next one was our

Expressions of America Art Metal Program, which is basically a program where - and I think the Mint can do this, the Mint Director's authority, simply to allow artists to explore different artistic ventures.

I don't know. It could be any number of different sorts of treatments or artistic departures in a way that they have a great deal of freedom.

Maybe at the most, we'd ask the Secretary to come up with some American theme for each year. And then the artist would just be given a blank palette to do something. And maybe we would have not more than two medals actually produced a year.

The idea was just to give the artist, as the name implies, an opportunity to express artistically. Do it in, you know, around American themes, because it is the U.S. Mint, but give them an opportunity to really exercise their talents and their abilities.

Mr. Ross: If Donald was here, he'd say leave it in.

Chairman Marks: I say leave it in.

Is there anything else we want to add to the Other category? Because if there isn't, we're pretty much done with the 2012 report until I bring back to you a draft.

So, that's what I will do. Thank you for all your discussion with that. And it is my intent to get us caught up and actually be working on the fiscal `13 annual report by spring or summer with the due date by statute being September 30th. Which like I've said before, we've never met.

So, okay. We've reached the end of our agenda. It's 3:30. We're about a half hour - oh, we're not done yet.

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the Code
Talkers Congressional Gold Medal (Standing Rock
Sioux Tribe)-Continued

Chairman Marks: We have results for Code Talkers.

Okay. So, wow. Again, possible 30, because we had everyone here at the time.

Possible 30 on the obverse very close. We have Obverse Number 1 with 18, and Obverse Number 2 with 19. And Obverse 3 is zero.

So, we've got a one-point difference between 1 and 2. With the lack of any further action from the Committee, our recommendation would be Obverse 2.

Mr. Olson: Let's see that background again.

Chairman Marks: Can we put up Obverse 2, please?

(Pause in the proceedings.)

Mr. Harrigal: Yes, we'll have to bring up the PowerPoint, yes.

Chairman Marks: That's Obverse 2 right there.

Mr. Olson: All I was saying is I'd like, and others have expressed, we'd like to see that Number 1 background again.

Chairman Marks: Okay. So, do we want to let stand? Do we want to have a motion to affirm our choice?

What would you like to do, folks?

Mr. Olson: It's their choice.

Chairman Marks: What?

Mr. Olson: It's their choice. Let it stand.

Chairman Marks: You want to let it stand?

Mr. Ross: I don't think we can change and other people have left the room.

Mr. Uram: I think we can. We still have quorum.

Mr. Ross: Well, I guess we can, but it doesn't seem

right.

(Laughter.)

Chairman Marks: I don't want to speak for Erik, but I think he was thinking, correct me if I'm wrong, but just to emphasize that Number 2 would be the choice. Since there was only a one-point spread, we could do a motion.

Mr. Jansen: Just to make it clean.

Chairman Marks: You know what? Make the motion, and we'll see if we have a second.

Mr. Olson: All right. We'll take motion for Number 2.

Chairman Marks: Is that your motion?

Mr. Jansen: Yes, I just want to reaffirm.

Chairman Marks: Okay. It's been moved to affirm our recommendation of Obverse 2 for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Gold Medal.

Is there a second?

Mr. Ross: Second.

Chairman Marks: Moved and seconded.

All those in favor, raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven.

Heidi.

Ms. Wastweet: Abstain.

Chairman Marks: Abstain. Seven, zero; one abstention; motion carries. Okay. Number 2, with emphasis, is our recommendation.

Conclude Meeting

Chairman Marks: Okay. I'm moving to conclude the

meeting. Is there any further discussion we need?

(No response.)

Chairman Marks: Okay. Hearing none, I will - we stand in adjournment.

(Whereupon, at 3:31 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)