

United States Mint
Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee

Meeting

Monday,
March 10, 2014

The Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee met in Conference Room A at 801 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., at 1:00 p.m., Gary Marks, Chair, presiding.

CCAC Members Present:

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

United States Mint Staff Present:

Steve Antonucci
Betty Birdsong
Don Everhart
William Norton
April Stafford
Megan Sullivan
Greg Weinman

* Present via telephone

Contents

Welcome and Call to Order	4
Discussion of Letter and Minutes from Previous Meeting	4
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2015 Native American \$1 Coin Program	6
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2016 Native American \$1 Coin Program	32
Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2015 and 2016 Presidential \$1 Coin Program	57
Adjourn	77

Proceedings

(1:03 p.m.)

Welcome and Call to Order

Chair Marks: Good morning. I'm calling this Monday, March 10th, 2014 meeting of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee to order. Thank you, everyone, for being here. I want to make note that on the phone today we have Michael Bugeja and so, we'll be referring to him on the phone periodically as we work through our business today. Also, I want to make a note that we have new microphones in front of us, and I've been informed that they are directional in nature. So, when you want to speak, make sure that you're speaking directly into them and your voice will be better picked up in that manner. So, we will have some guests in the room today. I don't believe any of them have arrived yet, but when they do, we'll make a point of introducing those folks. Also, we have -- one moment. We have a couple of members of the press here today, and I just want to recognize them. We have Bill McAllister from Coin World and we have Les Peters from Coin Update. Welcome, gentleman and thank you for being here. Okay.

Discussion of Letter and Minutes from Previous Meeting

The next item I want to address is something that originated out of our last meeting, back on February 11th, and if the staff want to -- if you want to begin working on putting that list up. There was a comment made at the last meeting from a member of the engraving staff that there was a feeling that some of the ideas of the CCAC may be taking United States coins and medals in a direction of sameness, or maybe the ordinary and so, to advance a constructive discussion and dialogue from that point, I wanted to just to take a moment and make a few -- just say a few things about that, and try to help initiate a dialogue between the parties. And I guess the first thing I want to say is that if the totality of what the Committee has been communicating to the art staff over the last few years produces that kind of comment, then as the Chair, I want to take some level of responsibility that we may not have been communicating our message effectively. Because certainly, the message that we've been trying to put forward was not certainly one that would take us in a direction of sameness. But, what we've been trying to do and need to do a better job of in the future is to articulate those basic elements of good design that are elements that were developed long before this Committee was even created and so, I just wanted to harken back to kind of the flagship report that the Committee put out back in January of 2011 that addresses this whole issue of design quality. Towards the conclusion of that report, we made a point of delineating out those

elements of good design because we felt that they were important to advancing this whole project of ours of improving the design and quality that we were putting out. So, I just wanted to go quickly through these, and then as a follow up to that, we'll be having a symposium in Philadelphia in oh, mid to late May where we will be, actually, Heidi and I will be representing the Committee at the symposium, to have a discussion and dialogue, not only with the internal artistic staff here at the Mint, but also the new cadre of AIP artists that we hope to have on board at that point in time. So, at that point, I would imagine that we're going to have more discussion about these points, but so just, briefly, to kind of launch out on this dialogue, you'll see up on the screen the characteristics of design excellence, and I'm just going to go through that list really quickly, and then we'll come back to it, like I said, in May. But, what we've been trying to communicate, and maybe it only came out that we were talking about symbolism and storyboards as positives and negatives, but what we need to communicate more often and more clearly are these things: Use of texture and patterns, meaningful negative space, thoughtful relationship of negative to positive space, stylization, ethnical influences, allegory and symbolism, detail yes, crowding no, use of perspective, use of forced perspective, minimal layers, harmonious, restrained type styles, clarity, interwoven images, not busy, collages, contrast of texture and smooth, fluidity, subtlety, relevancy of obverse and reverse. Which can't always be done, the way we do our processes, that last one. But, anyway, so those are the things that as a Committee it'll be my intent, at least as your Chair, to more frequently and hopefully more clearly, be communicating not only to our art staff, but to all those who are interested. So, with that, I want to point out that we have two of our distinguished members who will be participating in their last meeting today and tomorrow: Michael Ross and Michael Olson. We're certainly going to miss these gentlemen. We're going to miss them sorely. Each one of them have just contributed to an immense extent in our deliberations and helping us, you know, make recommendations that were good solid ones for the nation and the coinage and medals that the Mint puts out. So, tomorrow, we'll have a time to thank them and recognize their contributions to that effort. However, I do want to make everyone aware that as the Chair of the Committee, it is my ability, if I choose to, to appoint a Vice Chair of the Committee and so, I'm going to take that opportunity now to do that. And I'm going to appoint Michael Olson as our Vice Chairperson and tomorrow, when we get to the Special --

Ms. Stafford: First Special Service Force.

Chair Marks: -- First Special Service Force Congressional Gold Medal,

Mike is going to run the meeting, and that would be his last act as a member on the Committee and I just wanted to give him that ability to go out as the Vice Chair. So, I didn't want to take anyone by surprise with that, but that's what we will be doing. So, with all of that, is there any follow up before I move on? Okay. Great. So, the first item on our agenda, of course, is the discussion of the letter and minutes from our previous meeting, and that would be February 11th of this year. Those items were included in a packet for members to review. There are no comments on either of those documents. I would take a motion to approve.

Member Jansen: So moved.

Member Wastweet: I second.

Chair Marks: It's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes and letter of February 11th. All those in favor, please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you. That takes us now down to the review and discussion of candidate designs for the 2015 Native American \$1 Coin Program, and with that, I'll recognize April Stafford.

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2015 Native American \$1 Coin Program

Ms. Stafford: Thank you. It is Public Law 110-82 that requires the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue \$1 coins in honor of Native Americans and the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development and history of the United States. The Act mandates a reverse design for these coins with an image emblematic of one important Native American or Native American contribution each year in chronological order through 2016. Today, you will view designs for the 2015 and 2016 Native American \$1 coins. Both portfolios were developed from the previously approved concepts Mohawk Ironworkers Builders of New York City and Other Skylines for 2015 and for the year 2016, Code Talkers. As is custom, we worked closely with the National Museum of the American Indian on the concepts and designs and consulted with the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives and the National Congress of the American Indian. The CCAC also supported use of these design concepts in a previous meeting. The obverse continues to bear an image of Sacagawea, with the inscriptions Liberty and In God We Trust. Required reverse inscriptions are United States of America, and \$1, shown as dollar sign one. Edge incused inscriptions are E Pluribus Unum and the year of

minting. Today, we have 20 candidate designs for the 2015 Native American \$1 Coin Program, beginning with reverse design 2. Reverse 2 depicts the passing of a spud wrench from an earlier generation Mohawk Ironworker to a modern-day generation Mohawk Ironworker. Reverse 3 portrays a Mohawk Ironworker grabbing a pulley. The artist used the generic building to commemorate the work of the Mohawks. Reverse 4 depicts a Mohawk Ironworker walking confidently on an I-beam as he surveys his work. The background portrays a stylized city skyline. Reverse 5 depicts a profile image of a Mohawk Ironworker standing in front of an iron bridge structure. Two of his colleagues are in the process of adding a beam as seen at the top of the design. The design includes imagery from a Mohawk burlap strap on the border. Reverse 6 depicts a Mohawk Ironworker reaching for a hook while another is shown atop the bridge structure. Reverse 7 portrays a Mohawk Ironworker standing on a structural beam above the city. The additional inscription is Mohawk Ironworkers. Reverse 8 features two Mohawk Ironworkers in front of a building under construction and two working higher up. Imagery from a Mohawk burlap strap is included in the border. I should say here that this design, Reverse 8, is preferred by the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives, and the National Congress of the American Indian. Reverse 9 depicts a Mohawk Ironworker riding a beam of a new structure. A view of the city is shown below and the additional inscription is Mohawk Ironworkers. Reverses 10, 11, 12 and 13 depict the Mohawk Ironworkers reaching for an I-beam or pulley that is swinging into position. The artist stated that in these designs there's an attempt to portray the sense of height by either looking up at the figure or looking down at the city below. Each design carries the additional inscription Mohawk Ironworkers. So, here we have 10. Here we have 10, 11, 12 and 13. Thirteen is a preference also by the National Congress of the American Indian, as well as the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. Reverses 14, 15 and 16 depict a Mohawk Ironworker on a beam with the additional inscription Mohawk Ironworkers. Here we have 14, 15 which is also a preference by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and 16. Reverses 17 and 18 depict a Mohawk Ironworker grasping the cable of a crane -- a crane hook. The beaded wampum belt is in the background, and it's a familiar icon of the Iroquois Confederacy. It is a design known as the Silver Covenant Chain of Peace and Friendship. Design 18 depicts the gloved hand of a Mohawk Ironworker grasping the metal cable of a crane hook with the beaded wampum belt also in the background. An additional inscription for both designs is Mohawk Ironworkers. Reverse 19 depicts a Mohawk Ironworker driving bolts into a steel beam. The additional inscription Mohawk Ironworkers is included along the border of the design. Reverse 20 depicts two Mohawk Ironworkers on a horizontal beam receiving cables from a crane. The artist states that

this design is meant to emphasize the feeling of being high in the air, and the additional inscription Mohawk Ironworkers is incused on the beam. Reverse 21 portrays a proud Mohawk Ironworkers pausing from his labor atop a metal spire far above the city. The additional inscription is Mohawk Ironworkers. All right. We're having a little technical difficulty. We are for the first time in this room after we've had renovations to our audiovisual system. And Reverse 21 concludes this portfolio, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Oh, are we done?

Ms. Stafford: Sorry. Yes, we are.

Chair Marks: I'm sorry.

Ms. Stafford: That concludes the --

Chair Marks: I'm sorry.

Ms. Stafford: -- the 2015 portfolio.

Chair Marks: My able secretary distracted me, and ably so. Yes. Okay. I'm sorry, folks. We have -- of course, as April reported to us, we have 20 designs to look at here today, numbered 2 through 21. So, on your score sheets, you might want to just cross out Number 1. So, as is our practice when we have numerous designs to look at, we're going to start off by our culling process, and if we could bring up on the scene each of these designs as I work through them. I'm also going to kind of put these up, if you want to follow me. But, the process here for those of you who might not be familiar with it is that if any member wishes to continue consideration of the designs as we review them, then those designs remain in the consideration. However, if we are looking at a design, and there's no indication of interest from any member to continue looking at it, then we set those aside. And by doing that, we reduce down the pool of designs that we're looking at, so we can really focus our discussion on those that we feel like we want to consider for an ultimate recommendation. So, with that, if we could start with Number 2. Is there interest in looking at Number 2?

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes? Okay. So, that one is remaining. Interest in Number 3?

Vice Chair Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Four?

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes. Five? Any interest in 5? Okay. We're setting 5 aside. Six? Interest in 6? Setting 6 aside. Seven?

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Seven remains in. Eight? Is there interest in 8?

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Member Jansen: April, was this the stakeholder's choice? Number 8? Or was it 9?

Chair Marks: This was one of them.

Member Jansen: Eight and 13.

Chair Marks: There's more than one stakeholder.

Member Jansen: Eight and 13.

Ms. Stafford: Eight was preferred by the -- sorry. Eight was preferred by the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives, as well as the National Congress of the American Indian.

Member Jansen: And there was another that they also had an opinion on?

Ms. Stafford: There were several. Eight, 13, 15.

Chair Marks: Okay. Okay. Back to our process. Number 9? Interest in 9? Setting 9 aside. Ten?

Member Jansen: I would like to have 9 brought back in please.

Chair Marks: Nine back in.

Member Jansen: Back in please.

Chair Marks: Nine, or I'm sorry. Ten? Interest in 10? Set that one aside. Eleven? Interest in 11? That one's being set aside. Twelve?

Vice Chair Olson: Sure.

Chair Marks: Sure. Okay. Thirteen?

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes. Fourteen? Interest in 14? Setting 14 aside. There is

interest in 15.

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chair Marks: From the Chair. Interest in 16? Sixteen?

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chair Marks: Setting -- yes. Okay. Seventeen?

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Eighteen? Interest in 18?

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes? Okay. Nineteen? Nineteen? Set that one aside. Twenty? Interest in 20?

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Twenty-one? Interest in 21? Okay. We'll set that one aside. Okay. So, just for review, the designs that we will continue to look at in chronological order are 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20. All right. Okay. So, we now move to the technical question phase of our process. In this phase, we hope to resolve any questions that aren't particularly based on an evaluation of the design, but maybe a question about designs or about the program, what have you. So, Heidi, I see your hand.

Member Wastweet: I'd like to talk about the rims. Let's look at Number 8. So, this has a full bleed to the edge and it's not represented with a rim. Is that correct or is the rim not portrayed here? Anyone?

Ms. Birdsong: What was your question again?

Mr. Everhart: Is the rim not portrayed or is there going to be a rim?

Chair Marks: Do you mean a border or a rim?

Mr. Everhart: A border.

Chair Marks: A border. I see a border. I see a raised border.

Member Wastweet: And then the image is going to -- the shoulder is going to bleed full to the edge?

Mr. Everhart: Yes. That's the way I see it. No.

Member Wastweet: How is that going to be for production?

Mr. Everhart: Oh, we're looking at -- I thought you were looking at this one. Yes, it's a formatting error.

Member Wastweet: It's a formatting error. So, there will be a --

Mr. Everhart: Ignore that.

Member Wastweet: -- rim outside of this. Okay. And the same on Number 12.

Ms. Birdsong: Yes, same.

Member Wastweet: The same?

Ms. Birdsong: Yes.

Member Wastweet: Okay.

Chair Marks: Other questions?

Member Wastweet: And 13?

Member Bugeja: Yes, Gary, I had a couple of technical questions.

Chair Marks: Michael, I don't think Heidi is done.

Member Bugeja: Oh, I'm sorry. I couldn't see her.

Chair Marks: Hold that thought. I'll come right back to you.

Member Bugeja: Thank you, Gary.

Member Wastweet: And then just -- and Number 13 as well.

Ms. Birdsong: Yes.

Member Wastweet: There will be a rim outside of that. Okay. That's it. Thank you.

Chair Marks: Okay. Michael.

Member Bugeja: Yes, I was wondering if any of these designs -- I'm looking at particularly 3 and 4 can have incused buildings to add to the feeling of depth. Are there any plans to do incused or could we have that to add depth? Mechanically would that work?

Mr. Everhart: Michael, which part do you see as incused?

Member Bugeja: I see the buildings. If you make the building incused on 3 and the skyline incused on 4, you have some real depth there. I mean it wouldn't work on Number 7 because there's too much going

on, but it would seem that this is an opportunity if allowed technically to add depth to the orientation which is really quite good.

Mr. Everhart: I like the idea myself.

Member Bugeja: Is that Don?

Mr. Everhart: Yes, I'm sorry, Michael. It's Don Everhart. Yes.

Member Bugeja: Yes, I think that there's some really wonderful possibilities to use incuse. The other -- I have one more question, Don, I hope you can help me with. On designs 14 and 15, I think they're incredibly wonderful designs, but if those are frosted in anyway in proof, are we going to lose the man and the medal? Are they going to meld? We've seen this before in a few of the state quarters and I wondered whether -- what can be done technically to separate that in a proof version?

Member Wastweet: Can I add? This is Heidi. This --

Member Bugeja: Yes. Hi, Heidi.

Member Wastweet: This is a fantastic drawing, but it's a little misleading in the application of the shadowing and the cast shadows and the -- so, on that beam that you see behind his legs --

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Member Wastweet: -- that could be sculpted just smooth as an I-beam would and not try to copy the cast shadowing there and that would pop the legs and make it less confusing.

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Member Wastweet: So, as we look at this drawing, keep that in mind that these -- this crosshatching, this pencil work and the shading is not going to be portrayed in the sculpture. It will have more separation and definition.

Mr. Everhart: Yes, just to add to that --

Member Bugeja: Okay.

Mr. Everhart: Just to add to that --

Member Bugeja: That sounds good. Thank you, Gary.

Chair Marks: Go ahead, Don.

Mr. Everhart: Okay. I was just going to say that the smoothness of the

beam opposed as Heidi is indicating to the drapery and all the wrinkles in the pants and possibly texture, a rough texture on that hook, I think it would set it off pretty nicely. I think it's a good idea.

Chair Marks: Okay. Other technical questions? Erik?

Member Jansen: The term "ironworker" is that one word or two? In some designs such as 15 up here, it is one word and in the other design, it is two words.

Ms. Birdsong: Good catch. That should be one word.

Member Jansen: One word throughout the designs?

Ms. Birdsong: Yes. Yes.

Member Jansen: Second point, I think there's a risk here if we're not careful that the pure visual path that the observer will take themselves down will turn this into an ironworker's coin and it'll end up carrying some kind of Ayn Rand or some steel industry or some kind of New York City '20s/'30s kind of message to it and the Native American connection will be lost and so, I would only argue that when you're looking at these designs, pay attention as to whether the Mohawk reference is there literally and if we like the design and it isn't there, we actually consider asking the artist to incorporate it. I'm just concerned that we could accidentally get a disconnect here between the intention of the coin and the image. These images are pretty strong. So, I put that out there. I know there was some talk earlier about the facial and other body language or call it whatever you want elements that were appropriate for Native American appearance and there was some discussion about there's a number of tribes of the Iroquois group here and so, it's really hard to say one's right and one's wrong. Still I think we need to avoid Anglo or other kind of features that again might drive an ironworker's as opposed to a Native American concept here. The third thing is I find myself really attracted to a couple of --

Chair Marks: Are these technical questions?

Member Jansen: These are technical questions.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Jansen: I find myself really attracted to the use of perspective and I harbor back to your list, Gary, of the 13 attributes in the artistic goals here. The use of perspective and forced perspective and so, technically, I would put that out there as an issue to think about whether we're rendering a design or asking the sculptor to maybe add

an element of that to a design we otherwise like, but might not carry quite as much forced or otherwise perspective. Thank you.

Chair Marks: Are there other technical questions? Okay. The Chair has one. If we could bring up Number 7 please. Okay. This is a really interesting one. It makes me dizzy. But, I'm curious if -- I don't know if Don or Steve could enlighten me on -- particularly in the proof version of this. Is this mostly frost or would the street -- the street intersection down there, would that be --

Mr. Antonucci: I was looking at the street --

Chair Marks: -- mirrored or --

Mr. Antonucci: -- the street as being polished.

Chair Marks: Pardon me.

Mr. Antonucci: I was looking at the street surface as being polished. Originally, much -- else left to do.

Chair Marks: Okay. And the \$1 denomination would be polished?

Mr. Antonucci: Yes, and the border.

Chair Marks: Would you see -- is there an opportunity here, Steve, for your layered intensity of the frost idea or for a production claim like this, probably not?

Mr. Antonucci: It's so small. That's the challenge I had there, Gary.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Mr. Antonucci: How tiny that is and knowing it's that size. I just don't - - I don't know what I'm going to -- I mean if I'm -- if I had my druthers here, I'd write the -- hit the beam heavy and the background light and the ironworker somewhere in the --

Chair Marks: Is that realistic for this type of a coin?

Mr. Antonucci: It's realistic. It's possible. We can do these things. I know at the last meeting we had, I think Erik asked that question and we tried to employ more of this type of methodology on these. Everybody knows me. I'll give it a shot.

Chair Marks: All right. Well, thank you. I'm curious about the --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Can I ask --

Chair Marks: Go ahead.

Member Stevens-Sollman: It's your intention that if this coin is frosted, the ironworker would also be lightly frosted or would he be polished?

Mr. Antonucci: No, I wouldn't polish the ironworker. It would strictly be the street surfaces and probably the background, The United States of America. Is that what you're looking at?

Mr. Everhart: I see the border where US of A is. It's polished, the street and the \$1 and that's it. Okay. Unless there's some swimming pools down there.

Member Stevens-Sollman: So, would we be losing detail in this because of the polish? There's so much detail in that city scene down there. Would that be raised up enough?

Mr. Antonucci: That's what my concern is, Jeanne. Is that you've got a lot of detail down there. A lot of prismatic lines and I just don't know how well that will show up. Maybe we can simplify that a little bit. I don't --

Mr. Everhart: I think we'll have to play that down just to get the feeling of perspective. It's going to have to be a low relief and very subtle and then punch it up as you get up to the figure so that you have that feeling of depth and perspective.

Chair Marks: Okay. With that, thank you. Did you have any more, Jeanne? Okay. With that, we need to move on. We have -- just keep us on time here. We have a little less than 30 minutes to finish our review of this 2015 element of the program. So, as we launch into our individual reviews, I want to encourage the members to look at the image on your printed-out page down at the lower right-hand corner. That is what we're really talking about. We are not talking about these big designs. We are not talking about the designs up here on the wall and you may think they're the same, but when you shrink them down to the size of the \$1 coin, it fundamentally changes those images that you're seeing. So, I want to encourage us all keep yourself mindful of what we're talking about here. We're not talking about 7 inches. We're talking about a little over an inch. So, with that, Tom, would you like to start off?

Member Uram: Thanks, Chairman Gary. In general comments regarding the Mohawk design here, as was mentioned earlier, what bothers me about Number 2 and Number 3 is that when it's depicted on a quarter -- and I don't see anything that -- as a matter of fact, when I started running my notes, I slipped up and put steelworkers when I was looking at it. So, for that reason, I'm kind of hesitant on

Number 2 and 3. Particularly on Number 3, I think. These are all very strong images that are really in motion. We have a lot of depictions here that really have a lot of motion and now, how do we translate it into the emotion of that coin. Unfortunately, with this one here, I think it would end up being -- looking like a bungee jumper unfortunately when it was on the quarter to me. Plus it doesn't describe that it is -- I know that the hat and the different things there do translate, but with the average person picking this quarter up, I would be concerned that they would not realize that it was a Mohawk Ironworker. So, moving along to several of the other designs and I'd like you to look at Number 4 in particular. Five. I'm sorry. And I like that a lot. However, what I would like to look at is the Mohawk burlap strap that is on the border of this particular coin and what I'd like to suggest is that we keep that design in thought because it does represent that depiction there in place --

Member Jansen: Which number are you referring to?

Member Uram: Pardon me?

Member Jansen: Which design number are you referring to?

Member Uram: Number 5, that Mohawk strap that is going from like 2:00 to 10:00 on the edge there. Yes, what I'd like to see is maybe if you would go to 13 now.

Chair Marks: Are we looking at 4?

Member Jansen: Well, we eliminated 5.

Chair Marks: We eliminated --

Member Jansen: But, he's calling out a feature of 5.

Member Uram: I'm just looking at that.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Uram: And saying the feature of that. The most -- I really like this one in regards to the motion and the up. You still have the high and you still have the background of being way high in the air. However, I think that strap put on here might enhance this design that much more. It would be a tribute to those ironworkers and to the Mohawks for having that added thought. So, my thought is I like 13 particularly if we could add that. And then if we go to 15, I think this one has a lot of -- if it can be depicted properly on the quarter -- on the dollar. I'm sorry. And if it would be -- depending on how the relief and everything turns out, I think this has a lot going for it as well. My

other thought was that a couple of the other ones, in particular, back to Number 7, what concerns me about Number 7 is I like the design a lot. However, I like the design of the platinum coin that had liberty and all the years and everything and I look at it and it's just so frosted. I can't see it the way I thought I would see it here and it comes back to haunt me a little bit on this design. Although if this was a medal, I think it would be super because you can incuse and do a lot of things with that, with the ground and everything there. But, as a dollar coin, I think we could lose a lot on this one. So, as I look at this, I would like as my first choice to be Number 13 and particularly if we could add the burlap strap on the rim to give it that added dimension. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Tom. Michael Olson.

Vice Chair Olson: All right. You know, it's a real shame that these coins aren't available for circulation because the public and children in particular are really missing out by not having these available. There's some really great designs here. I don't see a bad one in the bunch. There's just varying levels of good design. I agree with the prior comments. That without specifically saying Mohawk Ironworkers, the message is going to be lost. So, that to me is an important element that needs to be included. Whether it's organic to a design or needs to be added later, my believe is that it must be on the design. Looking at these designs, the ones that I showed most preference to were the ones that did attempt to give you a little bit of dizziness and perception of height. With that, I'll go through the designs that the Committee has selected to review. Number 2, I really like that one for a couple of reasons. The art deco style lettering as well as what could appear to be the -- an Empire State Building or a building somewhat like it on the reverse is very appealing. The -- excuse me. Number 3. Very strong image. Now, it doesn't have the inscription on this, but it does look like there would really be a lot of room to place it on there, but I want to commend the artist because that is a darn good looking coin there and it captures the time period when these buildings were built and shows a good representation of the worker as well. Number 3, again, a little bit of a symbolism. Excuse me. I'm way off here. Okay. Yes, my notes are one off. It was late, late when I was working on this. All right. I'll try to adjust fire here. Number 4, again, commend the artist. They're showing depth. They're also showing some height. I particularly appreciated the style of lettering which appears to be somewhat industrial ironworking type of riveting. You can maybe see the angles of some of the letters. Very nice design. It think that would make a nice coin as well. Okay. Number -- let's see here. Okay. Moving on to Number 7. This one -- Number 7 is my favorite design of the bunch. I like it for a lot of reasons. Number one, I commend

whoever the artist is for again giving us something more than we see in a lot of cases. This is a really neat design. If this was on a 3-inch medal, you'd probably get a little dizzy looking at this. One comment of a design or technical perspective that I want to bring up is if this is meant to be a literal interpretation of a worker standing on a beam, I just don't see how it's possible. If it's a -- supposed to be just a representation of a scape where the worker is above and it's not meant to be a literal interpretation, then I can understand that, but when you look at those buildings, they look like they're one and two-story buildings. Nothing's a skyscraper there. Looking over the edge forward of the worker, I could see possibly that being a realistic scene, but when you look right behind him and you see the same thing, unless they're building an arch over a neighborhood, that's really not possible. There were some comments about it being too busy and maybe towards the detriment of maybe selecting this design, what I would suggest is if this design is selected possibly looking at the ground below and turning some of that into a rubble work scene which would be realistic at the base of a building that this gentleman was putting together. Because, again, this -- I -- I don't think it would be possible for a beam to be structurally across a neighborhood with nothing -- no other means of support. But, I do like this design. Right. Number 8. The strap is a nice addition. However, my only comment on that is it does not have the Mohawk inscription which if added to that design would make for a fine design. Number 9, the font again is industrial in nature or excuse me. That font Mohawk Ironworkers, I seem to recall that same font being used on a prior -- prior coins from this series which would be a nice tie-in and the dollar symbol as well matches with what we've seen in prior designs. Number 12, the reaching for the hook does give you a sense of perspective there. You're looking up rather than down, but you can tell that he's definitely in a high place and he's definitely working hard there. Number 13, again, nice perspective. It's a -- you're standing on top where the worker would be. I did appreciate the bolt heads that were added to each side of the rim and again, this one would be a nice design as well. It's got the inscription. I think the next one we were looking at was 15. Yes. Okay. That would make a fine design as well. I question maybe from Steve or Don that boot. On this rendition, it looks like it would be -- have a fairly -- it would be projected out from the coin. Would that really be a realistic way of looking at that?

Mr. Antonucci: Not the way it's drawn. You could never do it like that. That would be the highest point.

Vice Chair Olson: Yes. Okay. Moving on to Number 16, again, that's not one of my preferences, but it would turn out fine. Number 17, I think that one to me is too busy. There's too much going on there.

Appreciate the use of the inscription and the decoration there, but I think on this side of the coin that's going to fill up the pallet to a greater extent than we need. On Number 18, again, that's a nice design, but I think we've got some better choices to select from there. The final one, Number 20, that was not on my list. I question the perspective somewhat on that beam with the lettering, but that just wasn't -- it didn't have a lot of interest for me. Gary, that concludes my comments.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. I want to recognize April at this time.

Ms. Stafford: Yes, I just wanted to acknowledge that we have with us today Ms. Jackie Swift who is the Repatriation Manager of the National Museum of the American Indian. She is with us today. Ms. Swift is our main point of contact on all of the portfolios for the Native American \$1 Coin Program and she identifies for us additional subject matter experts with whom we work in developing the background information, the themes and the designs reviews and all of that. So.

Chair Marks: Thank you, April. Ms. Swift, as the Chairman, I want to welcome you to our meeting today and just a word on what you'll see here. You'll hear a lot of positive comments, but you'll also hear some critical ones. I just want to assure you that what you're hearing is our deliberative process to make sure the best that we can to the best of our ability we recommend based on all the expertise on this panel the design that's going to represent this subject matter in the best possible light. So, I just want to make sure you understand what we're doing and when we're all done, you know, you'll understand what we did. And also, if at any point there's -- you know, something really sticks on you and you want to have a comment made, you want to tell us something, I really welcome that. So, let us know.

Ms. Swift: Thank you. Well, I know that Betty's been great to work with. Thank you so much, Betty --

Ms. Birdsong: You're welcome.

Ms. Swift: -- these last few years and she's heard an earful of my critiques. So, you know, I think I've included all of our critiques in the last two or three rounds for each coin. So, we definitely have -- we have critical thoughts sometimes on this. So, thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you for being here.

Ms. Swift: Sure.

Chair Marks: We appreciate it. Heidi.

Member Wastweet: Thank you. I want to compliment the artists on a great group of designs. I'm sad that we can't pick more than one. I think there's some really strong designs here. Design Number 2, I want to point out that this is a good example of having a narrative scene with a thoughtful and artistic composition and it's a beautiful design. On Number 3, also, I think this is a very attractive design. Often times, you'll hear us on the Committee say we don't like extra text and lettering. We feel it clutters up and is sometimes hard to read. This is an example of a program where I think additional lettering is helpful. I think it helps to have the words Mohawk Ironworkers in this instance. This is an exception. And this design doesn't really have room for that. So, while it's a really attractive design, I do lean towards those that say Mohawk Ironworkers. On Design Number 4, another thing that we've been asking for in the Committee is to see designs with texture and here we see it and this would look fantastic on the coin. Again, I've said it before, nice drawings don't always make nice coins. This texture would look really great when it's reduced down to the coin. It doesn't say Mohawk Ironworker. So, it has a little strike against it there. But, for a design, it's really great. It's simple, but yet detailed and it's effective. Really nice design. On Number 7, another great design. It has a good feel to it. The dizziness that was mentioned. It's very creative. I would love this if it were a medal. I don't think it works as a \$1 coin. I'm picturing this -- holding this in my hand the way it reflects the light, the scale of it. I don't think it's going to read as well as this really great drawing. Also, the mass at the hard hat is going to be a little challenge for medal flow. It's going to not be popular I think with the production crew. On Design Number 8 -- on Design Number 2, I had pointed out that we had narration with a thoughtful and artistic composition. On 8 here, we have narrative subject, but I don't think the composition is artistic other than the addition of the design on the outside. But, the composition of the figures and the beams is not as effective and the head closest to us is quite large compared to the rest of the design and those small figures in the background, I'm picturing this actual size on the coin and those figures are inappropriately small and the detail around the edge with the Native American design while it is interesting, I think it again is not appropriate for this scale of the project. It makes it much more busy. Design Number 12, this would be another good choice. I think it's effective. The perspective of the beam is very effective. Gives us a feeling of height. It has the words Mohawk Ironworkers on it. This would be an attractive one as well. And Number 13, this one I really appreciate the curvature of the earth. It gives us a real sense of height and the cleverness of having the hand grasp the rim, the bullet point shaped like bolts. All very nice additions, but a lot going on for a \$1 coin. Again, it would make a great medal. I'm sorry we can't make a medal out of this. Design 15, I

think this hits all the points. It's got a bold character that's appropriate for the size of the coin. It's simple, but yet, it has a lot of detail. Again, like I said earlier, the drawing is a little misleading with all the crosshatching. It wouldn't be as busy as a sculpture as it is as a drawing. So, if you look at it with that in mind. The text is very well organized. It's all the clear and proper size. And the thing that puts this ahead for me over the other designs is the use of the feathers. So, that we have something that is distinguishing that this is a Native American coin. It's a subtle thing, but it's important to me and it sets it ahead of the other designs even though the others are attractive. This has a little more meaning for me. It was commented about the boot coming out. As a sculptor, I know that that's just an illusion. If you think about this as a drawing on a flat piece of paper, that boot doesn't come out any further than any other part of the drawing because it's flat and a coin is also flat and the sculptor knows how to use that trickery of the eye so that the boot looks like it's coming more forward, but it's not actually. So, don't worry about that in your consideration of this design. The sculptor will take care of you. On Design Number 16, I see something here that's a little interesting. It's a dual image. Usually when we see pictures of Native Americans, it's very common to see them in these heroic poses riding horses across the plains and here the Indian is riding a beam instead of a horse. But, it has a reminisce of him riding a horse and I like that dual imagery. So, that's really interesting and it's well organized as well. Design 17, this one the face to me looks too Caucasian. I want to see something that's a little more Native American looking and I think the design across the background when it's reduced to the coin, I think it's going to get a little busy and the same with 18. Design Number 20, I think this is an okay design. The anatomy is not quite as effective as some of the other drawings. So, it doesn't rise to the top of my favorites, but it's a decent design. So, I think that's all my comments.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Heidi.

Member Bugeja: Gary, this is Michael. Do you want me to pipe in?

Chair Marks: I was going to go to you here just right when I'm finished.

Member Bugeja: Okay.

Chair Marks: In fact, I was going to just now give you a heads up.

Member Bugeja: Thank you.

Chair Marks: But, you've been heads up now. Okay. So, first of all, kudos to the artists who put this collection together. I think from an

artistic point of view to a design they're all really good, solid designs. They're bold. They're crisp. Good composition I think and excellent execution, too. So, my comments here aren't so much whether I like something or not, but what I think's going to fit best on a coin of this size and I think that rules some in and others out. So, and then there's some other points too along the way. Number 2, I like this one. Like I said, I like them all, but to me, there's not really a lot of indication here that this would be a Native American theme. I'm not convinced with that just looking at it. There's nothing to give me that idea. So, that's not one, although I like the composition, that I'm leaning towards. Number 3, clean, nicely executed. I like the perspective and all that. Again, there's nothing here that particularly tells me this is a Mohawk Worker. So, I think there's others in this collection that convey that in a stronger way. Number 4, again, I'm looking for something that makes sure that the message of the Native American involvement in the ironworking is conveyed. I don't feel like that this conveys it as well as some others in the set that we're looking at and just generally and maybe it's just me, we have several images here of the backs of people. I would rather see the fronts of people and that's not, you know, an exclusive statement. There are times I think it works and there's a design or two in here that I do like. But, I think there's some better ones although I like this. It's an interesting perspective. Number 7, gosh, I like this one. But, I'm thinking there's too much going on for the size of this palette. I really like this one. But, if it were a 3-inch medal, I think it would be fabulous and I'm not convinced by the time we frost this like on the proof on this size, I'm not sure it's really going to pop as we might hope it would and I'm thinking that people look at it and they're not immediately going to understand what they're looking at and I think there's some others that convey better. The same with 8. I like this one, but I think there's some others that are better yet and I'm getting to those. Number 9, I think the image here might just be a little small. If you look at the little image members, look at the image that shows you in real size. It just doesn't give the pop that I think we would like to see. Number 12, I'm listening to all the rest of you on this one. I just -- I'm -- my thoughts aren't solidified on this. So, I want to fair and I'll pick a pass and listen to the remainder of the Committee on that one. I really like 13. I like the modern sense with the grip on the borderline there and the foot up resting on it as well. It's interesting. The only thing I'm worried a little bit about is the size of the characters by the time you get it down to the size of the pallet. Is it going to pop the way I would hope? I don't know and I'll be listening to the rest of you if you want to give me some of your thoughts on that. Number 15 is my favorite. I think this is a good, strong, crisp image. I think it's going to show well on the coin. The feathers on the hat not only with the lettering off to the left there, but the feathers in the hat, the bone structure and the

anatomy in the face, I think all conveys what we want to convey. I love the hook and the perspective that we're given here. The boot shoved into that hook and jetting out at us. I think this one does it all. I think this would be a fabulous addition to the series and I'll be giving it my full support. I feel the same way in many ways for Number 16. It doesn't quite have the advantage of some of the perspective that we saw in 15. It looks like the same artist did it and I really like it, but like I said, I think 15 is better and after all, we're looking for one design here to recommend. Number 17, Heidi said it. It looks somewhat like a Caucasian man here although we have the wording I think that tries to save the design. In an exercise where we're trying to find one to recommend, I just -- I don't think that's the best one for us to pick. The same with Number 18. I think there's some better ones. This one's a little -- it lacks some of the sense of motion and the excitement that some of the others convey. Although, I like the drawing itself. It's an attractive one. Twenty, I like the perspective here. I think the figures are going to end up a little bit small on this pallet and the others that I've indicated my preferences for I think just really outweigh this one. So, those are my comments and to that, I'll got to Michael Bugeja on the phone.

Member Bugeja: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief because I think those before me have expressed good ideas.

I do want to compliment the artists on a terrific set of drawings here and to remind them that you don't need a Mohawk on a building to have this type of perspective and motion. It's just really lovely.

But, there's one other thing that I want to call to the attention of both the Committee and to the Mint artists and that on several of these designs, we have few devices which really makes the ones that are there pop out and I think this is why some of these designs are so wonderfully fetching.

I do like Number 2. I understand that it lacks something of the Mohawk Ironworkers on there. You wouldn't know what it is. I think that's a valid comment. With incuse and orientation, this is a pretty novel coin.

Number 4 is one of my favorites. I think the skyline can be incused and you'll have such depth with that. It would be literally amazing.

However, I would move the legend United States of America in the same smaller type font as you find in 07 beginning with the U at 12:00 and outlining the rim United States of America and in that space that's left put Mohawk Ironworkers and I think you have a terrific coin with few devices and more depth than I've seen in a long, long time on any

coin.

Number 7, I like that, too. I understand it's a small plank chip. You can have even more depth here if you make the plank incused.

If we go down to Number 15, I think that is one of my favorites. I think it lends so much to -- I mean the artistry in here is just really wonderful. I can't say enough about it.

Those are among my favorites. I won't criticize ones that I find less impressive, but orientation, perspective, motion and movement I think on some of these are just really excellent.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Member Jansen: I will echo kudos, but I'll say it in a slightly different way. I'm having more fun going through these pictures and these images and these artworks than I've had in a set of alternatives in quite awhile. It's just flat-out fun because there are so many really wonderful uses of symbols and perspective and who would have thought that would have come out of Mohawk Ironworkers.

So, kudos to the artists. Kudos to the team drafted and selected the subset coming to us. Thank you for giving us more not less. It's fun.

I'm going to focus on some comments I've made before, but I'm going to reiterate really two other points.

Negative space is just becoming the vehicle of pizzazz, the vehicle of splash, the vehicle of visual focus and so, I'm drawn to designs that are using powerful negative space and not contributing so many details that are going to get lost in the uber-frosting technology that we are currently using.

And then I'm going to add another thought here that I haven't heard stated yet and that is I think these designs need to show a sense of activity. Active is maybe or dynamics or holy cow, I can feel that character trying to balance and normally, that's a comment I expect to hear from Heidi and I think she kind of implied it, but I didn't hear the words. So, I'm going to say it.

I'm going to go to Design Number 4. This was originally -- as I just did a quick casual scan of these and then slept on them before I did an analysis, this is the one that I said "oh, yeah," because it has texture. It has simplicity. It has perspective. It has the sense of you can feel the balance. This guy's just -- I mean he's comfortable, but he's

managing this.

It doesn't have the Mohawk Ironworkers and I wouldn't begin to second guess the artist, but I can appreciate it's a difficult workout. I'm not quite sure how you work that out and if I were to go with Number 4, it's going to receive my strong vote, a 3, I will immediately amend it to challenge the artist to add the Mohawk Ironworker logo on here somehow.

But, Design Number 4 is the one that I look at and said simple, straightforward, active, negative space, textures. It's got so many things here.

Number 7, Heidi said it. If this was a medal, holy cow. The artist that drew this I feel for them because they clearly suffer from vertigo and in that sense, they have shown us what vertigo feels like. So, thank you for that. I wish we were doing a medal, but it's confusion at 1.02 inches, the diameter of the quarter or of the dollar coin.

I'm going to jump to Design Number 9. This is the one that lingered in me as hey, you can't ignore this one. The baseline design is very nice. I think the buildings on the bottom will not disappear especially if there was a skyscraper added in there or it looked a little less kind of urban residential and a little more urban urban.

I'm going to give it a strong support. I love the beam. I love the balance. I love the character. It's got the verbiage we want and it uses negative space very powerfully.

I'm going to move to Number 12 and say the perspective of that beam is highly disturbing to me. The beam just simply fades to a vertical vanishing point unnaturally and it's very disturbing. That piece of steel clearly is a pointed piece of steel and not just a regular piece of steel. The perspective in the bottom half is dramatically different than the perspective in the top half of that beam and so, it really disturbs me.

It has the symbols. It has the negative space. It has the man reaching, but it's just disturbing to me.

Contrary on Number 13, this is going to get a strong support from me. I love the curved horizon. That coin wouldn't be half the design it is without three things that it has. Curved horizontal. Leg up on the Mohawk Ironworkers. That prioritizes that portion of the coin in your visual attack. When you look at that thing -- even coined up at 1 inch, when you look at that, your eye is going to go to his hand. You're going to appreciate the curve and you're going to go right to what his foot's on.

And I think it's a really cool design. I think it has everything. It will also get a strong support from me.

It might be worth looking at going Mohawk Ironworkers in incuse on that one. Again, just to highlight that. An incuse with a large enough font and in a field that is the perimeter field that isn't so uber-frosted that the frosting attacks and minimizes the font itself. Sometimes we've seen that on some of the quarter series where the actual font itself gets impinged upon by the frosting coming in from the edge of the letters.

I'm going to stand against some of the opinions that have been put out there and I'm going to encourage everybody to look on Number 15. Go to the full 8-inch rendering here and I'm going to put a thought in your mind and you may think I'm nuts and I actually like him as an artist, but when you put that on a quarter, it looks to me like a rock star holding a guitar. The way his hand curves around what appears to be the neck of the guitar, that to me looks like a rock star and not a Mohawk Ironworker. The feathers will disappear. You won't see them and it's just too busy.

As we've seen some of the -- and I'm going to use as a reference the - - oh, one of the quarters we did here last time where the background as the bridge wove through the hill side, the background was just this noise of trees or bushes or whatever and I think his whole accoutrement that he's wearing, his belts and his rivet pliers and so forth is just going to disappear into and what's going to pop out if a rock star holding a guitar. Sorry.

So, 15 is going to get a zero from me because I think it's just not what we want it to be.

I love the use of symbols and the integration of the covenant chain of peace and friendship belt. Has all the symbols. It just kind of though misses my mark.

And the same comments for 18. I would have loved them because I think they have a really nice native piece to them, but they don't seem Mohawk Ironworkers in my head, in my eye, in my mind's head.

But, things could be fixed. I mean I watched Phoebe Hemphill fix the face on 2012 when she sculpted the 2012 Native American \$1. It went from an Anglo face to a really, really appropriate Native American face. So, I'm not worried about the face there. It can be fixed. So, even if the group likes that, I think the face is not something to worry about there.

I look at 15, 16 and to a certain degree 17 and guys, careful. We're

getting back to pictures on metal.

Finally, Number 20, this one's kind of cool. It's kind of cool because it's kind of funky. You talked about frontal views. You got full frontal views here, guys.

Whereas, the iron beam on the bottom, it kind of is a little funny to see an I-beam there because of the way the ironworkers in the shaded portion come up, but again, you do not miss. This is about Mohawk Ironworkers and this is about guys way up on a moving piece of steel holding onto cables and man, they are bold, strong, fearless and good and whereas, I might like to change the faces of bit. Again, I think that can be handled.

How would you -- Steve, how would you handle the texturing of this thing in a frost in a proof?

Mr. Antonucci: Well, obviously, the drapery, we would frost that background --

Member Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Antonucci: The beam is where I like the work. The Mohawk Ironworkers, we would incuse that and hit that pretty hard --

Member Jansen: Yes.

Mr. Antonucci: -- with a heavy frost. It would pop right out on you and maybe put a light frost on that beam.

Member Jansen: And although I've said it before, I'm going to say it again here in a very, very strong fashion. We owe it, in my opinion, to the shareholders here to make sure this image leads with we are Mohawk and of all the images, with that incuse, this coin leads with we are Mohawk. We are strong.

Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Erik. We'll go to Jeanne.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I have to agree with -- thank you, Gary. I have to agree with my colleagues about the great work that has been presented to us by the artists and I agree with Erik that this is a great portfolio to look at.

I believe the artists had a good time. It seems like their imagination just really flew with this project and I'm happy to see that in all of these designs.

I am a little concerned because we are only making a dollar-size image and that, for me, excludes some of these pieces that would make a great medal, a 3-inch piece, a 4-inch piece. So, I think I will skip to the ones that I believe would be more apropos to that smaller size that we're working on.

And therefore, I'll speak to Number 4 which is pretty dynamic. I love the fact that this beam just moves right into those buildings. You know, I'm very convinced that it's supported by that structure back there. So, I like this very much.

I'm disappointed that we don't have the words Mohawk on here, Mohawk Ironworkers and I'm wondering if we do choose this if we couldn't move the dollar sign to behind the ironworker and put Mohawk Ironworker in incused text in that space on a small scale so we don't lose the texture.

I think this is a very powerful piece. He shows his fearlessness and even though I'm sure they were fearful being up there, that can't be a very easy job at all, I think this is a very proud moment for these people.

Also, I'm reminded of the fact that the ironworkers or Mohawk Ironworkers built the Trade Center that was collapsed in 9/11 and those ironworkers came back to help find what they could find out of all that rubble. So, not only did they construct it, but they filtered through it and I'm very proud to be a part of this project.

So, my vote pretty much goes towards this one in its clarity if we would have the Mohawk Ironworkers on here.

And again, I'm going to skip over to Number 7. I think it's a terribly great and wonderful direction to go. I feel very sad that we can't use this. I think we shouldn't use it. I shouldn't say we can't. But, we shouldn't use it on a dollar because of all the information that is there and I think it will defeat our purpose. But, it is a very powerful concept.

And again, Michael Olson and I kind of wondered if this worker isn't balanced and hanging way far over the building as that beam is maybe turning over that landscape. I think it's just really fabulous.

I understand that Number 8 is one of the preferred pieces and I think that it is a good piece. I love what's happening on its helmet. No one has really mentioned the imagery on the helmet. As opposed to putting feathers on, there's some great little drawings on there indicating symbolism from the Confederacy.

I think that we don't have the ironworkers wordage on here and the burlap belting takes that place, but as we reduce this design to a dollar size, we're going to lose a lot of that and once we have some frosting on there, I feel like we're going to lose so much of that beading and detail. So, I'm not going to support this piece.

If I go to Number 12 which is again another simple, very powerful, strong image. It does have everything we have on it. I'm looking at this as a possibility because I think when it's reduced to a small size, we're going to still see proud Mohawk Ironworkers. I like the fact that we have high ironworker on here and this is the only design that has that. That sort of is interesting.

And, Erik, I don't think it's going to come to a point. I think it's going to hit another beam from across here.

Going over to Number 15, I like this very much. I especially love what the artist did with the gloves. I mean I don't know. I mean, you know, working with metal it's really hard and a glove is never going to be the right size and it's going to flop over and everything and this artist really got that information in there. Got all of the wrinkles and the dirt and everything that goes on when you're working construction.

I like this very, very much. I think it has a lot of possibilities and I agree with Heidi that that boot's going to recede and be flat if the sculpting is done right.

And that's all. Thank you very much, Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Jeanne.

Robert.

Member Hoge: Well, thank you. I don't want to rehash many of the comments of my colleagues because I agree with almost everything that's been said here. Similar observations.

I'd really like to discuss how much I think these are interesting designs. Some of them really kind of exceptional.

But, first of all, could you review for me again quickly, Gary, which were the preferences of the stakeholders among these? I lost track.

Member Jansen: They preferred Item Number 8, Number 13 and Number 15.

Member Hoge: Just those three.

Chair Marks: That's correct.

Member Hoge: Okay. One thing that has troubled me a little bit in our discussion here is whether or not these people look like Mohawks or members of the Iroquois Confederation or not because it seems to me we're getting into a little bit of a problem here with possible racial profiling and ethnic stereotyping. I mean, you know, we need to be aware that this kind of thing probably is not something we want to -- you know, see part of what's going on.

If you look at historic photographs of Native Americans, one thing that you're really struck by is their individuality. I think that's something to bear in mind, too.

I like seeing the native elements in some of these. The burlap work and the wampum. Unfortunately, it seems like these are not incorporated as much as they might be in some of these images.

Number 7 I think is a wonderful thing I agree as for a medal. I think that the -- here the perspective of the buildings below would probably end up looking like some kind of microscopic circuit board. I think in the perspective of a coin, this just wouldn't do exciting and unusual as it is.

Number 13 I thought was perhaps the best although I'm a little troubled with whether the cityscape could be shown properly in this kind of perspective. It has the same kind of problem with Number 7. The great distance of the microscopic detail. I think this is wonderful traditional use of an exergue where it says Mohawk Ironworkers. The way the worker is holding the circle and stepping and reaching into the perspective of iron in the sky I think is a marvelous feature.

Again, though, it's difficult to decide on these because they're so many of them that do have very pleasing elements. So, you know, I feel like I can't go wholeheartedly just to one rather than another. It's a very difficult selection.

Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Robert. I will wrap this up, we're a little overtime, but I think we're in good shape. Just a couple of comments.

First of all, kind of harkening back to our discussion about symbolism that we had at the start of the meeting, I'm going to point out that, although there's some symbols in here, most of these designs deal with more of a realism. Images of people doing things and this is an example where it works and they've incorporated symbols in a very appropriate way. I want to -- not wanting to be accused of just being simply on the bandwagon for symbolism, this is a great example where realism works and I think the artists have executed very well.

I also want to agree with my friend Erik that this has been a lot of fun and in agreeing with him, now I going to disagree with him on 15. If we could pull that up real quick.

He claims it looks like the man is playing a guitar. The only problem is there's no guitar there and so, maybe he's playing an air guitar at 1500 feet and some imaginary Van Halen tune. But, I don't see it and even at the small size, I don't see it my friend. I don't see it. What's that?

Vice Chair Olson: Jump by Van Halen.

Chair Marks: So, I think the criticism misses its mark and I still think this is a stand out and I'll be giving my full support to it.

Any other quick comments before we go to the scoring?

Member Wastweet: Just two quick comments. I want to caution on Number 9, the perspective of the anatomy is incorrect. So, let's keep that in mind. The arms are much too long. The legs are too short and it's -- the head is in the wrong proportion to the rest of the body. I just want to point that out.

Vice Chair Olson: Maybe he jumped and that's what happened.

Chair Marks: Okay. Anything else?

Member Wastweet: And then second comment. Just a message to the artist, please don't draw cast shadows because that's misleading to us as we review these designs. So, draw these as they're sculptures not paintings. That's it.

Chair Marks: Good point. Any other quick comments?

Okay. Not hearing any, I'll ask you to fill out your ballots and pass those in. Well, actually, yes, pass those in to Erik and while you're doing that, I'm going to recognize April Stafford to give us her report on the 2016 addition to this program.

Member Wastweet: Can I make one more quick comment?

Chair Marks: Okay. Go ahead.

Member Wastweet: As you're scoring, please remember you don't have to give the high score to only your favorite. Give scores on merit to all those that deserve merit.

Member Jansen: And make special note that Design Number 1 is a no vote. So, don't -- what do you call that, Mr. Olson? Adjust your fire

incorrectly.

Vice Chair Olson: Yes, adjust fire.

Member Jansen: Yes, so, there is no vote on Item Number 1. Make sure you got the right number by your intended votes. Thank you.

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2016 Native American \$1 Coin Program

Ms. Stafford: For the 2016 Native American \$1 Coin Program, we have 18 candidate designs for your consideration.

Reverse 1, 2 and 3 are World War I and World War II Code Talkers in profile with a stylized eagle in the background.

Design 1 and 3 include radio emissions represented by concentric bands in the background. Additional inscriptions include Code Talkers World War I and World War II.

Here we have Designs 1 and 2 and I'll note here that Designs 1 and 2 were preferred by the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives and we have Design 3. Also preferred by the Congressional Native American Caucus of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

Reverses 4, 5 and 6. Design 4 depicts the silhouette of a Code Talker in action while communicating. He's positioned against the backdrop of two helmets. One from each World War. At the bottom of the design is an additional inscription Code Talkers and a star at the center of the inscriptions WWI and WWII. A diamond-patterned border treatment is also included behind the World War II soldier and just inside of the inscription United States of America.

Design 5 is similar except the World War II Code Talker is depicted in full.

Design 6 has a World War II Code Talker in action and juxtaposed against the silhouette of a World War I Code Talker who's receiving a message and decoding it on paper. Additional inscriptions at the bottom of the rim are Code Talkers and separated by two small stars WWI and WWII.

Design Number 4 I'd like to note was preferred by the National Congress of the American Indian.

Moving on to reverse 7, depicts a Code Talker using his radio to send a message. In front of him are two lightning bolts used to represent

military communication squadrons and also symbolize electronic communications emitting from the receiver in his right hand. A red-tailed hawk stylized with geometric elements soars above the lightning bolts to carry the soldier's message in his native language.

Reverse 8 depicts a Code Talker kneeling with his radio beside him, antenna extended as he communicates in code. Three arcs on the left represent radio waves emitting from the antenna as he speaks into the receiver. The inscription United States of America surrounds him as a symbol that his messages are sent on the country's behalf.

Reverse 9 features the helmets and dates of World War I and World War II. Two feathers form a V symbolizing victory, unity and the important role that Code Talkers played in the overall victory of both wars. The additional inscriptions used are Code Talkers, 1917 and 1945. This reverse was preferred by the National Congress of the American Indian as well as the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

Reverses 10, 11 and 12. Design 10 and 11 depict Code Talkers pausing to communicate. While Design 12 depicts a Code Talker in action and incorporates two P51s flying overhead. The additional inscription in Design 11 and 12 is Code Talkers. Ten, 11 and 12.

Reverse 13 depicts a Code Talker sitting and hurrying to decode a message so it can be translated to his team. Seen in the foreground and background are the ruins after an air strike bombing.

Reverse 14 depicts two Code Talkers in action during World War II. The figures are staged to convey the work and risks that Native Americans accepted as they defended the United States.

Reverse 15 depicts a Code Talker from World War II.

Reverse 16 depicts a Code Talker holding his binoculars and receiver in hand as he pauses to assess the current situation. Feathers on the border of the design symbolize the strength and courage of Code Talkers. The additional inscription is Code Talkers. This reverse was preferred by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

In Reverse 17 and 18, Code Talkers pause and look straight ahead seconds before they communicate their message. Feathers on the border symbolize the strength and courage of Code Talkers with the additional inscription Code Talkers. Here's Reverse 17 and 18.

That's it, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you very much.

Okay. So, the same exercise as before. We have 18 designs here and so, we want to go through our process of identifying those that we want to move forward with concerning our discussion. So, we'll just kind of run through each of these and we all know the process.

So, Number 1, is there interest in looking at Number 1?

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Number 1, this is in.

Number 2?

Vice Chair Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Number 3?

Member Uram: Yes.

Chair Marks: Number 4? Four?

Ms. Stafford: This is preferred.

Chair Marks: This is one of the preferred designs --

Ms. Stafford: Yes.

Chair Marks: -- of the stakeholders or stakeholder group.

Ms. Stafford: Preferred by the National Congress of the American Indian.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, we'll keep that one.

Number 5? Setting 5 aside.

Six?

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chair Marks: Seven? Seven?

Setting 7 aside.

Eight? Setting 8 aside.

Nine?

Member Hoge: Yes.

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Chair Marks: Ten? Setting 10 aside.

Eleven? Setting that one aside.

Twelve? Setting 12 aside.

Thirteen? I want 13. It's in.

Fourteen? Setting 14 aside.

Fifteen? Setting that one aside.

Sixteen? Setting 16 aside?

Member Uram: Yes.

Chair Marks: What?

Member Uram: Wasn't 16 one --

Chair Marks: Did I hear a yes?

Member Uram: Preferred yes.

Chair Marks: Preferred. Sixteen. We'll keep 16 in the consideration.

Seventeen?

Member Bugeja: Yes.

Chair Marks: Yes. Okay. And 18? Eighteen? Setting 18 aside.

So, for the record, I'll run through what remains for our consideration. We have 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 13, 16 and 17. So, we've taken our 18 total grouping and we've reduced it by half down to nine.

So, on those nine remaining, are there any technical questions that you'd like to have addressed? Okay. I'm not hearing anyone. Okay.

So, that takes us to our individual comments and Robert, would you like to go first?

Member Hoge: Sure. My favorite is Number 9. I think it has the most basic strong elements. I would like to see a change though to the dates because I think that there might be some question as to the relevance. I gather that perhaps 1917 was the beginning of the Code Talkers' Program and 1945, of course, represents the end of World War II. But, you know, I mean I'm having to kind of figure well, what

does this mean?

There were other years in which the Code Talkers were active. So, I think it would be much better if it simply said WWI on the left side and WWII on the right right in the same position below the helmets. I mean that would do the job and explain the helmets.

Chair Marks: Excellent comment.

Member Hoge: For the others, I would probably defer to what our stakeholders are most interested in.

I'm a little bit troubled by the fact that so many of these look an awful lot like the Code Talker medals.

But, there again, in many cases, they just don't speak to me as saying this is a Native American kind of thing.

Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Robert. Let's go to Michael Bugeja.

Member Bugeja: Thank you, Gary. I'm going to be brief again because this is another good set and we eliminated the designs that I had some problems with.

I particularly like the balance in 1, 2 and 3. Anyone of those would work for me. It's a well-balanced coin and it has some depth. There's not much more to say about that.

I did like 4, but I also like 6 because there is a classic optimal line of sight that goes from the hand of the shadow figure through the antenna of the realized soldier. Again, just extraordinary balance. You could look at this coin any number of ways and get an endearing -- an enduring and endearing image.

I do like 9 from the minimalist perspective. However, I do believe that in Code Talkers, it's good to see the faces of our Native Americans and I'm little less enamored of that.

I am going to go to the one that I found to be my favorite and that's Number 17. There is a real powerful design here. Not only with the rim, but we have the soldier literally coming forward out of that coin. The perspective is amazing in that you see him stepping out of that coin holding a weapon with the background kind of a gray silhouette. A look of determination on his face. The Code Talker's insignia and the symbolism of the feather. It is a -- should be a minor symbolism. Not a major one as we see in 9.

So, Mr. Chairman, that would conclude the ones that I had some strong feelings about.

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

Member Stevens-Sollman: Thank you, Gary.

When I first looked at the set of designs, I was taken by this first -- these first three, Number 1, 2 and 3. Mainly, I agree with Michael about the balance.

The only thing is I guess I'm so used to looking at the Code Talkers' medal with the phone and all of that, so, I think it's missing here for some reason and therefore, I'm going to go -- skip down to Number 4 which is the preferred stakeholder design and I'm not sure that the helmets do enough for me even though they are symbolic of World War I and World War II.

So, I'd have to go to Number 6 which really stands out and I like the fact that we've got the two stars down there separating the Wars and the Code Talkers and I think that having the simplicity of design. We have again a very small field being a dollar, but there we have our little telephone/radio situation. Convinces me that yes, this is the Code Talkers and I like the fact that the shadow is emblematic of the receiver. I think this is quite a powerful piece and I'm happy to see this kind of device coin.

Number 9 is a preferred design. Again, I am not convinced that the helmets are letting me know that these are Code Talkers. I mean we do have the inscription, but the helmets aren't enough. I think it's particularly interesting to have the eagle feathers indicating a V for victory.

The designs of this portfolio I think are quite ingenious and I commend all the artists who have contributed to it.

Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Jeanne.

Okay. We'll go -- we'll come back to Erik. He's busy taking care of our tally from the last portion of the program.

So, my comments, to be a little bit contrary, let's go to Number 4 please.

I want to ask everyone to think about the Wyoming State Quarter, the bucking bronco and it was done in silhouette and I've heard lots of

criticism of that one. There's a feeling that it was an unfinished design. I'm not sure it translated well. It's just a matter of -- maybe it's just a matter of my preference, but I have heard lots of other comments in that regard.

So, I guess I'm concerned about putting the silhouette on there and subjecting ourselves to that kind of response. I'm not sure it's the best avenue for us to go.

And then on Number 6, I'm going to ask us all to try to block out what's on the screen and how big that is and how much that profile jumps out at you and instead, look at the slightly over 1-inch image at the bottom right of your sheet that has this design on it. I think for the observer who might not be familiar with this design and sees it for the first time on the coin, particularly the one that's not the proof, but more of the business strike, I'm afraid that that profile might look like some kind of indecipherable image or globs.

So, I'm just not convinced that this is -- I understand the idea we wanted to give some deference to the World War I aspect of the Code Talkers and it is listed in the text. I think this design would be beautiful as a very simple design if you took the profile out and then take this soldier and enlarge him somewhat and just have him running on the phone with the phone pack on his back, gun in hand.

I think then that's a powerful image that is readily discernible. I think it would be a really good design that way. Very simple. So, I think it would be very effective.

So, I'll go to lucky 13. The one that I picked and I didn't hear anyone else say they wanted to have in the consideration and the reason, folks, is I think there's good contrast with negative space and the raised devices here, the frosted in the proof. I think it's well executed.

The gentleman is clearly involved in recording a message. He's got the pack on his back. He's got the weaponry and I'll leave it to our military expert, Mr. Olson or Lieutenant Colonel Olson, to advise me later if he thinks all this gear is date appropriate.

I like the rubble. He's clearly in a war zone. I think that the image is big. It's bold and if you look at the small image down the right of your sheet, just with the naked eye you can pretty much make out what's going on here.

I think it has all of the messages that you want to have in conveying Code Talkers and what I like is there's no words on it either. It's simple, but bold and well executed.

So, I want to encourage everyone if you haven't -- if you dismissed 13, please at least give it another half thought because I think it's a worthwhile design.

And with that, I'll go to Erik.

Member Jansen: I kind of suffer what I think I'm hearing from others. I'm kind of suffering from Code Talker fatigue here only because we've had so many medals and not because it's less than a worthy topic. It's an extraordinary topic worthy of the attention it's getting. It's just we have seen so much art here. So, that's a human failing on my part.

When I review these things, I try to take a quick look and put them aside and then I come back and do detailed looks later.

On the quick look, I wanted to make sure we did the preservation of a Native American symbol again. I think that can be lost. The Code Talkers kind of is that in this case unless there are some other Native American kind of symbols that are brought in. So, I'm sensitive and quite honestly looking for that.

I would say the following. There was a comment on the last dollar design that it's a shame that these aren't available to the public and that, of course, is a Fed and a statutory decision made away from us.

But, I would encourage the Marketing Committee to consider offering this dollar, whatever design we choose, in conjunction with small or large medals for the Code Talkers themselves. I think that would be an interesting product which would again up the importance of this topic as well as expand the numismatic sales opportunities for products already done. Which is essentially in my business sense a zero incremental cost profit.

So, offer a dollar coin with your choice as a buyer of a medal or a 1 and 15/16 inch whatever the size of the smaller medal is in a set. I think that might be an interesting combination to price attractively.

In terms of individual designs here, when I did my first pass on this, I actually liked Design Number 4 because again, simple symbol, negative space. I love the incuse guy with the antenna in active engagement. I loved it and I still like it and I'm going to stand with strong support for Design Number 4 because I think it has it all even though it might not be as elegant. I mean the curvaceousness of the helmets while curvaceous is not necessarily attractive, but the rest is there and so, I want to show respect for that.

Number 6, I agree with the Chair's comment that the background shadow or image is a little bit confusing to me. I'm having a hard time

making sense of it and I think on a coin, it would steal your eye control without returning much meaning and so, I'm a little bit confused. So, I would encourage you if you're looking at Number 6 to take that in consideration.

Moving on to Number 9, this was also the one that caught my eye because this one is so different than the rest of them. I like it. It was clearly done by an artist of the hand as opposed to an artist of Photoshop and I think that shows in its character.

I'm a little concerned that the shafts of the feathers are a little dominant coming out of the bottom half of the feathers. They almost look like points or sabers as opposed to integral pieces of the feathers and so, while artistically I can fault that, it's not intentionally a fault. It's really a -- kind of a -- an advisory piece to the sculptor to try to make sure those points are more feather like than saber like.

I love the two helmets. It's World War I and World War II.

This coin feels like a coin that would have been designed in 1945. It doesn't have a really fancy, real hooky serif kind of font to it. It's pretty doggone simple. Great use of negative space. I really, really like Design Number 9.

Moving on, let me check what we've eliminated here.

Design Number 13 to me is picture on metal, guys, and whereas, it's a fine image. A very fine image. The rifle and the plane of the boots make he think he's sitting on a hill side. I'm not sure that's intentional, but it kind of is a situation on the way it's designed and I'm not sure I like that.

On Number 16, I really like the layout of 16 and 17. The use of the perimeter, the integration of symbols.

Design 17 along with 16 would both work. They're quite satisfactory. I don't think they're as symbolic or inspiring as the others that I showed more preference to. I will probably give them a bit of support, but not the strength that I described in the others.

The art work is really quite wonderful here, and I say that in the sense that we have put the artistic community through the ringer coming up with new Code Talker designs and like a sprinter who's run eight heats and then has to get fired up for the finals, you know, the energy is still here and to that, I commend these artists for just running sprint after sprint after sprint. Thank you.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Erik.

Heidi.

Member Wastweet: I'd like to say that no coin is an island and by that, I mean no program exists isolated from all the others. So, I think we should look at these as part of the bigger picture. We have a rich series of Code Talker Congressional Gold Medals. So, this can be not just a miniature Congressional Gold Medal, but a companion piece to that.

For that reason, I'm really drawn to Design Number 9, because it is simple and appropriate for the size of the coin and it's very different from the Code Talker Congressional Gold Medals. I love Robert's idea of putting the World War I/World War II instead of the dates. I think that would add a lot.

I'm also liking Design Number 6. Gary and I rarely disagree, but on Design Number 6, I think this is really clever, because the Code Talkers didn't work by themselves. They worked in tandem. They had to have somebody on the other end of the phone to talk to and I think this is a really clever way to show those two people working at a distance, but working together, and as Michael Bugeja has said on the phone, the designs are linked by that line that the eye connects between the pen and antenna. So, I -- and I think that it's not too busy. It would work for the size of the coin. So, I also like this one.

Design 13, I think that this could be brought back for a Congressional Gold Medal. It's more like what we've been seeing for that program. It is a nice design and we do have some more Code Talker Congressional Gold Medals coming up. So, I would like to suggest that we bring this back for that program instead of this program. The same with Design Number 17. This can be revisited later.

Design 16, I'm not as attracted to this drawing. I think the anatomy is a little simplistic. In the leg, there's no muscle definition. The right hand is very tiny, and the profile of the head loses me. I don't think it's as well drawn. I know that this was one of the preferred designs, but I would steer away from this one for those reasons.

I'm also attracted to Designs 1, 2 and 3. Maybe we could revisit those in the future program as well. They're attractive to me. I'm a little undecided about them. Design Number 4, if we could go there, this is another of the preferred, and a fairly subjective comment, this just isn't attractive to me. The helmets are rather blobbish. They don't have sharp silhouettes and they're not descriptive, and just the layout personally doesn't appeal to me. So, I'm leaning toward Number 9 and 6.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Heidi. Mike Olson.

Vice Chair Olson: Okay. Just some general comments on this particular series or this particular issue. In my opinion, anything that is issued needs to say Code Talkers, so we get the message clearly across that that is what we are commemorating here.

It would be great to have something different than the 35 medals that we've already seen for the coin that is going to be produced in greater quantity. Some of these gentlemen here, I feel like they're members of my unit. They're on their third or fourth tour of duty here. I see some familiar faces. So, but it's good to see them again and yes, still shooting, moving and communicating.

But, in with that, some of these images without -- I don't have a photographic memory of everything that we've approved, but I think we need to be very careful that we don't put something on a coin that represents all that is specific to one that's already been issued. So, that is something we need to be very cautious about.

I agree with what Erik has stated. A good choice here could spark interest in the series which benefits everyone as far as numismatic sales, but also general education of the public that get interested in the medal series. There's a whole lot of history there that a lot of people aren't aware of now that they certainly could learn more about.

I'll say it again. It's too bad these aren't circulating. I personally buy a box of these every year, and I have them on hand when I know I'm going to be around youngsters and particularly the one this year, the design this year with the animals on it -- or excuse me, from 2013. The one that's currently available. They love them. They love them. It's something different and it's a shame that they can't be more widely distributed.

Getting on to the Designs, 1, 2 and 3, I put those all in the same category. Those would be a good default design. I think with Number 2 probably being the preferred choice. They do get a little busy with the eagle in the middle, and the denomination, and then the little bitty radio waves that are coming out of the eagle's wings on 1 and 3. A good general design. I think there's better to be seen here.

Number 4, let's see. Number 4 is the only one with a helmet that we're considering. I'm not a big fan of that one either. Heidi put it well. I think they look like blobs. Most people looking at coin in its actual size probably couldn't tell the difference between the World War I and World War II helmet. I think those helmets are more of a detractor than they are a complement to that design.

Number 6 is my personal favorite for a lot of reasons. The artistic has already been discussed. The symbolic. You've got two wars there. You've got the World War I and you've got World War II, and I think it's kind of neat that we've got the World War I soldier in shadow, or in a vague image, talking to the current soldier from World War II. One communicating to another. It is a powerful message, and like Michael Bugeja has said, I do catch that line. I didn't know what I was looking at when I was looking, but Michael pointed that out. I think it makes for a nice eye-catching image. So, that one, Number 6, would be my preference.

Number 9 is a fine design. I think 6 is better, but 9 would be okay as well. I agree with the prior comments that the dates are confusing, and if this design is selected, we definitely should consider a motion to replace the dates with the World Wars in their respective positions.

Number 13, Gary, I looked that over as you were speaking about that design. I didn't see anything in there that looked out of place. He looks like he's got everything he needs. I do share the sentiments that that would probably make a better medal than it would a coin, but I'm going to throw a bone or two its way because it is a nice design.

Number 16, not a lot of interest there. Heidi pointed out some things that, artistically, there are problems with it, and that is a fellow that I know I've seen him on some battlefield here before. It looks like something that we've already done. Number 17, I think for a future medal that would suffice. I really am attracted, however, to the feathers in the border. I just think they're going to end up being too small on a dollar-size coin to really make much of a difference, but that is a nice element.

One thing I would like to point out: take a look at the dollar denomination on this particular design. It carries through on several of them. I went back as others were reviewing the designs, and I took a look at the history throughout the series, beginning in 2009. Every year with the exception of 2013, we've used a similar font for the dollar denomination. If we're looking for any type of continuity, it would be nice to continue with that even though there was a break in 2013. Just something that -- something to consider there. That's it.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Mike. We'll go to Tom now.

Member Uram: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since I'm the last of the Mohicans here, as far as the comments go, I just want to say that I agree that some of the -- all of these designs, you know, they are really terrific in both sets. I just want to make a couple of comments as it regards to Number 6 and Number 9.

I agree also with Number 6 if the gentleman had just been without the background there, I think that the motion in this dollar coin would be super. So, I think certainly even the way it is, it's a great design and worthy of some votes.

My top vote though, however, is going to go probably to Number 9 for several reasons. Number one is, Member Bob had mentioned at the beginning of his comments, this kind of is very distinctive as it relates to not -- setting itself apart from a number of the other Code Talkers that we have already approved and I like the symbolism of the eagle's -- of the wings, the feathers for sure there, and I like the fact that they're loose and that there's nothing tying them, making them basically together. They are stronger, but they're not bound together and I think that's really great.

And I think if the helmets are -- Don, are they going to be, the helmets and so forth going to be mainly frosted on, if that was chosen?

Mr. Everhart: Yes.

Member Uram: -- with the relief in the back. And so, I think that -- kind of gravitated me to some of the coins from '43, '44 and '45 of Canada with their Victory Nickel, but this too added -- I can see that with even more emphasis of what it's trying to dramatically portray here. So, my vote, I suppose, would go for this one simply because there's just a lot going on and I think it would be -- set itself apart from the other ones for no other reason.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Tom. Okay. That brings us to the end of our individual comments. Is there any quick follow up?

Okay. Hearing none, I have a report for you on the 2015 Native American design scoring. While I'm -- well, actually, I'm going to read through these and I'm going to take a short break after this and then come back and look at the Presidential series. But, before we go out on break, make sure you fill out your scoring sheets for the 2016 Native American.

So, meanwhile though, here are the results of the 2015 Native American. Of course, we didn't have Number 1. So, Number 2 received two points. Number 3 received eight.

And let me back up here and just say that we've got, with eight members participating, the maximum score is 24. So, the threshold for approval at all is 13. So, keep that in mind. Twenty-four is a perfect

score.

So, Number 4 by a close call is so far our recommended design at 19. Nineteen of 24. Design -- and I'm not going to read out the ones that we culled out. So, Number 7 received eight points. Number 8 received four. Number 9 received six. Number 12 received nine. Number 13 received 18. That's just one less than Number 4.

Number 1 which or I'm sorry. Number 14 which was eliminated did get a vote anyway.

Number 15 made the threshold with 13. Thirteen. So, that occupies the third position. Number 16 received six, and Number 20 received three.

So, given the close nature of that scoring, could we put Number 4 and then Number 13 up on the screen for 2015? There's -- there it goes.

Ms. Stafford: Which one did you want first?

Chair Marks: Well, let's just go for it. Go for it.

Member Jansen: Can't go side-by-side?

Ms. Stafford: Not right now. We're working that out.

Chair Marks: Okay. Four. There we are. That is our selected design of 19. We're all familiar with that image. Let's go now to Number 13. Number 13 received one fewer point.

Vice Chair Olson: Two great choices.

Chair Marks: Pardon me?

Vice Chair Olson: Two great choices.

Chair Marks: So, you know, if there's no motion, then --

Member Stevens-Sollman: I would like to make a motion.

Chair Marks: Okay. What's your motion, Jeanne?

Member Stevens-Sollman: My motion is for Number 6.

Member Jansen: Six?

Member Stevens-Sollman: No, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm on the wrong -
- I'm in the wrong space here.

Chair Marks: Thirteen?

Member Stevens-Sollman: No. No. No. I'm sorry. Number 4.

Chair Marks: Well, actually, you don't need a motion. That's already -- that's the selected design. There's no --

Member Stevens-Sollman: I -- oh, but --

Chair Marks: Go ahead.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I was thinking --

Chair Marks: Do I misunderstand?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes, I was hoping that even though this was chosen, okay --

Chair Marks: Got you.

Member Stevens-Sollman: -- which I think is perfect. I would like to see Mohawk Ironworkers on there somewhere. If we could ask the artist --

Mr. Everhart: I have a suggestion for that.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Can we do that?

Mr. Everhart: Could you put the design up please? I was looking at this design trying to figure out how we could do it. I would run United States of America around the top border. There would be a nice break where the helmet is, between United and States, and then where US of A is right now put Mohawk Ironworkers.

Member Stevens-Sollman: That would work.

Vice Chair Olson: Would there be any sentiment towards making that dollar denomination conform to the bulk of the rest of the series?

(Simultaneous Speaking.)

Mr. Everhart: How so? One thing I would also point out, if you're going to make the buildings negative, then that dollar sign's going to have to be positive.

Member Wastweet: Are you done with your motion?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Member Jansen: Well, wait. there are --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Well, yes.

Member Jansen: I got five -- I got five changes here called out.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Well, my motion is just to, somehow --

Chair Marks: So, Jeanne's got the floor. Jeanne's got the floor.

Member Stevens-Sollman: My motion is to simply put Mohawk Ironworkers on the coin.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, simply to put the Mohawk Ironworkers on --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Somewhere. I don't care --

Chair Marks: -- the design. Okay. So, that's the motion. Is there a second?

Member Wastweet: I would like to second.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to include the words Mohawk Ironworkers on Design Number 4. Any discussion?

All those in favor please raise your hand. Six, seven. It's looks like a unanimous vote. Eight to zero.

Vice Chair Olson: I've got a second motion, Gary. I'd like to move that the dollar denomination be -- the fonts be changed to reflect what would be shown in Design Number 9. It's in several designs. Design Number 7, design Number 9. Which would conform with the majority of the rest of the series.

Member Uram: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's been moved and seconded.

Member Uram: Second by --

Chair Marks: Tom.

Member Uram: Thank you.

Chair Marks: It's been moved and seconded to recommend that the font for the one dollar denomination be changed to that which existed from 2009 through 2012. Is that correct?

Vice Chair Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. Is there any discussion on that motion? All those in --

Member Jansen: Question.

Chair Marks: Go ahead.

Member Jansen: We show here as incused. Are we going to address that issue here or do you want to resolve that separately?

(Simultaneous Speaking.)

Chair Marks: I -- you know what? I think this is a case where I'd rather just let the staff, folks like Don and Steve, kind of work that out.

Member Jansen: All right. So, you want to change the font to the same one that existed from 2009 to '12?

Chair Marks: Correct.

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Chair Marks: Okay. All those in favor raise your hand. Michael Bugeja?

Member Bugeja: Aye.

Chair Marks: Unanimous. Eight to zero. That motion's approved. Are there any other motions? Robert.

Member Hoge: I would like to move that we recommend to the artists to consider the suggestion that Don made, about rearranging the inscriptions and adding Mohawk Ironworkers on this.

Chair Marks: Okay. Now, we have a motion to include Ironworkers on the design. It wasn't specific.

Member Hoge: Yes, but Don was specific. He was saying he could see it maybe United to the left of the helmet and then States of America onward around at the top, and then where it now says States of America could read Mohawk Ironworkers.

Chair Marks: Okay. All right. So, the motion is to make the prior motion that we approved more specific.

Member Hoge: Maybe it should be to amend the first motion to rearrange.

Chair Marks: Okay. To place Mohawk Ironworkers where United States of America is, and then place United States of America just to the left? Is that what you suggested, Don?

Mr. Antonucci: United to the left of the helmet, States of America to the right.

Mr. Everhart: Yes, just put it on the arc around the rim.

Chair Marks: On the arc. Okay. Put that on the arc. Okay.

Member Hoge: You know, I think I'd like to --

Chair Marks: Hold on. Before you comment, can I see if there's a second?

Member Jansen: Second.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's been seconded. Go ahead, Robert.

Member Hoge: Really just as a recommendation. I like what Don said, but I think we want to not really be designing by committee here, but if the artist feels -- it's very strong as it stands and maybe it's best to just let them figure out how to take care of this.

Member Stevens-Sollman: That's what I would like to see.

Chair Marks: Are you withdrawing your motion?

Member Hoge: No. I'm just saying that the artist consider doing what Don said, among other things.

Chair Marks: Okay. I'm confused. Okay. So, I understand we have a motion to be specific about where the text changes should be. That would be to put Mohawk Ironworkers where United States of America appears, and then put United States of America around the upper arc of the design. That's correct? Robert, is that correct?

Member Hoge: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, that is the motion and it has been -- Erik, you seconded it?

Member Jansen: Yes, I seconded. I'd like to add a phrase to the motion: within the discretion of the artist, the staff artist.

Chair Marks: Does the maker of the motion concur?

Member Hoge: Yes. Yes, indeed.

Chair Marks: Okay. Say that again.

Member Jansen: Recommend to artist to rearrange the logos United States of America to a perimeter position from 9:00 to 3:00 with United to the left of the helmet, States of America to the right of the arc, and place Mohawk Ironworkers where USA appears on the original designs, within the discretion of the staff artist of the Mint.

Chair Marks: Okay. I would just suggest it's not logos we're talking about. It's text.

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Chair Marks: Okay. Is everybody clear on the motion?

Member Uram: Question.

Chair Marks: Question. Go ahead.

Member Uram: You said from 9:00 to 3:00. I thought what Don was talking about was more like 5 minute to 12:00 coming down this way. Not 9:00 all the way around. You're going to lose --

Member Jansen: It's 3:17. We're running late.

Member Uram: If not, you're going to lose depth going 9:00 to 3:00. Whereas, Don was saying I think from his helmet point down. But, I -- you know, I'm just throwing it out there. I think you're going to lose something.

Vice Chair Olson: Hey, let's let them surprise us.

Chair Marks: Let's vote this thing out. All those --

Member Wastweet: I would prefer it to not be so specific. Because as one who works in this medium, I may think something works visually and then once I get in there and start arranging things, I realize oh, it would look better one way or another. I would rather just leave it to the artist's discretion and not be specific.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Jansen: I got that. I will take out the references as to 9:00 and 3:00.

Chair Marks: The motion maker concurs? Okay.

Member Hoge: Yes, sir.

Chair Marks: All those in favor please raise your hand. One, two, three, four.

Michael Bugeja?

Member Bugeja: Abstain.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's four opposed.

Vice Chair Olson: Was the motion to be specific or to let the Mint figure it out?

Chair Marks: No. Be specific.

Member Jansen: Within the discretion of the staff artist of the Mint.

Vice Chair Olson: Okay.

Chair Marks: Are you supporting?

Vice Chair Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. That's five. All those opposed? Two and one abstention. So, that motion passes. Okay. Are there any other motions?

Member Jansen: There was some discussion about how to handle the texturing and the incuse or protrusion nature of the dollar sign. I just want to know if there's any interest out there in a motion to address that.

Member Stevens-Sollman: If there's any --

Chair Marks: I'd rather leave that to the artist.

Vice Chair Olson: We already voted on the font. We'll just let them figure out the incuse or --

Chair Marks: Yes. Okay. Are there any other motions? Okay. As loyal opposition to this design, I'm going to make a motion, and I'm probably going to go down in flames, but I just have to do it, folks.

Member Jansen: Oh, but you're a firefighters' guy.

Chair Marks: And might not even get a second, but I'm going to do it. I'm going to make a motion that our recommended design is 13.

Member Jansen: Second.

Chair Marks: Sorry. I just think it's a better design.

Member Jansen: Recommend Design Number 13?

Chair Marks: Yes, it's our Number -- no, Number 13 which is our -- came in second. It missed it by one point, by tying. Okay. So, can you put that up on the screen perhaps. I want to make sure everyone knows what I'm talking about.

(Off record remarks.)

Okay. Can I ask everyone to look at the -- I mean it's important to me that you go with my motion?

Member Jansen: NA-R-13. This is the curvaceous horizon with the ironworker leg up on the Mohawk Ironworker's --

Chair Marks: This one.

Member Jansen: That was one vote shy of the --

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Jansen: -- the 19. The other --

Chair Marks: Do I have a second?

Member Uram: Second.

Member Bugeja: Gary, did you place that as a motion?

Chair Marks: Yes, I'm making a motion to recommend Design Number 13.

Member Bugeja: I second it.

Chair Marks: Okay. It's been seconded twice. The first one was Tom.

Vice Chair Olson: Tom got the first.

Chair Marks: Okay. Is there any discussion about my motion?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Is it legal? Is it legal?

Chair Marks: It's legal if we want the motion to pass. Yes, if there's a majority of -- we've done this before. We have done this before.

Member Uram: We did this with the --

Chair Marks: There is no precedent being made here. What's that?

Member Uram: We did it with the blue heron.

Vice Chair Olson: Now, wouldn't your motion also have to include negation of the -- well, I suppose this would trump the vote.

Chair Marks: No. No, if we approve this, it kind of wipes out everything else you just did. But, I figure having come up shy by one vote, there clearly was a lot of support for this design and so, now, I'm interested in what a simple majority thinks about this, compared to Design Number 4. So, any further discussion?

Member Jansen: I would like to have the Mint sculptors weigh in on pros and cons of how they think the sculpt will go on these two designs. Is one of them harder, better, easier?

Mr. Everhart: Neither one of them's harder or easier. That doesn't even enter into the -- this isn't working. It's dead.

(Off record remarks.)

It's not -- easy or hard doesn't enter into it. We can do whatever we have to do. I could give you my personal opinion.

Member Jansen: Can I have the personal opinion of --

Mr. Everhart: Yes, you may have that. I think 13 is a much nicer design myself. I think there's more depth and volume to it, and it says Mohawk Ironworkers without having to move things around.

Mr. Antonucci: The other thing I just want to say about this that impresses me is how the subject matter is grabbing onto the coin. I love that. We've never done that before that I know of. Which is -- that just tickles me to death.

Chair Marks: So, if I could speak to my motion, I think the genius of this motion, if I might, is that if I go down in flames, it confirms the rest of you, and it wipes out any idea that 4 wasn't the one. But, if this one prevails, then we've clarified something very important here, and we've shifted to something that a simple majority of us decided we wanted.

Member Jansen: I think that's called going all in here.

Chair Marks: Yes. Heidi.

Member Wastweet: April's trying to intercede.

Ms. Stafford: I don't know if it's helpful, I'm certainly not trying to pile on so to speak. But, I would just note that this was a preferred design amongst our stakeholders.

Chair Marks: Ah, and Number 12 was not?

Ms. Stafford: It was not.

Chair Marks: Yes. Thank you. Thank you for piling on.

(Simultaneous Speaking.)

Okay. Heidi.

Member Wastweet: Well, I'm going to swim against the new current. I still -- I still prefer 14. I think that 13 is --

(Simultaneous Speaking.)

Member Jansen: Four.

Member Wastweet: Excuse me. Four. I think 13 is busy for the size of the coin. While it's a really clever design, I like it, I don't think it's appropriate to the scale. The word Ironworkers, if you look at your actual size printout on the page is extremely small. So, I still support Number 4.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Stevens-Sollman: And I still do, too.

Chair Marks: Any other comments? Remember, folks, the chance of this getting approved is much greater than Number 4 because we have more support. We have the stakeholder groups supporting this one. Okay. So, there's a chance that you could go with Number 4 and ultimately, it's not going to get approved. But, this would help this one get approved for sure.

Member Jansen: Only because we had consideration --

Vice Chair Olson: Gary, hey, here let me make it easy for you. I'll just give you my arm.

Chair Marks: You know what? I try to play neutral sometimes, but not this time. I'm all in.

Member Jansen: Only because there was some discussion about the font on the number 1 in the prior design, I think we have that same issue on this design. Do we not, Mr. Olson?

Chair Marks: Yes, you know what? Thank you. Just to simplify all this so we don't have to -- if I prevail here, I don't want to come back with another motion. So, I will amend my motion to include the font from '09 to '12 and Tom, do you agree with --

Member Uram: I agree.

Chair Marks: -- that? Okay. Motion maker and second agree. So, this is an all done package here. Okay.

Member Jansen: And does that necessarily put the font selection on the overall reverse design in conflict with itself?

Chair Marks: I don't think so. I wouldn't mind if you changed all the fonts to that. Because that's the font --

Member Jansen: You're the motion maker.

Chair Marks: Okay. We're going to recommend the font used generally for '09 through '12 is utilized for this design, if this motion is approved. Tom, do you agree?

Member Uram: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Jansen: So, that would include the perimeter and otherwise text?

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Jansen: Thank you.

Chair Marks: Can I just point out something? I don't know, maybe I'm wrong. I don't think anyone pointed out about this design, but note the bolts on the right and the left of this.

Member Jansen: I don't think they're in font. Are they?

Chair Marks: No. No. No. I just like the bolts, and we're talking about ironworkers, folks. This is -- yes, this is cool. Okay.

Member Uram: Well, you know, Gary, if you recall, I was actually trying to put the burlap on there, too. But, I'll delete that. I have no issue with that. The bolts are great, too.

Chair Marks: All right. We've just about firmed up our break. But, this has been fun.

Mr. Everhart: Gary.

Chair Marks: Yes.

Mr. Everhart: I have a suggestion on the bolts. I mean it's very minimal, but I think it would be more interesting if you rotated it, so there's a point at the top and a point at the bottom rather than horizontal like this. That's very minor and --

Member Jansen: You know, Don, if you were to do something like that, it could be scandalous in the future.

Chair Marks: My thought on that, Don, was why wouldn't you put a series of bolts on either side so it --

Mr. Everhart: I think it would detract from the main thrust of the composition. It would draw your attention out.

Chair Marks: Okay. Fine. Okay. We've got a motion on the table.

Member Jansen: Are we bolting the bolt concept or are we --

Vice Chair Olson: You know what would be really cool? Could you guys thread those? And so, you could like actually --

Chair Marks: I'm going to call the question. I'm going to call the question.

Vice Chair Olson: Call it. Call it please.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, the motion is to recommend Design 13 with change to the font, as discussed ad infinitum. I hope there's no further discussion.

Okay. All those in favor raise your hand please? One, two, three, four, five.

Member Bugeja: Aye.

Chair Marks: Oh, three, five, six. Opposed? Two. Motion carries.

Okay. Thank you, and I beg the indulgence of my friends who didn't prevail in this. But, thank you, thank you for your tolerance. Okay. We are scheduled to begin our discussion at this very moment on the Presidential images, and we've allotted ourselves an hour and 15 minutes.

I'm thinking that the straightforward nature of that consideration that we can probably pull it off in an hour, folks. So, I think we need a break, but I'm going to ask for your cooperation on one point. Let's really make sure we're back here in 15 minutes. That would be at quarter to 4:00. Make sure we're here so we can give ourselves that full hour. So, we are recessed.

(Whereupon, at 3:27 p.m., a recess was taken until 3:44 p.m.)

Chair Marks: We need to get this meeting back in session. We have a quorum in the room. So, we need to get going. So, April, I'm going to ask you to present the 2015 and 2016 Presidential \$1 Coin report to us.

Review and Discuss Candidate Designs for the 2015 and 2016
Presidential \$1 Coin Program

Ms. Stafford: It is Public Law 109145, the Presidential \$1 Coin Act of 2005, that requires the Secretary of the Treasury to issue four Presidential \$1 Coins per year with images emblematic of each President in the order in which they served.

The reverse of these coins bears a dramatic image of the Statue of Liberty throughout the Presidential \$1 Coin Program. In accordance with the Act, the obverse shall bear the name and likeness of a President of the United States, the order in which the President served, the dates or years of the term of office of that President, and pursuant to an amendment to the Act, In God We Trust.

Today, we'll be reviewing candidate designs for the 2015 and 2016 Presidential \$1 Coin Program starting with Harry S. Truman. Here we have Designs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Next, Dwight D. Eisenhower. We have four designs. Design 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Next, we have John F. Kennedy with five designs. Design 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Lyndon B. Johnson with six designs. Design 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Richard Nixon with four designs. Design 1, 2, 3 and 4. And Gerald Ford with four designs. Design 1, 2, 3 and 4. Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, April. Okay. Once again, we'll go through our process of narrowing down the field of designs so we can focus on a lesser number. So, if we could bring up Truman 1.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Two. Truman 2. Setting that aside. Truman 3. Setting that aside. Truman 4. Truman 5.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: No. No way.

Everyone: No.

Member Jansen: No.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, we just recommended Number 1. You see how effective this process is? Okay. Let's go to Dwight Eisenhower. Number 1. I'll say yes. Number 2.

(Chorus of yes.)

Chair Marks: Three.

Member Hoge: Yes.

Chair Marks: Four. Setting 4 aside. Okay.

So, that takes us to John F. Kennedy. Number 1.

Member Hoge: Yes.

Chair Marks: Two.

Member Hoge: Yes.

Chair Marks: Three. Setting aside. Number 4.

Member Uram: Yes.

Chair Marks: Number 5.

Vice Chair Olson: That's Rudy from the movie.

Chair Marks: Setting aside. Okay. So, that takes us to Johnson. Number 1.

Member Hoge: Yes.

Chair Marks: Two. Setting 2 aside. Three.

Vice Chair Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Four.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Five. Setting 5 aside. Six. Setting 6 aside.

Now, we go to Nixon. Number 1, yes. Two.

Member Bugeja: Yes. Yes.

Chair Marks: Three. Setting 3 aside. Number 4. Setting 4 aside. Takes us to Ford. Ford Number 1.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Ford Number 2.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Ford Number 3. Three. Setting aside. Ford 4.

Vice Chair Olson: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. That completes our process there. Let me review quickly what we came up with. We have recommended Truman 1. On Eisenhower, we have Designs 1, 2 and 3 to consider. On Kennedy, we have Designs 1, 2, 4 to consider. On Johnson, we have 1, 3 and 4. On Nixon, we have 1, 2, simply 1 and 2. And on Ford, we have 1, 2 and 4. So.

Vice Chair Olson: Did we have 2 on Ford? I marked down 3.

Chair Marks: Pardon me.

Vice Chair Olson: Okay. It's 1, 2, 4 on Ford. Okay. Gary, on Eisenhower, tell me again.

Chair Marks: Let me pull that up. Eisenhower, we have 1, 2 and 3.

Vice Chair Olson: Okay.

Chair Marks: Everyone got it all?

Member Jansen: What was Ford again?

Chair Marks: Ford. Ford is 1, 2 and 4. Everyone clear? Okay. So, let's go to technical questions. Do we have any for staff?

Hearing none, we'll go to our comment phase and Michael Olson has asked to go first. So, I'll honor that. Michael.

Vice Chair Olson: All right. I had a hard time with all of these. In every case, I only found one that I felt represented the Presidents as I recall how they should look.

Number 1, I won't make any further comments. I had a couple on these other ones, but we'll move on. It's late. It looks like the recommendation will be Number 1, which is the one that I had selected.

Moving on to Eisenhower, we're looking at 1, 2 and 3. Number 2 is the one I believed looked closest to what President Eisenhower looked like. Number 1, to me, it looks like he's ready to go to DEFCON-3 and the Russians better be worried. He just looks angry there. I think looking serious is important, but I think that one just goes a little bit too far. He just looks like he's angry.

Number 3, I did not really think -- there was just something in the mouth area that I did not believe resembled the way -- the pictures that I've seen. So, Number 2 would be the one that's going to be getting my sole support.

On JFK, Gary, we had Number 1 and 4 on JFK. Correct?

Chair Marks: Two, 4. One, 2 and 4.

Vice Chair Olson: One, 2 and 4. Okay. I did not really like any of these, but I picked the one that I thought was most appropriate. Number 1 is a nice picture. The problem I have with it is he's not looking at the viewer. I know we did a first spouse here a year ago. I believe it's the one that's for sale now. The Roosevelt. That I believe it was the first one where the subject was not looking somewhat towards the viewer.

If this is the one that the group goes with, I guess I can support it, but I wish we had something better. I believe the President ought to be looking at the viewer, as we're used to seeing them. Not looking askance. Wondering what he's thinking about.

With that being said, there really were not any other good choices out of this group. The one that I would favor the most rather than Number 1 would be Number 4, and I don't really care for that one either. There's been some comments. He looks like his brother there, and I would somewhat agree, he does. So, I'll be interested to hear what the rest of the group has to say.

To Johnson, there was only one from that group that I thought was a flattering pose, that looked the most like him, and that was Number 3. The image in my mind of President Johnson would be that image. Number 1, again, he's looking away from the camera. It's not really a full portrait. It's kind of a halfway in between, and I don't think it conveys a real powerful image when they're not looking directly at you. Number 4, when you take a look at his eyes, he's kind of looking up at something and you kind of wonder what the heck is he looking at.

Again, you know, this is the Commander In Chief. This is the President of the United States. I just -- I don't get why we would have an image like that. So, my only vote for this one will be going for Number 3.

On to Nixon, not a lot of good choices in this one. I felt Number 2 looked the closest. There was some comment or we've got 1 into consideration which has caused me to maybe take a look at Number 1 again. Three and 4 just don't make the mark for me and from the way it looks, didn't make it with the Committee either. So, it looks like we'll be selecting between Number 1 and 2 and I'll be interested to hear what the rest of the Committee has to say.

On to Ford, we're looking at 1, 2 and 4. From my perspective, Number 4 most closely resembled what I remember President Ford looking like.

Number 3 looks a little goofy and Number 1, this may be the same artist. I'm not quite sure. I don't -- it seems like a recent development where we've seen Presidents that are not looking directly at the viewer. But, again, I really would have a hard time supporting Number 1 for that reason. So, in this case again, Number 4 will be getting my sole support.

That concludes my comments.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Mike. We'll go to Tom.

Member Uram: Thank you, Chairman.

Obviously the Harry Truman Number 1, I think depicts an accurate and correct visual there.

Moving on to Eisenhower, the choice is between 1, 2 and 3. I think that 2 I like just a little bit better than Number 3. It was between Number 2 and Number 3. I just think that the depiction there of his smile and so forth in proportion to everything else is the way I would go there.

Moving on to President Kennedy, it's kind of interesting. I agree with what was said about the President looking at you and so forth, but this is very unusual, this Number 1, and I think that if you consider the whole Kennedy era and so forth, this might have some -- what shall I say? Bring back some of those thoughts of the concern of the missile crisis and the different things that he had to deal with and I kind of like this Number 1 versus some of the ones that we have and once again, it could break from some of the images that we do have that are continually straight on.

In Number 2, you get to make the same argument for Number 2 where he's looking forward and looking ahead at a bright future. So, I'm kind of torn between Number 1 and Number 2, but I think that for some of the things that he had to deal with, I kind of like Number 1 just a little bit because it does come across a little bit differently. But, maybe it's too somber. I don't know. But, certainly, Number 2's more looking ahead.

Moving on to Johnson, you guys are going to have to call me Johnson. Number 3, I think Number 3's pretty much the -- what I remember him looking like and looking up. There's a number of portraits of him in that -- in that situation of Number 4. Kind of looking up across from the desk. Looking up and talking. I think that that adds some value to the Number 4 because I can see that in a number of -- and it's a very straightforward, very persuading-looking view that he's taking there. So, I remember that depiction.

So, I would be between Number 4 and Number 3. Might even like that Number 4 a little bit better because there is a little bit more to it and more expression that he's trying to project with those eyes.

As it relates to Gerald Ford, Number 1 -- did I skip something?

Member Wastweet: Nixon.

Member Uram: Nixon. I just think Number 2. Number 2 would work out. I think we had between Number 1 and Number 2. Let's just go with Number 2. I think it depicts the accurate -- I wasn't crazy about any of them, but for what it's worth, I'll go with Number 2.

Okay. Who are we on to next? Ford. This is tough because you see I made it through school in four terms. Johnson, Ford, Nixon and Carter. So, I'm getting these all confused. Only one person caught that. Okay.

On to Ford, okay, this basically reminds me of the Inaugural Medal. So, I'd be against it because of that. It's pretty much -- for those of you who remember it, it's the -- one, I remember being on that. I like Number 2 once again because it's very positive. As you recall in the Ford era, his probably most significant speech was his inaugural address where he had the healing of the nation speech and I think that he portrayed a new vision and a future for a country that was in turmoil at the time. So, therefore, I would lean to Number 2 over Number 4 which is more of a -- I don't know. I always -- when looking at him and seeing him, I just think that the smiling Number 2 is what he was trying to project versus the more stern look.

So, based on what he had -- once again, if you compare him with the Kennedy situation and so forth, for the same reasons, I would be for Number 2.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Tom. Let's go to Michael Bugeja. Michael?

Member Bugeja: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?

Chair Marks: Yes. Please go ahead.

Member Bugeja: I just have a few comments on these. I like, of course, the Truman Number 1 and the Eisenhower Number 2 I felt was very fetching for a lot of the same reasons.

These are -- these portraits really don't have much numismatically to discuss except maybe the downward-looking Kennedy which I find contemplative and an interesting coin because it's -- all these profiles

of Presidents or profiles in courage in his case should have character to distinguish art from drawing and I think that one truly does. I like the balance of the mottos. I like the orientation. The fields and more.

Really nothing to say about Lyndon Johnson. You know, I remember more of the Number 2, but I don't know. I don't see a lot of character in here and he was a character. Number 1 is his political face. That's for sure.

Nixon, what are the designs on Nixon again, Gary, before I comment on the wrong one.

Chair Marks: One and two.

Member Bugeja: One and two. I prefer the straight on. It's the Nixon I remember.

I actually interviewed Gerald Ford as a reporter for United Press International and the -- Number 1 is how he typically looked and Number 2 would be an interesting rendition of him. Number 1 is how I remember him vividly.

That's it, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Michael. Take this over to Robert.

Member Hoge: I agree with Number 1 for Truman. It looks like those are all pictures of different people.

For Eisenhower, I concur with Number 2. He looks -- that looks the most of the way I seem to recall him in images.

For the Kennedy, I have to disagree with Michael because I think Number 1 while it's a beautiful portrait of Kennedy has a distinct shading of his hair which I don't see possible to represent on a coin and also, I think the President looking downward even if he is very serious is not such a good sign and a number of these are looking down. You know, the President shouldn't be looking down on us.

So, I think that of the Kennedy images I believe I'd have to go with -- I think it's Number 2. That's a preference.

For Johnson, these are hard to decide. They all look a little bit like him in major respects. I think that probably I would want to go with Number 3 because he is looking straight at you and not looking downward and not looking vague.

For the Nixon image, I guess it's Number 2. He looks like he's saying to us clearly I'm not a crook.

For the Ford images, I didn't think any of them really captured his aspect sufficiently well. But, if we want a jolly looking President, I guess Number 2 would be it.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you. Were you done, Robert?

Member Hoge: That's it.

Chair Marks: All right, Jeanne. Go ahead.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I think we're going to go directly to Eisenhower. Wait. I believe Number 2 looks most like Eisenhower. The only thing that I'm a little concerned about is that circle around his left eye and I'm sure that's just a -- maybe a mistake I hope. But, you know, his right side looks just to me like Eisenhower looked as he was aging. Number 3 is a little bit younger and maybe his eyes are drawn a little better. But, I do like Number 2.

Kennedy -- are we -- Kennedy, Number 1 is my preference because I think it looks most like him even though he's looking away. The only problem is his lapel is missing on his right side. I think it should come around. It would help -- it would help that and that happens on, I think, Johnson, too.

But, Number 4 looks too much like Robert Kennedy and I realize he's a Kennedy, but that does not look like John Kennedy to me.

And Number 2, again, Number 2, I just don't think he looks like President Kennedy. He's a little too chunky in the jowl and he doesn't look as youthful as he did. I mean he's only in his 40s. It just does not look like the man I remember.

So, I'm going to go for Number 1 even though he's looking away.

And Johnson, again, the lapel is missing on the right side. He kind of looks like his shoulder is in the wrong place there and I don't think this wistful look is the look of a man who really determined as Johnson was and, therefore, I'm going to go with Number 4.

Number 4, even though he's looking up, he looks pretty fierce. I mean he looks like a leader of our country as much as he could be at the time.

And Richard Nixon, I need to ask why we don't have Richard M. Nixon?

Chair Marks: Say again.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Why do we not have Richard M. Nixon? Milhous Nixon. Every other President has a middle initial.

Member Uram: Same comment for Ford.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Well, yes, but was he ever referred to as a middle initial? So, my question is do we add that to this coin?

Chair Marks: I don't think I ever heard referred to as M. Richard M. I heard Richard Milhous Nixon.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Correct. But, still would we have eliminated that middle initial or name? That's my question to --

Member Weinman: I'm guessing that this -- I mean the connection it was probably established at the beginning of the program.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Member Weinman: Probably from the White House Historical Society. So, we can -- but, we'll check.

Member Uram: That would be the same on Gerald R. Ford because you always heard Gerald R. Ford for the most part.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Right. I mean you know it's -- well, anyway.

Member Weinman: It's a good move. We'll go back and check.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Thank you. Thank you. I think his profile is better than having a full face. Although, I don't think either one is a good representation of him.

And Gerald Ford, I know Heidi's going to comment on the teeth and so, I will, too. It's very hard to do teeth.

But, I'm going to add one more thing. I think there's too much information on here with -- I think it's kind of -- other than using the word lumpy. You know, the one part of his face I just don't think that's characteristic of his profile or of his portrait. So, I'm going to go with Number 4. It's the most, in my opinion, like Gerald Ford.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Jeanne. Erik.

Member Jansen: Harry Truman is a fait accompli.

Dwight Eisenhower, I would say the difference between 2 and 3 are almost in the sculpt and so, I'm just going to give a strong endorsement of 2 and 3 and let the best that can happen.

On Kennedy, I was taken by the -- oh, there was a word used a moment ago on image number 1. The fact that he's looking down and away from him almost to me is an acknowledgment of his assassination and if a coin as frames are rimmed in black to respect the loss, that portrait kind of reflects that loss to me.

At the same time, I refuse to put RFK on a coin. So, I'm going to reject Number 4 and I end up standing up for Number 2 as well.

So, my vote on Kennedy is going to be a strong vote for Number 1 and a back up weaker vote for Number 2.

On LBJ, boy, I remember this guy as a fierce politician and Number 4 is the one that closely does that. Although, Number 3 is not far off because you just know that he is a man dealing from self-built and self-perceived and self-asserted power.

Number 1 feels like a weak President to me and he is missing the lapel and the shoulders are wrong.

So, my vote on LBJ is really a strong vote on Number 4 and a weaker vote on 3 and a weaker vote on 1.

When it comes to Richard Nixon, I'm going to give the CFA a side portrait here. So, I'm going to vote for Number 1 and a weak vote for Number 2.

And on Jerry Ford, I'll let Heidi make comments on the Number 2 and I'll just suffice it to say that I'm going to put weak votes in for 4 and 1.

Chair Marks: Thank you, Erik. Okay. On Harry Truman, folks, since we have the one design, it's an opportunity for us. When you fill out your ballot, please give it a three so we can go forward with that design with the strongest possible recommendation. When we report that it was a unanimous score for those present, I think that tilts a little more in our favor if another group picks something else which they probably won't, but let's go ahead and score that and I'd ask because of how our culling came out that you just give that a three.

So, on Eisenhower, both 2 and 3 I think are good representations of him. The comment on the circle around the eye, I've actually seen a photograph of that. It really looks that way. Yes, so, I think that the artist here was probably working off that photograph or some other photograph like it. But, I remember seeing that feature. It was unique. But, I don't think it's an error.

So, I'm probably going to -- I don't know. I'm probably going to support both of those equally and let the Committee go from there.

Kennedy is a little harder for me. A lot of good comments here on Number 1. I guess I'll be interested to see what Heidi has to say about the hair because we end up looking right smack at his part and I'm not sure of the shadowing in the hair. We have some dark lines and there's some open spaces there that are white. When that becomes a coin, what is that going to look like? Because then we've got just the monochrome silver. I think it's fundamentally going to change this and I'm not saying that we shouldn't go with this design, but I guess I'm wondering about it.

I'm -- and there's been some -- there's some -- I love Erik's comment about foreshadowing of the assassination. However, Robert's comments resonate with me, too. The President looking down.

You know what? Kennedy was the guy who was the optimist and a rising tide lifts all ships and so forth.

So, I guess I'm really conflicted right now because the only other one that I would consider supporting is 2 and there's just something about 2. It's a little chunky. Someone else said it. It's a little chunky. So, I'm struggling between 1 and 2 and I don't know. I might give support to both. We'll see here in a moment.

On Johnson, I think I'm going to do like Erik. I'll support both 3 and 4. I think they're both, you know, good likenesses of him and I'll leave it to the Committee to -- I'll probably support them evenly. So, the Committee other than me will make that choice.

Okay. Now, Nixon's the one. I'm the strongest on this one. Nixon's image is all about the nose and I think the profile catches it. I mean that is unmistakably Nixon and, you know, I'll say 2 is a great image and that's him looking into the TV screen. I think Robert you brought it up. That's him looking into the TV screen saying the people need to know their President is not a crook.

But, I think the nose wins out for me. I think this is quintessentially Nixon. You can't mistake that image, that profile for anyone else and given the CFA's preference for profiles, if we pick Number 1, I think it's a shoe-in. Just my guess.

Ford, I'll steal a little bit of Heidi's thunder. I know she's going to say it. Teeth. I don't know if you went back and looked at the series if you're going to find another President that we've shown teeth and what I've always heard from sculptors, I'm not one of them, but what I've always heard is teeth bad. Teeth bad.

So, I'm going to trust that and let Heidi inform us a little bit more if she wishes.

So, you know, I guess I'm with 4.

So, okay. That's it for me. Heidi.

Member Wastweet: I always look at these as if I'm going to be the sculptor and I get to choose which one of these I would most like to sculpt from. So, that's the angle that I come in.

For Eisenhower, I would go with Number 2. I like the more gentle treatment of the lines especially in the neck. It's going to translate better to a sculpture. I don't -- I'm not bothered by the line around the left eye. I have confidence in our sculptors to make that look appropriate. I'm supporting Number 2.

On Kennedy, when I first saw Number 1, I didn't like it. I thought that oh, no, our President should look strong and chin up. But, then the more I look at it, I'm actually changing my mind. Because after all, Kennedy was human and this shows his ultimate mortality and why do we want to portray all of our Presidents as heroic and unattainable like gods. They're not. They are human and I'm touched by this being different. I like -- the more I look at it, the more I like it.

I'm not bothered by the missing lapel on the far side because that shape becomes a very nice and artistic little abstract shape and it's different than the typical run the edge just around the letters. We have a continuity to the series. So, anything different needs to be subtle and that's the subtle difference there with that little wing shape there and I like that very much and the lapel would break that up.

So, I would defer to the original image and the intention of the artist. I'm going to support Number 1.

Kennedy Number 2, the chin -- the underneath the chin bothers me. That won't translate -- in my opinion translate well to the coin like a strong jaw line could have. So.

Johnson, I don't have a strong preference between 3 and 4. I would steer away from 1. The lines are just too harsh there and it looks cartoonish. So, I think I would lean toward Number 3 because of the gaze.

On Nixon, Gary, you completely swayed me. I was going to support Number 2, but after what you said, I'm completely convinced I'm going to swing toward 1. The profile, the texture of the hair is good. It is an unmistakable, unmistakable nose. I'll support Number 1.

On Ford, you guys know me so well. I don't need to say anything on 2. Michael Bugeja really swayed me on this. I certainly haven't met him

and if Michael says that this is the way he remembered him, then I'm going to take that as --

Chair Marks: Which one is that?

Member Wastweet: Ford Number 1. When he said that's the way he remembered him when he interviewed him, I'm going to look to that as my authority.

Oh, I forgot to address on Kennedy. If we could back up just for a minute. The hair. There was a question on the hair. As a sculptor, I think that hair

will look just fine and Don, you can weigh in your opinion as well.

Mr. Everhart: I don't see it as a problem at all.

Member Wastweet: Yes.

Mr. Everhart: I think the pose is reminiscent of his official White House portrait.

Member Wastweet: Good point.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Wastweet: And that's it. Okay.

Chair Marks: Thank you much. Okay. So, that brings us to the end unless we have any follow up comments from anybody.

Member Bugeja: Gary, this is Michael. I wanted to check the comment on Richard Nixon and the Inaugural Medal for Richard Nixon, the official Inaugural Medal was Richard Milhous Nixon and just to clarify. I don't know if that means anything, but that is the Inaugural Medal. The inscription from the President's Office.

Chair Marks: Okay. Thank you, Michael. Mike Olson.

Vice Chair Olson: After hearing the comments on Kennedy, I hear a little bit of support here, a little bit of support there, but no strong support from a lot of people. Just wanted to say a couple of things.

You know, Kennedy was one of our most heroic Presidents. He's a World War II hero. Everybody knows the PT-109 story. This guy was the real deal and he was one of our most popular Presidents. He was only my President for one month before he was assassinated. So, I have no recollection other than what I've seen on a TV.

But, when you look back at how big of a deal that was when he got elected and the things he set in motion in a positive way, the space race, his speech about we choose to do these things and the others not because they're easy because they're hard, ask not what your country can do for you, what can you do for your country. Standing at the Berlin Wall in the middle of enemy -- surrounded by the enemy saying I'm with you. I'm a Berliner.

This was a positive President and while I have no artistic complaint about how this is rendered, I think I may have seen a picture very similar to this of him. I think we owe him more than something like this. Go back and take a look at when he's giving these speeches. His forcefulness, positive.

We all know he was unfortunately assassinated, but I would like to remember him in a more positive way on some of the things he started us off on a path towards doing rather than having him remembered in this manner here.

Just throwing that up for consideration. It would be an --

Member Bugeja: Michael, let me just -- there has been some -- Michael Bugeja. There's been some talk about Number 1. That is a riff on the official White House portrait of John F. Kennedy. That's what hangs in the White House. That's what really this is. He's looking -- in the official White House portrait, he's looking down to the right. On the coin, he's looking down to the left. But, that's that illusion. That's a very famous portrait.

I almost did not advocate for Number 1 because I thought it has been used so often. But, that is the selection that he had made for himself in that painting. The official White House portrait.

I don't know if you have the means to take a look at that, but that's what hangs in the White House.

Vice Chair Olson: No, I agree. I recall seeing this picture before. The only -- what I'm suggesting and I'll make a motion whether it's supported by the Committee or not as --

Chair Marks: You're not making it yet.

Vice Chair Olson: Right. But, I will. I would like to see some new designs.

Chair Marks: Okay. Any other comments? Okay. Then I'm going to ask everyone to complete their ballots and turn those in and while you're doing that, I got some results on 2016 Native American. Give

everyone a chance to get ready for that.

Okay. Twenty sixteen Native American \$1 Coin reverse, again, I'll reiterate a perfect score is 24 and 13 is needed for the threshold and I'll only address those designs that we considered.

So, Number 1, Design Number 1, received seven. Number 2 received five. Number 3 received five. Design Number 4 received seven. Design Number 6 received 14. Design Number 9 received 19 and is our indicated recommendation. Number 13 received seven. Number -- is 16 in? Yes, 16 received one vote and 17 received eight. So, it's fairly clear that Number 9 will be the choice.

Is there any way to put Number 9 up on the screen or is that too much of a hassle?

Number 9, I'll just tell you all. Number 9 is the two feathers crossed with the helmets. So.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Excuse me. But, I think when we were discussing this one before, Robert had made a comment on the years, 1917 and 1945. That perhaps maybe we should put World War I --

Chair Marks: And he was part of the discussion.

Member Stevens-Sollman: -- World War I and World War II in its place. So, I would like to move to do that.

Vice Chair Olson: Second.

Chair Marks: Let's give our motion taker a moment here.

Member Jansen: Got it.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, it's been moved --

Member Jansen: State your motion again.

Chair Marks: It's been moved and seconded to recommend that the dates 1917 and 1945 be changed to WWI and WWII.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes. Thank you.

Vice Chair Olson: Gary, could I add a friendly -- I don't know how to go about it. Friendly this or that amendment.

Chair Marks: Okay. Hold on. Hold on. Do we have a second?

Member Hoge: Yes, Michael was the second.

Vice Chair Olson: Yes, I was.

Chair Marks: Then friendly amendment.

Vice Chair Olson: Yes, this one also does not have the historical dollar denomination --

Chair Marks: The established --

Vice Chair Olson: -- that's been used.

Chair Marks: -- font.

Vice Chair Olson: Yes. Could we add that to this one motion?

Chair Marks: The motion taker agree?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, the recommendation is not only to change the date for the war indicators, but also to change the font to that which is familiar to a series between '09 and '12.

Member Jansen: Just the dollar sign or the rest --

Chair Marks: The whole thing.

Member Jansen: Font?

Chair Marks: The whole thing. All text. Correct?

Vice Chair Olson: No. No. Just the dollar sign. It think there was comments made by Tom that this text that was on here was representative for the World War II type coinage. I'm just talking about the dollar.

Chair Marks: Oh.

Vice Chair Olson: Dollar denomination.

Chair Marks: And the motion taker agrees?

Member Stevens-Sollman: To just change the dollar font?

Chair Marks: Yes.

Member Stevens-Sollman: You know what? In --

Chair Marks: You don't have to.

Member Stevens-Sollman: No, I think if Tom has indicated that this is

the font that is used in World War II, then maybe even though it is going against our dollar font with the rest of it, this may well go better with the text that's in the medal. So, I would say not to include that in my --

Chair Marks: You're accepting his --

Member Jansen: Just the dollar font. Tom disagrees.

Vice Chair Olson: Just the dollar.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay.

Vice Chair Olson: We're just talking about changing the dollar.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay. Not the --

Vice Chair Olson: Denomination.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Okay. All right. Then I'll agree with that.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, that's the motion, folks. Change the dates of the war indicators and we want to font the one dollar denomination.

Any discussion?

Member Jansen: Is there any reason to augment the date with WWI/WWII below them?

Member Stevens-Sollman: No.

Chair Marks: No.

Member Stevens-Sollman: No, I think we can get rid of the dates and that's my motion is replace the dates.

Member Jansen: Okay. Strictly just that.

Member Stevens-Sollman: That's okay.

Chair Marks: Okay. We understand the motion now. Any further comment?

Okay. All those in favor please raise your hand.

Member Bugeja: Aye.

Chair Marks: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. All those opposed. Only because I think it should be the totality of the font change, but motion carries seven to one and --

Member Jansen: Michael Bugeja, please send me your votes if you would by email.

Chair Marks: Okay. So, all we're -- am I correct? All we're waiting for now is the tally.

Member Jansen: I need Bugeja votes.

Chair Marks: The Presidential designs.

Member Jansen: Yes.

Chair Marks: Anything else today that we --

Member Jansen: Michael, will you send me your votes by email please?

Chair Marks: Anything else we need to deal with?

Member Bugeja: Yes, I sent it to you, Erik.

Member Jansen: Okay. I'll see if I get it in a minute.

Chair Marks: Okay.

Member Bugeja: I'll re-send it again.

Member Jansen: No. No. Okay. That would be fine.

Chair Marks: Rather than just sit here in session. Let's break for five or ten minutes. I'm going to ask everyone if you can stay in the room because the only thing we need to do is come back into session and report the results.

Either that or if you want to, we could hold it off until tomorrow morning.

Vice Chair Olson: Just get it done right here.

Chair Marks: Let's do it. Okay. So, we'll be in recess for --

Member Jansen: Ten minutes.

Chair Marks: -- ten minutes.

(Whereupon the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:32 p.m. and went back on at 4:41 p.m.)

Chair Marks: Come back to order. We have results. So, on Truman, I have a shocking report. Number 1 received the unanimous 24 out of 24.

Eisenhower Design Number 1 received zero. Design Number 2 is our selected design or our recommended design with 21 of the 24 possible. Number 3 received seven.

Moving on to Kennedy, Number 1 is our recommended with 16 of the 24. Number 2 received six and Number 4 received one.

I should report Number 3 which we had taken out received two.

Well, I got more to report. Number 5, which we took out, also got one.

So, moving on to Johnson, Design Number 1 received two points. Design Number 3, and a close call, as our recommended design with 17 and Number 4 close behind with 15 and that was Johnson.

Okay. So, that takes us to Nixon which Greg aptly said was tricky because it's tied. It's tied, folks at 14 between 1 and 2. Now, I think it's apropos that 14 is only one over the threshold anyway. So, it's a low-level tie. So, I'm not -- not a lot of enthusiasm for the tie. But, we are at a tie.

So, before we deal with that, let's go on to Ford where I'm sad to report we didn't reach the threshold. We don't have a recommendation here as of yet.

Number 1 received nine. Number 2 received three and Number 4 received ten. So, Number 4 would be our highest vote accumulator.

Is it possible to get these images up? Can we look at Nixon 1 and Nixon 2 first? Let's deal with Nixon. Then we can go on to Ford. See if there's anything we want to do or if we want to ask for new designs. I don't know. So, let's deal with Nixon first.

Because as it is a tie, means there is no recommendation. So, technically, we have recommended that one either.

Well, there's 1 and Number 2 would be that one. So --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Is it possible re-vote? I mean didn't we do that the last time. Simple show of hands.

Chair Marks: Usually at this point, we would take a -- see if we could get a majority vote for one or the other.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes. Can we do that?

Chair Marks: So, you know, and by process of elimination if we make a motion and then it loses, then we'll probably have to do a second motion and it would go the other way.

So, is there anyone who wants to lay one on the table?,

Member Stevens-Sollman: I move that we reconsider these two and have another vote. Can we do that?

Chair Marks: Well, actually, I think --

Member Stevens-Sollman: Oh.

Chair Marks: -- a motion would be for one or the other.

Member Stevens-Sollman: Oh. Oh.

Chair Marks: Just recommend one or the other.

Member Stevens-Sollman: I will. Okay. Then you know what? I'm going to -- I'll make a motion that we look at Number 1 as our --

Chair Marks: Recommend Number 1?

Member Stevens-Sollman: Yes.

Chair Marks: The motion is to recommend Number 1.

Vice Chair Olson: Second.

Chair Marks: And it's been seconded by Michael Olson.

Is there any discussion? Pretty straightforward I think.

Member Jansen: I would just make a comment that I would hate to say that it would win by a nose, but I do think -- I think the nose comment that was made late is really the important comment and I would also offer I think the CFA always prefers a side portrait and if we want to make this a selection that is maybe simpler for the deciders in this case, this might be the preferred design.

Chair Marks: Okay. So --

Member Hoge: Let me comment. I think this is virtually identical to the portrait that's on his -- his presidential portrait, too.

Chair Marks: Okay. With that, I'm going to call the question. All those in favor please raise your hand. Two, three, four, five, six. Michael's gone. Opposed. No, he's gone. He's gone. So, the motion carries six to one.

That takes us to Ford. Can we look at both 1 and 4. I'll remind you Design Number 1 got nine and Design Number 4 got 10.

Vice Chair Olson: I make a motion we recommend Number 4.

Member Uram: Second.

Member Jansen: Who was the second?

Chair Marks: Tom. The motion is to recommend Design Number 4. Any discussion?

All those in favor raise your hand. Four, five, six. Opposed.

Member Wastweet: Abstain.

Chair Marks: One abstention. Six and one abstention. Motion carries.

Adjourn

We are at the end of our agenda for today. I will welcome you all back for our public meeting at 9:30 in the morning tomorrow. We are in recess.

(Whereupon the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:47 p.m.)