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CHAIRMAN MARKS: Good morning, everyone. I’m calling this Tuesday, January 27, 2015 meeting of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee to order. I want to welcome everyone here to the meeting today. We have a full agenda.

I first want to recognize the guests that we have with us here today representing the programs we will be discussing. Samuel Rodriguez with the Borinqueneers. I’m not sure if everyone is here yet.

Scott Tolley who is with Jack Nicklaus, a program we are going to be looking at designs for later on. Jason Rano, who is Director of Government Relations for the National Park Foundation, and Donald Leadbetter, with Centennial Partnership Coordinators.

I want to welcome all of you. Sam, welcome to our meeting. Also, we have some
journalists who are with us today. I want to ask that if you are a journalist on the phone, please identify yourself so we can all know that you are here.

MR. GOLINO: This is Louis Golino.

MR. WALKER: This is Hubert Walker for CoinWeek.

MR. ZIELINKSI: Mike Zielinski for Coin Update.

MR. UNSER: Mike Unser from Coin News.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I see Bill McAllister just came in the room. Welcome to you all. Before I get started, I just wanted to cover a little bit of ground for any folks who might be here for the first time and not familiar with our committee.

We are a committee that was created by an act of Congress in 2003. When Congress created the committee, they had the thought that they wanted to bring together a panel of expertise in the areas of sculpture, metallic arts, numismatics and numismatics curation,
American History, and then also put some representation from the Congress, people who are recommended by various leadership members in Congress ultimately appointed by the Secretary, and also representation from the general public.

Here with you today is a rich panel of folks who bring deep backgrounds in their fields. We are very passionate about what we do. We believe in the mission of portraying the accomplishments, the aspirations, the history of America in coins and medals.

We are excited to engage with the various representatives of the programs today. The one thing that I will add to this is we are not a rubberstamp committee; we are here to perform a duty that we take very seriously. Often times we agree with our sponsors, but we take our role very seriously.

We want to make sure that whatever the U.S. Mint produces either in coinage or medals is something that on multiple levels is
successful. One, conveying the message that needs to be conveyed through the medal or coin, to do it in a way that articulates beautiful art and a way that honors the program and its goals.

I just wanted to cover that ground so that we understand what we are doing here. We have had some instances in the past where I didn’t do that and people weren’t clear, so I wanted to take this opportunity to make sure I covered that ground.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 14, 2014 MEETING MINUTES AND LETTERS TO THE SECRETARY

CHAIRMAN MARKS: With that said, first item on our agenda is to approve the letter and minutes from our October 14, 2014 meeting. Those materials were provided to the committee in the meeting packet. I trust you have had an opportunity to review those materials.

Are there any changes, additions, deletions to those documents?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: If there is a motion to approve the same, I’d like to take that now.

MOTION
MR. JANSEN: So moved.
MS. WASTWEET: Second.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Moved and seconded to approve the letters to the Secretary and the minutes of the October 14, 2014 meeting. All those in favor, please say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Motion carries unanimously. Thank you. The next item for discussion is the concepts and themes for the 65th Infantry Regiment “Borinqueneers” Congressional Gold Medal.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF CONCEPTS AND THEMES FOR THE 65TH INFANTRY REGIMENT “BORINQUENEERS” CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL
CHAIRMAN MARKS: We will go to April
and Megan for their reports to us about that program. Just a word, we have about an hour and five minutes at this point to cover this ground. I want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to contribute to this discussion. I want to make sure not one person monopolizes the discussion.

I’m going to ask that when you are addressing this issue that you not exceed five minutes. I think we can say everything we need to say in five minutes. That way, we can have a thorough discussion where everybody is contributing.

With that, I will go to April and I’ll ask her for her report.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. Before I begin, I’d like to repeat to anyone who is joining this committee meeting on the conference call to please mute your phone, including our CCAC member, Mr. Bugeja. That might be actually your line that is open, if you don’t mind; on this end we get a lot of
feedback. Thank you.

DR. BUGEJA: I have it on mute very judiciously, so it’s not me.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. If everyone who is on the line could mute your phone that would be great. Thank you.

It is Public Law 113-120 that awards the Congressional Gold Medal in honor of the 65th Infantry Regiment known as the “Borinqueneers” in recognition of its pioneering military service, its devotion to duty and many acts of valor in the face of adversity.

The 65th Infantry Regiment of Puerto Rico was the last segregated unit of the United States military, comprised primarily of Hispanic soldiers. They fought in World War I, World War II, and the Korean War. Their story has been described as one of pride, courage, heartbreak, and redemption.

The liaison has presented the following recommendations for the medal design
based on the responses from the Borinqueneers surveyed.

For its obverse, it includes the “65th Infantry Regiment” as the unit name, the war name, specifically “Borinqueneers,” and a representation of the official insignia of the United States Army Infantry which depicts crossed rifles.

On the reverse, suggestions include the dates “1899-1956,” which represents the unit’s 57 years of active duty, the global conflicts the Borinqueneers were involved in, including World War I, World War II, and the Korean War, the unit’s motto, “Honor et Fidelitas,” Latin for honor and fidelity, a depiction of El Morro, El Morro Fort or officially “Castillo San Felipe del Morro,” which would stand guards at the entrance to San Juan Harbor as a reminder of a bygone era when invading countries would attempt sea attacks to take this prized city and harbor.

Although the U.S. would not formally
enter the conflict in 1917, the first shots fired by U.S. soldiers in World War I were from El Morro. The 65th Infantry Regiment sailed past El Morro to war and also when they returned from war.

Also ideas for the reverse include the unit’s distinctive insignia, the Maltese Cross, and two bay laurel branches to symbolize the victory of the 65th Infantry Regiment.

Today we have Sam Rodriguez, our liaison for the 65th Infantry Regiment Congressional Gold Medal. Sam, would you like to say a few words?

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Good morning, everybody. Good morning, everybody, who is listening in to this important historic meeting. It is such an honor to be here. I want to thank everyone. I took the liberty of taking a picture the first time I was here to share with my stakeholders.

I believe you guys and this committee
is part of history, and going forward, everybody in Puerto Rico will know who you are because for us in Puerto Rico, history is very important, we study it very much, and we are very proud of our history, and this committee is part of that.

This story started many, many years ago. I got involved in 2013 and have not stopped working at it. This is a team effort. I do not work alone. This is a whole community. I’m sure you have documents from supporters from all across the nation because it is very important.

My work in this process started with a conversation between April, Megan, Mr. Bush and Javier and I when we set out the course of what we were going to do today up to this point, the time line, the design plan. We came up with the theme and even the thesis. We said we were going to let the data draw the design.

In my 30 years of government service,
I have implemented many Acts and in government, the rulemaking and transparency, so we were going to apply the same concept to this report. That is what we did. We had a survey. We got information from the public, everywhere. In my report, all of that is all outlined.

I just wanted to let everybody know that this has been a very transparent process, everybody in the community knows what is going on today because of our social media campaign, e-mails.

I just want to thank you for this opportunity.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. That’s it, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Do we have any questions before we go forward about the program itself? I want to make sure the members are clear about the program or any aspect of it.

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there someone who would like to begin with their comments on the program? What I think might be helpful, Mr. Rodriguez, could you share with us some of the ideas? Obviously, you have a lot of passion for this program and you have done a lot of work. I think you probably have a sense of where you would like the program to go. I think it will be very beneficial if you could share some of that with us.

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: Sir, yes. Going into this, I didn’t want to go in my own decision, I wanted to create a document based on the recommendations I received from Megan, which is I wanted to create elements that artists could be inspired to design and come up with a theme themselves. I don’t want to take a position on anything because that would be counterproductive. I want to let the artists take that position.

My idea was to collect information from all aspects, social, demographics, all
aspects of our heritage and our military heritage, so the artists when they sit down they have a document, they don’t have to go nowhere, they just look at it and start to think and get their inspiration juices.

The Borinqueneers started out as “Jibaro’s,” meaning men from the country, and they were working the land, agriculture. They didn’t have any education. One day they found out they could be a part of the United States Army, they could put on a uniform and represent the United States of America.

They got involved. They went out, they signed up, and they went to work. They became soldiers. When the time came for them to go to war, they were like we’re going to go to war, we’re going to take our guitars, we’re going to go to war. They said we have to give a warning. They automatically went to “Borinqueneer” which stems from the word “Borinquen,” which is the indigenous name of Puerto Rico. I explain all that in the
That became their battle name and they went to war with that. As soon as they got there, they were engaged, they got on a train, and straight to the hills.

The war in Korea was about always claiming the higher land. Most of their battles were going to the mountains.

After the comment period ended, in Philadelphia, a road was named after the Borinqueneers, 65th Infantry Regiment. I went there to participate in the festivities on Veterans’ Day, and while I was there, I got to meet Mr. Hector Maisonave. Hector Maisonave was a member of the Borinqueneers. This man cannot see today. He’s blind, but his mind is sharp as a razor.

He told me a story about his interaction, his experience in going into the mountains, how they would go into the mountains. He explained he would be the point man with the machine gun going into battle,
facing death, and that everybody on each side forming a diamond would have their bayonets ready to go and do whatever they had to do.

That’s how he explained that to me. I documented all of that and I put it in the report because I thought that was striking. Throughout the survey, almost everybody who participated in the survey wanted to see Korea. In the survey, I put do you want to see World War I, World War II, or Korea. Almost unanimously, it was Korea and bayonets. That kind of made my analysis very simple.

They also migrated to the official painting of the fixed bayonets of the Borinqueneers that was commissioned by the United States Guard. Everybody likes it. That is a painting that was commissioned by the Guard and not the regular Army, that is why I kind of thought it would be best for the actual artists to see that and for this committee to see that. We want to keep it as
true to the story as ever.

I developed all that information. My survey was a survey that was open to all stakeholders, family members, historians, not just Borinqueneers but everybody who had an interest, and I conveyed that information. I think it is going to inspire the artists to do great work.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you very much. Hello?

MR. MORALES: Good morning. My name is Javier Morales, BCGM, Puerto Rico, if I could have a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes; please. Please go ahead, sir.

MR. MORALES: Thank you. I have been down here in Puerto Rico since 2006. I was inspired to get involved with researching the Borinqueneers. My time has been spent in the last eight years going around the island looking for veterans that have been forgotten really, not only as members of the U.S. Armed
Forces, but also when they come back after spending a lot of sweat and tears, they have been forgotten as well. Their benefits have not been met.

I think we need a memorial that will inspire the world to know veterans from Puerto Rico had a lot to do with the history of the United States by not only in the Korean War but prior to that, during World War II as well.

We kind of should give a lot of credit to those veterans that joined the U.S. Army during World War I and World War II. They went in without knowing any English. They had to learn that language, a different language.

They not only learned that language, they learned to be disciplined, and that involvement in World War I and World War II was carried forward to the veterans of the Korean War. They were the ones that trained the new soldiers.

I think we can see the outcome, the
results from that by seeing what happened. They were very dedicated and went in with valor, with determination, to do what they had to do, and they did it. I think that is very important to keep in mind, not only the Korean War veterans, but we had World War I and World War II heroes, which many of them didn’t know what was expected of them, but they went in there and they did it.

I think honoring all the Borinqueneers is very important to all of us. Down here in Puerto Rico, I was able to travel, trying to get feedback from them, meeting the veterans and asking them what would you like to see. Again, some of the results were fast forwarded to Sam, and recorded in the report as well.

All the veterans here in Puerto Rico are anxious to see what the results are. I really want to thank you for taking the time you have given us to do this. I thank everybody for hearing our recommendations. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you.

COL. FREYTES: Could I speak? This is Col. Dennis Freytes, U.S. Army retired, former Professor of Military Science at the University of Puerto Rico. I would like to speak on behalf of my father, Borinqueneer Menendez, and my uncle, who greatly fought with the Borinqueneers. Can I say a few words?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, please, sir.

COL. FREYTES: First, I want to thank Sam Rodriguez and Javier Morales. I think they were excellent liaisons. They really brought in a lot of good things about the Borinqueneers and held a lot of events here in Florida and in Puerto Rico.

I would like to add one event in the Borinqueneers’ lives is a famous charge. It was the last infantry bayonet charge, and should be captured on this coin. I have recommended that one side of the coin say “The Borinqueneers,” have the flags of the United
States and Puerto Rico, because it is very important to identify Puerto Rico from where the Borinqueneers came, even though we have a lot of Borinqueneers residing all over in different states.

On the other side of the coin, like mentioned, the 65th Infantry Regiment and 1899, and then the infantry rifles over the shield where it says “Honor and Fidelity.”

I’m a former commander of Infantry, Special Forces and Airborne. This was an infantry unit and it should be recognized.

Under that, World War I, like Javier mentioned, World War II and Korea, and at the end, “U.S./Puerto Rico.” It is very important that people understand where the Borinqueneers came from, and their most important action being that charge in U.S. Army history.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, sir. We are going to go ahead to our committee discussion. I will first recognize Erik
MR. JANSEN: I want to thank Sam for the background material you provided us. It was some of the most thorough, colorful, crisp that we have received in a while, so thank you. It made it easy to understand the story.

As I read through that, it was interesting one particular word jumped out at me, and I was kind of moved to examine that word, and the word was “up hill battles.” That is a word we throw around any time something is tough, oh, it’s an up hill battle.

Suddenly, when I read your piece, I had a vision of guys going up hill against the old adage, “Always hold the high ground in a battle,” and when you don’t, you are at a disadvantage. The up hill piece of that, I examined that word and suddenly this story came alive for me.

As we try to draft directions and inspiration to the artists, I’m not sure what
I would do with that, but I’m not the artists that will get to figure that out. The up hill battle seems to be the constant here along side -- we can make a long list of words -- “courage.”

Quite frankly, another thing that was striking in the story was the transition from a proud segregated group to a group that had proven itself and then essentially unsegregated without losing the strength of its legacy and pride. That would be the second piece of this.

The last commenter mentioned a symbol of crossed flags, and that might be a way to do it although certainly not the only way. I think there is a story here about the transition from a segregated group in a time of segregation which carried its strengths forward to share them in a non-segregated world as they proved themselves in their service in the Korean War and certainly post-World II period.
I think the Maltese Cross insignia is a powerful symbol which could be almost a central feature on one side of this medal. It is such a bold and simple yet identifiable characteristic of the organization.

I would encourage the artists not to repeat the kind of El Morro architecture that was featured on the 50 States quarter, when we did the territorial adjunct to that at the end of that program. You will recall that quarter has the round turret featured on it, along with a flower, I think, off to the right at the 3:00 position if I remember right.

I would encourage us to almost look beyond that and really try to dig inspirationally into the character of this group in the segregation move to join the power of the United States and not just the Puerto Rican history, as well as the up hill battle. That is a rich one.

That would be my comments. Thank you, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. Mary, are you ready?

MS. LANNIN: Yes, I am. I agree with what Erik said. I’d like to ask a couple of questions. “Borinquena” is the daughter of the sun and the sea.” Is there in Puerto Rico a fictional representation of this woman?

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: No, ma’am. That was the composition that became the anthem of Puerto Rico, and the composer, Manuel Fernandez Juncos, just described Puerto Rico as being the daughter of the sea and --

MS. LANNIN: There is no fictional image that people would identify with that concept?

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: I wish there were, but no.

MS. LANNIN: Okay. I also like the idea of the Maltese Cross, but one of the things I was reading in this very rich history that you provided us is the use of bayonets. That is something I really don’t think about
normally when I think about war, and how personal and close that must be, and without giving the artists any ideas of mine, but what if the Maltese Cross were made out of bayonets. Just a thought.

That’s it for me.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Very good. Herman?

DR. VIOLA: I’m Herman Viola. I’m the historian on this committee. I want to say I feel this is a very historic moment. I am actually quite proud that I could be part of this session and make this a reality. In fact, I’m surprised we haven’t recognized this group before.

I really liked the discussion. It’s a matter of what the veterans would like to see. I think that is a very creative idea with the bayonets. I am really looking forward to the artistic designs that would come out of this.

Have your people done any drawings they could share with us that maybe they have given some thought to as to what they would
like to see, the up hill, the bayonets?

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: No, a lot of stakeholders sent in some drawings themselves but because it would be better for the artists to come up with their own designs, I kind of left that to the professionals.

I wanted something that would be crisp, organic, but we have the complete intellectual property and ownership. The rendition that I provided was a compilation of stories from Borinqueneers.

There was a movement in Florida where people were also participating in designs. When I got that information, I just noted the elements, and I added it in one of the appendices of the report, just to show the transparency and integrity of the process, that everything was used in the analysis of this report.

DR. VIOLA: Thank you. I can visualize some very exciting designs. I’m looking forward to see what the artists come
up with. Thank you.

MR. MEDINA: Mr. Viola, this is Frank Medina, National Chair for Borinqueneers Congressional Gold Medal Alliance. With the respect of the Chair and Sam Rodriguez, I’d like to address your question real quick.

I was under the understanding that visual renditions were not allowed due to any potential copyright infringement. I’m sure has received a lot of renditions from the veterans themselves. I know I did. I forwarded them on to the U.S. Mint. I think Sam received those as well.

To answer your question, yes, there have been a lot of veteran renditions.

DR. VIOLA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WEINMAN: This is Greg Weinman, counsel for the Mint. That is correct, for copyright reasons, in order to ensure we were able to create a design that we could use, that we don’t infringe on anybody else’s copyrights, reference materials but not actual
depictions.

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Viola, I just wanted to add, the discussion for today is to solicit input from the committee with regard to ideas that the artists might come to these designs with. Certainly if you have suggestions, ideas, or as you say, you can envision exciting designs, that, I believe, is something you can put on the record and we will share with the artists to consider as they move forward.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Actually, I have something to add to this discussion, and that is as the committee’s representative as Chair, I was able to look at some extensive documents that were provided by the Borinqueneers Congressional Gold Medal Alliance, a very well put together document with lots of illustrations and ideas in it.

I’m sure if committee members between now and when we review the art would like to have an opportunity to review those materials,
I think we can certainly make that available to you.

I did want to make sure that those responsible with the Alliance knew that I as Chairman did look at their materials and very much appreciate the effort that went into that. It was quite extensive. There was a great deal of input from a number of individuals represented in that, a three ring binder.

Again, if that is something that would interest committee members, I can surely make sure it makes its way to you.

DR. VIOLA:  Okay. Thank you.

MR. MORALES:  Excuse me, this is Javier Morales from Puerto Rico, we sent in some of our designs as well and I think they should also be looked at by the committee.

MR. MEDINA:  Also, the National Association for Uniformed Services for Congressional Gold Medal Alliance sent some designs, and we also relinquish all
Copyrights. We would like for that to be seen by the committee.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. I need to make sure that the committee members all get a chance to weigh in on this. I am going to direct the discussion back to the committee members.

MR. C. RODRIGUEZ: Good morning. May I interrupt for a minute, please?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, go ahead. After you are done, sir, we need to give the committee members a chance to discuss this program so we can have a full discussion amongst the committee. Please proceed and tell us what you would like us to know.

MR. C. RODRIGUEZ: My name is Casimiro Rodriguez from the Hispanic Heritage Council, Buffalo, New York. Our organization was part of the National Congressional Gold Medal Alliance. Just a point of clarification. Is there some time line as to when all the ideas and input needs to be in by? Is there a time
by which all this information needs to get to the committee?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I would suggest in the interest of time -- that’s a very relevant question, sir, but I would ask that be directed to staff off line. They can give you an answer in detail.

For this period of time, which is limited for us, I want to make sure that our committee members have a full opportunity to discuss all that has already been spoken to by the various sponsors and interested parties in this program.

I am going to ask for all those on the phone and in the audience here if you would please give our committee a chance to talk. Our time is limited. At this point, if I could have another member who would like to contribute. Heidi, would you go ahead, please?

MS. WASTWEET: Thank you, Gary. On this committee, we see a lot of military
medals. There is a tendency that after time they start to look very generic and very much like each other. I would urge in this case we want to really focus on the things that made this group unique and what identifies them that makes them different from all the other military groups.

There is also a tendency to put a lot of words on this, we have “pride” and “courage,” words that are thrown around all branches of the military, and they do encompass all of the military. After using those words over and over again, they fall flat.

I want to caution against using too much insignia’s and words that would be better left for follow up conversations and make the medal very visual so it really grabs people so they want to talk about it rather than read the medal.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I need another committee member who would like to comment.
Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Gary. I would follow up with what Heidi says. Thank you, Mr. Rodriguez. I would like to enhance our knowledge of history. I am very honored to have read your reports. It’s a pleasure to meet you.

I would like to know, you have given us, our committee, and our artists a tremendous amount of information, it’s very powerful, however, what is it if we boiled it down -- what can you tell us that is terribly important?

In other words, if we could weed out some of it, because we have a small field to work from, not a big story board, what would be the best in your opinion or your stakeholders’ opinion to represent this medal?

I can see tons of things, but what would your people like best?

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: Well, to make our medal unique, I included some pictures of
highly awarded soldiers that fought in battle. In one of the appendices, I included six pictures that show the broad spectrum of our demographics and our heritage.

One of those is Sergeant Major Negron. He was awarded the Medal of Honor. Also, Modesto Cartagena. Also, Arcadio Santiago-Rodriguez, and others. I think some of them are still alive. Enrique Vazquez-Vega is living today in Pennsylvania.

I want us to move forward and not waste too much time because time is of urgency. Just this past weekend, two Borinqueneers died. They are dying every day.

You have enough information there to make a medal next week. We need to move forward. The pictures are there. We have Borinqueneers that are black, white, full spectrum of beauty and diversity of our little island. All of those are included there. One Borinqueneer, his descendants live here in Maryland. Another one is alive in Florida.
We want to honor them while they are still with us so they can enjoy the blessings of their labor and their sacrifices.

In terms of flags, there is a lot of passion. I would carry a flag in my sock, but I would refrain from that because the Borinqueneers became a desegregated unit, and many soldiers were from Hawaii, Texas, so we want to make this an Americana, an American, symbolism, very simple, not too busy, so all America can embrace the medal and participate in the history, and we can tell our story to the entire nation.

Last year, in the 60th anniversary of the Korean War, USA Today published a special report about the 65th Infantry. Not one letter, not one page or one phrase ever touched upon the 65th Infantry.

We feel we need to get an opportunity to be at the frontline. Even though we have written our own history with blood and tears, the media hasn’t given us -- we want to move
forward and having those men would be a great way to tell our history. It will show our heroes, our John Wayne’s, so to speak.

That is what I kind of depicted and saw from the information we collected from the stakeholders.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thomas?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Some of the same comments I would echo as Mary mentioned about the bayonets and Heidi about the simplicity and so forth. Both Sam and the Colonel mentioned the importance of the formation and the diamond formation.

I think what would be really nice is to incorporate whether it is the cross and the bayonets or whatever into a diamond type design that would set off the insert of what that design might be. I would think that the artists might want to take a look at both what Sam and the Colonel have said about the
formation and so forth as being an integral part of the design, particularly if it was encapsulated that way.

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: I believe an appendix has infantry formations of a V. If you were to look at that picture, you could see faces of men in front and those on the side coming up to mountains ready to kill you with bayonets and rifles ready to go, because we feel this is a story of men that actually -- their hands had to defend themselves and advocate for American democracy in foreign lands.

If you take that concept of a V formation coming up, you automatically can see men on your left and on your right. You can even see the patches on their shoulders if you put it in the right angle. I’m sure the artists from work I have seen from this agency -- I am very, very impressed and very, very confident something beautiful is going to come out of this.
MR. URAM: I would certainly encourage our designers and engravers to maybe use that concept to get that depth of perception and taking into account that formation design so that can be very moving and the medal would have a lot of depth to it that way. I think using the diamond formation would accomplish both the history aspect as well as the creativity of the engraver.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Another member?

DR. BUGEJA: Gary, this is Michael Bugeja.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, Michael. Go ahead, please.

DR. BUGEJA: I am a citizen of Malta as well as the United States. I do want to point out that the Maltese Cross has to be done very carefully because there are other insignia that look a lot like that, including the Iron Cross.

The Maltese Cross has very spear like
points towards the center. If you take a look at how they have used it, it is a perfect Maltese Cross. The Maltese Cross dates back to the Knights of St. John, and it stands for, in addition to honor and faith, courage, particularly courage under fire. For instance, the New York Fire Department also has adopted the Maltese Cross.

I’ve researched this a little bit to see how the 65th Infantry Regiment has used the shield and Maltese Cross. There is a very fetching design by Rafael Cortez that shows it almost as a shield for the Infantry climbing up that hill. It is a stylistic type of artwork that has depth to it.

The only thing I really wanted to mention was be very, very careful with how you depict the Maltese Cross because there are many other types of crosses that are often confused for it.

I think that might be the extent of my contribution, Gary.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael.

Robert?

MR. HOGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to echo the comments of my colleagues here. I look forward to the opportunity to see the various designs/ideas that have been submitted.

I am wondering if this isn’t an opportunity for us to introduce a little bit of Spanish language into an American coin.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I know you can do that; yes.

MR. HOGE: I think that would lend a distinctive aspect to this coinage, give it something different from all these other many military congressional medals that have come out in one way or another.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Robert. Michael Moran.

MR. MORAN: I have only a couple of notes or advice for the artists as they contemplate their themes and designs. One, if
you do the Puerto Rico flag, you must do the United States flag, because as Mr. Rodriguez mentioned, it was at the end an integrated unit. Two, I’m sure we are going to see something from the canvas of a bayonet charge.

I would remind our artists we are in 3D and we don’t have a canvas to paint on here. I would hope they instead bring the element of the bayonets somehow more creatively into the design rather than a mass of men charging up the hill.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. I think everyone has commented. I will bring us full circle then with some final comments.

First of all, I wanted to thank Mr. Rodriguez. You have said a number of times that your preference is to allow the artists to be artists and to bring forth the ideas, the values that would represent the Borinqueneers appropriately. I appreciate that very much.

My years on the committee have been
spent in a large measure advocating that very idea, that the art ought to be something that is allowed to speak to us, and sometimes we want to commandeer the art and we want to put lots of text and those sorts of elements onto a medal, which is by its nature very small, but it is an opportunity if we allow it for art to be used in a way that can speak in ways that words never can, to speak to the soul about important ideas or values.

As I was sitting here listening to all of the conversation from all the contributors, I was left with just a series of some words that I would hope would inspire the artists to think in the context of art that can speak to us rather than art that is co-joined with excessive text and other ideas that try to coerce us into a certain conclusion about what we as individuals feel and see with the art.

Words like “valor” and “honor,” and I first said “team,” but I think “team” doesn’t quite get at it. I think it’s more
brotherhood. These were men obviously who had to band together and protect each other, to look out for each other, especially in the heat of battle, to have each other’s back, to use a well worn term at this point.

The other ideas that I would hope could speak to us through the art are the ideas of “courage” and “dignity,” “service.” I’m taking the idea of what my colleague Erik said about the idea that this is an up hill battle, that in fact, that is what these men had to engage in often, to take the hill.

I guess all I would like to do rather than try to steer the artists is to leave them with the impression of these words and ask them to think about those in terms of action, that what these men really represented were these ideals put in action. They lived these ideals. Those are the kinds of inspirations I would hope our artists would pick up on and try to convey to us through their work.

I’m very much looking forward to the
time when all of the stakeholders both on the phone and here in the room can come and join us again when we are actually looking at the designs. I’m very excited about that.

I think this is a part of our history, and others have said it here in the room, that we haven’t paid enough attention to. I think most Americans are fairly oblivious to it, frankly.

I think this is a wonderful opportunity to educate and help build honor and respect for these gentlemen who sometimes were called on to give everything in the defense of their country, their peoples, their families, and I think for artists, this is a high calling, and I’m very much looking forward to what they will come back and give to us.

We have a few more minutes. I wanted to make sure that all the stakeholders felt they were able to contribute to our discussion. I’m going to give another 10
minutes if there are others who want to contribute a little bit more. This is your time.

If you’re on the phone, or Mr. Rodriguez here in the room, if there is something additional you would like us to know that would become part of this dialogue conveyed to the artists, this would be your opportunity.

COL. FREYTES: This is Dennis Freytes. I think you hit it right on the head. I think this teamwork of the U.S. Mint is right on target, like they said in the military.

One of the things that Sam mentioned about the Medal of Honor winners and all that, if we are going to have a depiction of their bravery in taking the hill, and remember, they did the last bayonet charge in U.S. Army history. You could almost superimpose the Medal of Honor and Master Sergeant Negron’s face, Cartagena’s face, taking the hill with the bayonets. You can accomplish both goals
there.

I would also say you need to put somewhere in there “U.S./Puerto Rico.” It is very important that people understand they come from the U.S. Territory of Puerto Rico.

Overall, great job, great themes. It’s an honor to have been able to talk before this honorable Board.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, sir. Mr. Rodriguez has some comments to make.

MR. S. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Earlier the suggestion about language, I find it a good opportunity and very interesting. I am a lover of the Spanish language. However, on this medal, I think that the Latin words “Honor et Fidelitas” is more appropriate because it doesn’t go either Spanish or English. It’s a language of its own, and will also make people think and find out what does that mean.

I really love to see my language spoken, I think it is more important for
future generations to also be exposed to Latin as a language.

In terms of the Maltese Cross, I included a copy of the actual design by the United States Army, the official design, so there is no mistake, no artistic mistake about where do we get that, and that’s already vetted. It came from military history and National Guard Bureau.

We have done all that work, all that vetting process. I totally agree with you. This is a story that has yet to be told and has never been told. Sometimes it has been told incorrectly.

This is a time to do it correctly for future generations so each little young man or girl that goes into the Naval Academy or the Infantry Academy will have one of those coins in their pockets. I guarantee you, if they are going into an Infantry school and they are Hispanic, they are going to know about the 65th, and I want all the students that get
commissioned to learn about our history and to carry these medals in their pockets as a badge of honor and heritage.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you very much. For the gentleman on the phone, please.

MR. COLON: This is Jose Colon. I do agree with those ideas. We have to go back to the history of the 65th Infantry, and that is why I believe the Maltese Cross should be included on the medal.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else?

MR. MEDINA: This is Frank Medina, National Chair of the Borinqueneers Congressional Gold Medal Alliance. I will be real brief. First, I appreciate the CCAC for having this forum for everybody to partake. I did have a couple of points of clarification here. Number one, the highest military achievement for the 65th was the epic withdrawal of the Chosin Reservoir.

Also, a point of clarification for the
crossed rifles. I’m a former Captain in the Army. During the Korean War, the 65th was part of the regimental combat team, in other words, it wasn’t just the Infantry that the 65th was composed of. There were medics from the 65th, there were electricians, truck drivers, communicators, technicians. I think the crossed rifles needs to be debated.

Going back on the Navajo and Native American CGMs, they all had their native language or some sort of citation inscribed in their designs.

I think this is very important. I echo the recommendation of including some words in Spanish. It doesn’t have to be a lot but I think definitely some.

I heavily recommend having a portrait of the most notable or one of the most notable Borinqueneers. I know he mentioned Modesto Cartagena, the most decorated Puerto Rican soldier, and Juan Negron, the first Medal of Honor for a Borinqueneer.
I think we would be remiss if we didn’t mention General Richard Cavazos. General Richard Cavazos was the first Latino Army Four Star General. I think he’s the only one Hispanic. He is of Mexican/American descent. If we are going to portray the 65th was not totally homogeneous, I think we should consider engraving General Richard Carvazos portrait, being the only Latino Four Star General. There have only been two or three Four Star Hispanic Officers period, two in the Navy and one in the Army.

I would not dismiss the Puerto Rican flag. This is from my survey of 90 plus Borinqueneers. Last, one recurrent theme when I was doing the surveys, I saw a recurring pattern of the 3rd ID patch. That suggestion was very frequent, and also the profile, Puerto Rico is 100x35. The 3rd ID patch because the 3rd Infantry Division was a parent organization of the 65th, and that patch resonates with the Borinqueneers.
That is all I have. I appreciate the efforts of Sam Rodriguez and Javier Morales in carrying the torch in this journey, and the CCAC. I look forward to participating in the future.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, sir.

MR. MORALES: This is Javier Morales from the Island of Puerto Rico. I have to agree with a lot that was said here, but we have to remember as Frank Medina just mentioned, the Island of Puerto Rico is like 100x35. This is the birthplace of the 65th Infantry Regiment. This is where the Borinqueneers came out of.

To make a great change in the history of the American Armed Forces, the wars in the United States, I think we have to keep that in mind, from a small island, such a great regiment came out that changed the history of the United States.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, sir. At this point, we have reached the end of our
time allotted for our discussion. I want to thank all of the stakeholders who have contributed, both on the phone and here in the room. I want to thank the staff for your support and preparing the committee for the discussion, and I want to thank the committee members.

Before I close out completely, I want to recognize Mary Lannin because I know she has one final comment that she would like to provide to us.

MS. LANNIN: I really liked Bob’s comment about adding Spanish to this coin. As a four year Latin student, I appreciate the Latin as a motto. Just an idea, what if because of the changing demographics you had encircling the reverse English, Spanish and Latin, the phrases, just encircling it, “Honor and Fidelity,” “Honor et Fidelitas,” “Honor and Fidelity.”

You can put whatever art you want in the middle. It kind of satisfies Bob, which I
think is a great idea, of adding Spanish.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think you have a
great idea, too, Mary. Thank you. That is a
great contribution. I see that our legal
counsel would like to contribute something.
After that, just to let everyone know, I’m
going to take a quick break before we
reconvene for our next program discussion.
Greg?

MR. WEINMAN: Just a quick
clarification on a couple of things. First,
once again, the actual legislation for this
particular Congressional Gold Medal is the
award on behalf of Congress, a single gold
medal with the appropriate design, in honor of
the 65th Infantry Regiment known as the
Borinqueneers. That is the subject of what is
being honored.

Also, there was a comment about
individuals. As the committee knows, we tend
not to feature actual individuals on a medal
of this nature because the medal is in fact
honoring the entire organization. If you put actual historical individuals on the medal, you are in fact honoring them as opposed to the regiment as a whole. That has been our tradition and our practice to do that.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Thank you. With that, we are in recess. Thank you, everyone.

(Brief recess.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We are back on the record. Just a note to the committee members and the staff, we had an administrative meeting this morning. We weren’t able to accomplish all that we needed to talk about, so as we break at the noon hour for lunch, we will convene upstairs to cover those last points that we weren’t able to earlier this morning. Just a note to members, when we recess for lunch, let’s head upstairs for some more administrative business.

At this point, we are going to start our discussion on the designs for the 2015
Gold Liberty Coin and Silver Medal. The first order of business will be to recognize April for her report. April?

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF CANDIDATE DESIGNS FOR THE 2015 HIGH RELIEF 24K GOLD AND SILVER MEDAL

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a result of the success of the 2009 Ultra High Relief Double Eagle Gold Coin, the United States Mint will produce a 2015 24K High Relief Gold Coin featuring a new modern rendition of Liberty on the obverse and a modern rendition of an American Eagle on the reverse.

To make this design accessible to more collectors, the Mint will also produce a medal struck in Silver bearing the same design as the 2015 24K High Relief Coin.

Let me go to the specifications. The research and development is ongoing. However, the diameter of the Gold Coin is expected to be approximately that of the Half Dollar, and the diameter of the Silver Medal is expected
to be that of a small Bronze Medal or the American Eagle Silver Bullion Coin.

Those specifications for the Gold Coin are 1.186 inches and about 30.1 millimeters, and the Silver Medal would be between 1.420 inches and 1.598 inches or 36.1 millimeters to 40.6 millimeters.

In order to maximize the coin’s potential height of relief, please consider the following: if a preferred design is weighted to one side of the composition, it will pair well with one that is weighted on the opposite side. Similarly, horizontally oriented designs will pair well with vertically oriented designs on the other side.

Designs that will lend themselves to taking full advantage of the highest relief available will tend to feature elements that are centrally located. Their borders will terminate away from the center of the palette. On the other hand, designs that use primary elements that are narrow or contain small gaps
of negative space will likely cause limitations in relief height.

The Commission of Fine Arts met last Thursday and recommended two obverse designs and two reverse designs. They are obverses 11 and 3 and reverses 1 and 10.

Today, we have 25 obverse designs for your consideration. For the obverse designs, required inscriptions for the Gold Coin are “Liberty,” “In God We Trust,” and “2015.” The corresponding Silver Medal obverse requires the inscription “2015” with the optional inscription of “Liberty.”

Designs are presented in both their Gold Coin and Silver Medal versions side by side.

First, we will start with obverses 1 through 4, which depict a close up view of Liberty. Here we have obverse 1, 2, 3, again, a preference of the CFA, and 4.

Obverses 5 and 6 show Liberty with palm fronds symbolizing victory and peace.
Here is obverse 5 and 6.

Obverses 7 and 8 present Liberty looking confidently to the future while accompanied by an olive branch and a torch or an Eagle. Here is obverse 7 and 8.

Obverses 9 and 10 show Liberty in profile accompanied by symbols of prosperity, strength and peace or 50 stars, a shield, and olive branches. Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness are represented in both obverses with either three flickers of a flame or three beams of light. The artists also included skyscrapers as a 21st Century symbol of a free modern society success. Here is obverse 9 and 10.

Obverses 11 and 12 portray Liberty standing, crowned with leaves holding the American Flag and either a torch or a sword. Here is obverse 11, a CFA preference, and 12.

Obverse 13 depicts Liberty looking over her shoulder as if in remembrance of all the sacrifices made in her name. Liberty is
encircled by 13 stars.

Obverse 14 presents Liberty dressed in armor with additional elements inspired by Thomas Crawford’s Statue of Freedom, which stands upon the dome of the U.S. Capitol. A shawl hangs over her shoulder while she holds a sword, wreath, and shield.

Obverses 15 through 18 depict Liberty as she leads a youth, emblematic of future generations. Obverses 15, 16, and 17 set the figures in front of a globe or sun and incorporate 13 stars. Obverse 18 incorporates an additional seven stars symbolic of the seven continents, a reference to the global impact of American liberty. There is obverse 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Obverse 19 features Liberty carrying a torch and a bouquet of oak and olive. The background features the sun and a view of the U.S. Capitol.

Obverses 20 through 22 depict Liberty holding a torch or lamp accompanied by a sword
and shield or oak and olive branches. In the background, the rising sun symbolizes the beginning of a new era. Here is obverse 20, 21, and 22, which also incorporates 13 stars.

Obverses 23, 24, and 25 are alternative versions to obverses 20, 21, and 22 respectively. These designs depict Liberty with wings, an artist’s endeavor to symbolize victory.

Those are the obverse designs. Would you care for me to go on to the reverse designs?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Please proceed to the reverses.

MS. STAFFORD: We have 16 reverse designs for review. Required inscriptions for the Gold Coin are “United States of America,” “E Pluribus Unum,” “One ounce,” “0.9999 fine gold,” and while the final denomination has yet to be decided, we have used $75 as a placeholder for the denomination. The corresponding Silver Medal reverse may
optionally depict the inscription “United States of America.” Designs are again presented in both Gold Coin and Silver Medal formats.

Here we have reverse one. This was again a CFA preference, one of the CFA reverse preferences. Reverse 2, reverse 3, reverse 4, 5, and 6. All of these feature an Eagle in flight, some carrying objects such as olive or oak branches and arrows.

Reverses 7 through 13 portray Eagles grasping objects such as olive or oak branches, arrows, shields, and fasces. Here we have reverse 7, 8, 9, 10, this was also a CFA preference, 11, 12, and 13.

Reverses 14 through 16 depict a close up view of an Eagle. Here is reverse 14, which incorporates different oak leaves, 15, and 16, which sets a realistic Eagle in front of a stylized wing.

That concludes the designs, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, April.

Back on September 24, this committee went on record when it adopted its resolution calling for an annual Arts Medal Program. In that resolution, we recommended a series of Liberty Medals that would be struck on an annual basis and dated.

This is a concept that this committee and members of this committee have worked to have the opportunity to be a part of for some time, years. I know I speak for the committee when I say that we view this as a special moment for us as a committee, certainly for the United States Mint because we see this program -- I think the word “blockbuster” has been used -- we see this as a blockbuster program for the Mint.

We see it as a platform for going forward and exploring new and exciting designs that illustrate some of the core values of our nation, Liberty being the chief vehicle iconically for American coins and medals.
In 1947, Liberty walked off our circulating coinage for good when the walking Liberty half dollar was replaced by the Franklin half dollar. Since that time, collectors like myself and others on this committee, myself having been a collector for 40 plus years now, we have wanted, desired, hoped for a program that would give us an opportunity in our generation to experience modern renditions of Liberty that would capture the true essence of our nation today with all of its multiplicity of ethnic heritages, values, and aspirations.

We see this as a very special moment. It is something that we all take very seriously. I know at the present the Mint sees this as a one year program. We, of course, are on record with our resolution from September calling for this very thing to be an annual program. In a little bit we are going to have some motions to further clarify this committee’s recommendations to the Mint on a
number of issues, one of those issues will be that idea.

I want to walk us back, just a little bit of chronology. I don’t want to get too far into the weeds. If you look at the CCAC’s annual reports for the past few years, we have had this idea of an Arts Medal Program. Along about March, at our March meeting, I announced with a desire myself to try to push that idea forward that we would have a special meeting in April for the committee to look at a possible change to the reverse of the American Silver Eagle, seeing this as an opportunity to refresh and bring some new ideas in design to the flagship coin for the United States Mint.

We went on record in fact with a specific design that we thought would be very desirous for collectors and recommended it. Through a series of developments along the way, we were very fortunate that we had an approval from the Deputy Secretary for a program that one, completed as a bookend the
Gold Coin idea that was started under Director Moy, where he had revisited the Saint Gaudens double Eagle from 1907, something that the Mint had not been able to accomplish at that time because of its high relief.

At the time, Director Moy suggested once that was accomplished, the Mint needed to do another one that would encompass a modern design and show Liberty in a new and unique way for our time.

I see first of all this is an opportunity to complete that vision, and I think it’s an important one. Sometimes I think we spend too much time reveling in the wonderful designs of the past, but I think we have a lot to say in our generation about liberty and other values that make us Americans.

As we realized we had an approval from the Deputy Secretary, we also came to understand that for the Silver Medal, what was being brought forward to us was the high
relief medal. Everything to that point from the committee’s recommendations had incorporated and it was in the context of using the 40.6 millimeter planchet of the One Dollar American Silver Eagle Coin.

That was something I know by and large the members became concerned with. We have felt strongly that planchet for the American Silver Eagle would be the appropriate one. I brought along with me today an American Silver Eagle proof that I passed around to the committee earlier that really kind of illustrates how beautiful that coin is, and part of the reason is because of what I call the “eye blast.” It’s large enough that it lets the eye enjoy the fullness of the design that is presented on its surface. In the contrast between the polish and the frost, it is just so stunning. It has relief. It has adequate relief to make this coin beautiful.

It is beautiful. There are 750,000 collectors or at least examples of this coin
plus sold every year by the United States Mint. The collector base, the customer base of the Mint has weighed in heavily that this American Silver Eagle is something that they find very attractive.

Part of that is the design itself. Another part of it is the size of the planchet. Like I said, it allows that eye blast to occur.

Realizing the Mint was looking at a smaller planchet in high relief and not really understanding all the in’s and out’s of that, I thought it would be helpful for the committee to have a subcommittee that would be able to interact with the staff and kind of look into the issues involved and see what it might be all about.

I appointed Mike Moran, Erik Jansen and myself to that task, did that while we were all here at our Nation’s Capital back in October. Since then, your subcommittee has interacted with the staff. We have asked
questions. We have had discussions. We are coming back to you today with a request that we further clarify some recommendations that we have made in the past but also add to that specific to this medal program.

I think at this point I will just go ahead and start working through some of those motions.

There are six of them. The first one is basically to reaffirm our recommendation and our strong desire that this Silver Medal be presented on the 40.6 millimeter planchet.

MOTION

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I am going to make the motion. The motion is to recommend the Mint use a 40.6 millimeter standard diameter planchet for the Silver Medal in order to balance maximization of the palette for eye appeal with a requirement for an one ounce Silver content. Do I have a second for that motion?

MR. JANSEN: Second.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Moved and seconded. Is there discussion about this motion? I will tell you this, a subsequent motion coming right after this that is going to address the issue of maximizing relief. That is really not on the table here with this motion. Is there discussion about the fact of our recommendation to use the 40.6 millimeter planchet?

MR. JANSEN: I weighed in with a second, so I’ll put some thoughts out there. To me, this is really a two faceted discussion, with all due respect to the third, which is a production issue.

The two primary impulses I feel here is when it comes to beautiful art on a proof planchet palette, bigger is much, much, much better. When you look back at the history of this country, Silver Dollars, whereas they didn’t circulate highly, extraordinary demand because of the size, the iconic content, one of the most collected coins there is.
The Silver Eagle I think appeals to a financial community in the larger bulk of production. I think as an artistic piece, it’s an increment to that market and not one that would cannibalize it.

The first reason I would go to a larger planchet, quite frankly, it’s a standard size. Economically, it fits into the procurement, tooling, handling, the packaging that the Mint already has in place, and with all due respect to cost, that is an important issue here. Bigger is better.

The second reason is the fact it is a proven issue. Collectors have -- the second point is really the mind of the collector to me, and I am a collector, I’ve been a collector for almost 50 of my years. We have a funny thing. We like to complete the series.

When it comes to whether it is making collectors happy or providing a product we know collectors will appreciate, creating an
extension to an existing proven market I think is really important.

Anything other than the diameter of the historic medals this Mint has struck, anything different than the Silver Eagle I think is probably a risk, a mistake. Honestly, denying a clear opportunity.

The third that I want to show respect to is the experience, the tooling, the cost that the Mint already has in place. Whereas, high relief, which I think is a necessary feature of this product offering, is really important, I would challenge the Mint and its technologists to experiment a little bit and find out -- we know we can do ultra high relief on a 27 millimeter Gold planchet. We proved that in 2009. I’d like to know how far we can stretch here to really put just an absolutely compelling eye blast -- I like that term, thanks, Gary -- out there in terms of new relief.

I think our numismatic collectors out
there, those that already buy from us and those that will represent new customer opportunities to the Mint, they see high relief, they see eye blast, and they will say wow.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are there any other comments on the motion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’ll call for the question. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. We have an unanimous vote, 10-0.

MOTION

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The next motion is to recommend the relief of the Silver Medal be maximized to the fullest possible extent and in excess of the relief established for the obverse of the One Dollar American Silver Eagle. Do I have a second?
MR. MORAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Moved and seconded.

This motion will be something that the Mint can, I think, work with and work towards, depending on the design we pick subsequently. If we can pick a design where the medal flow is minimized and a deeper dish can therefore be established, then maybe there is at least some incremental depth that can be gained out of a design.

If we pick a design where the raised elements are broader across the landscape of the palette, that is going to be more difficult. Keep that in mind.

We do have the motion on the table basically saying that we want the Mint’s technical and die making people, that we know are very good at what they do, we have seen some of the work here in very recent years, which is just amazing -- we’d like to throw down the challenge to them, a positive challenge, to say take whatever design we have
here and let’s see what we can do on the 40.6 millimeter planchet.

A 40.6 millimeter planchet in our vision would be the guiding limitation for you. Let’s see what you can do at that size as far as relief.

That is kind of the background and intent of this motion. Are there any other comments on that point?

MS. STAFFORD: I believe you said to be maximized to be greater than the American Eagle. Could you just read it one more time?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. The motion is to recommend the relief of the Silver Medal be maximized to the fullest possible extent and in excess of the relief established for the obverse of the One Dollar American Silver Eagle.

MR. JANSEN: I was on the committee as we worked through these issues. I’m actually glad you asked that question, April, because we could go through numbers and all kinds of
ways of establishing what is the definition of “high relief” or “ultra high relief,” but I think where the rubber meets the road is what makes collectors notice.

The high volume standard we all know is the American Eagle. I think to do better than that is to make this product offering distinctive, incremental, and memorable.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’ll just add to that quickly. Again, I mentioned there are three-quarters of a million examples a year at least with this planchet with the relief that it has that says success.

An analogy here. If you have a football team and you have a star quarterback, you don’t put the unknown third string quarterback in in the big game.

We have come so far here at the U.S. Mint, and the team we have on board has done such wonderful things, I think this is doable. I think it is doable. I’d like to have them show us how they can do it.
With that, I’m going to call the question for the recommendation that the relief of the Silver Medal be maximized to the fullest possible extent and in excess of the relief established for the obverse of the One Dollar American Silver Eagle.

All those in favor, please raise your hand.

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. Unanimous.

MOTION

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The next motion is a novel one. You will notice on the artwork that we have in front of us today, on the reverses, you see the denomination of $75. That was put there as a placeholder for lack of a better reason why. It is something I think still needs to be established, exactly what the denomination will be.

As our subcommittee was in
discussions, this was somewhere in Thanksgiving time, Erik, Mike and I were talking about the issues related to the Silver Medal and the Gold Coin. In that discussion of the Gold Coin, Mike Moran brought up the idea of using the historic denomination for $100. There is a historic American denomination for that. It’s never been used. It was attempted or looked at in the 1870s with something they called a “Half Union.”

You are familiar with the Eagle. An Eagle is a $10 Coin. That is where we get our Half Eagle, our Quarter Eagle, Double Eagle. A $50 Coin in that realm historically would be a “Half Union.”

That means a $100 denomination is something called “One Union.” If you think about the implications of those two simple words to the American experience, “One Union.”

We think as a committee, and we have had a lot of discussions about this internally, especially among the subcommittee,
that this would give an extra punch, if you will, of excitement to the collecting community, especially those of us who are years into our hobby, who have studied numismatics extensively. We know about this designation of “One Union.”

It is one of those ideas in numismatics that carries with it a lot of allure, something that is very attractive, but has always been elusive. It’s just something that hasn’t been done.

We have had other $100 denominations, but never has the U.S. Mint called it “One Union.” What we are proposing here with this next motion is that we take the words “One Union” followed by the numeric representation of “$100,” and that be used for the Gold Coin in this program, “One Union.”

My motion is to recommend that the Gold Coin and the Liberty series utilize the denomination “One Union” historically envisioned to represent $100 on United States
coinage.

Do I have a second?

MR. MORAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there discussion? Mike?

MR. MORAN: I can’t tell you when I wrote that e-mail how excited I was as I wrote it of the whole concept of going back to an Union and Half Union, although we will stay with the Union here.

It is tied back to the heritage, our numismatic heritage at the Mint. While these coins never became a reality, the patterns were struck at the Mint in anticipation of legislation. They are rare, rare, rare pieces today, one that we will never own.

At the same time it stimulates your imagination as to what an Union would be like, and to come back and resurrect this concept and put it out there and make it available to the collecting base, I think would be a marketing coup. I think it will be received
within the collecting base, and hopefully beyond the collecting base.

I think it is an element of surprise, so to speak, that adds to the allure of this program, and I’m all for it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Others who want to comment on this? This is your moment.

MS. LANNIN: I’d like to put in my order.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That is the kind of comment I want to hear.

MR. MORAN: Do you want a certified first issue?

MS. LANNIN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Anyone else? Robert?

MR. HOGE: I agree, this is really an extraordinary opportunity. The Union, this extreme rarity from the 1870s, is something that is legendary and almost every collector of American coinage has heard of this somewhere. It’s in their consciousness.

This is an opportunity to relate to
that history, to think back to those times when the United States was in fact making an effort through this denomination and the pattern ideas of the 1870s to coordinate our coinage with that of the entire world.

Since the American Dollar really is the basket currency of the world, this is really kind of an interesting gesture, something that may actually take off in popularity internationally.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Robert. I will go to the question. All those in favor of the motion to use “One Union” as the denomination for the Gold Coin -- I’m going too fast here.

I did ask our legal counsel to look at this issue because I knew there would be questions about it. I would recognize Greg now for his comments.

MR. WEINMAN: Just quickly, a couple of things. First, I want to clarify that of course, there never were Unions, at least not
legally circulating. It was in 1870 that legislation was proposed.

Going back to just a little bit of legislative history, the original Coinage Act back in the 1700s authorized Gold Coins up to a Half Eagle, a half ounce. Later on, the One Dollar Gold Coin and the Double Eagle were authorized in the 1840s, and then the legislation was posed in 1870.

I don’t know the legislative history, but it was proposed and made it to the Senate. It died in the House. At that point, a Half Eagle was going to be a 2.5 ounce Gold Coin, a Full Eagle was going to be a 5 ounce Gold Coin. This would go along with the one ounce Double Eagle.

As far as where the term “Union” comes from, I looked at the legislation. There is nothing in the legislation specifically that defines “Union.” There may be some other history there. I don’t know if it was related to the Civil War, it was obviously post-Civil
War when this came up.

Just to clarify, there never actually was a legally circulating coin called “Half Union” or “Union.” That said, for the here and now, as many of you know, the Secretary has very broad authority in the current laws when it comes to Gold Coins.

Whatever was authorized when it comes to Gold Coins back in 1870, those laws have all been overcome by current legislation, which essentially states that the Secretary may continue to mint and issue the coins ascribed, and at the same time the Secretary is minting and issuing other bullion and proof coins in accordance with such coins’ specifications, varieties, quantities, and denominations as the Secretary in the Secretary’s discretion may prescribe from time-to-time.

That is obviously very broad language that would authorize this. Accordingly, we have no legal objection to establishing a coin
of this particular nominal denomination or with that particular inscription. The law would allow it.

That should clarify what the previous attempt was and what the law says today.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Right. That is absolutely correct. There never has been an actual coin carrying that denomination of “One Union,” and that is the point. That is why there is such an allure and that is what makes it such a distinct idea that will appeal, I believe, very powerfully, to those of us who collect these sorts of things.

Thank you, Greg, for enlightening us on all that. I’m going to proceed to the question. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

DR. BEGEJA: Aye.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We have an unanimous vote on that motion. Thank you.

The next one is actually inspired from
the 2011 September 11th National Medal. That was a medal that I have right here in my hand. One of the great things about it was the Mint put Mint marks on a medal.

For the collecting community, that is a significant thing, to have a Mint mark. It is actually part of the design that many collectors look for. There are certain Mints that carry more of a numismatic character to what they produce, that being West Point and San Francisco.

It was the thought of your subcommittee that there would be some extra excitement added to the program if we expressed our hope to the Mint and if they would follow it, to put Mint marks on these Silver Medals. It’s not without precedent, as I said, with the September 11th Medal. In fact, it carried a “W” for West Point. There was also a “P” for Philadelphia.

MOTION

CHAIRMAN MARKS: With that, my motion
is to recommend the Mint’s two numismatic production facilities, West Point and San Francisco, be utilized to assure solid supply and interest for the collecting community. Solid supply goes to our belief that you are going to need to have a good supply chain for this product, and also just the ability from a design point of view to be able to collect two of these because they are different; they are made different by two different Mint marks.

It just adds an extra bit of spice to the program and interest for collectors. This is something that I think many collectors would find very appealing.

That is my motion. Is there a second?

DR. VIOLA: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: With that, is there discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think we know where we are on this. All those in favor, raise your hand.
DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

MS. STAFFORD: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. May I ask, the West Point and San Francisco Mint mark, that is for the Silver Medals as well as the Gold Coins, or are you only talking about the Silver Medals in terms of Mint marks?

MR. JANSEN: Great question.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Our subcommittee members, correct me if I’m wrong, I think our focus has been on the Silver Medal.

MR. MORAN: It has, but I don’t see why they can’t do it on both.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: If the Mint wanted to apply that broadly, I’m sure you could. Honestly, our discussion was a little more narrow than that. I think that would be a great move for either of the products.

MR. MORAN: Has San Francisco struck Gold recently?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I don’t think so.

MS. STAFFORD: No. That is why I was
wanting to clarify it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Our focus was on the Silver.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Are there production issues with San Francisco striking Gold Coins in this case?

MS. STAFFORD: Actually, I’m looking towards Stacy Kelley and also Steve Antonucci on the line to answer that. Stacy, do you want to go ahead and take that first?

MS. KELLEY: Sure. This is not something that we would normally do in the San Francisco facility. It could pose some opportunities to develop that. Steve, would you like to add anything?

MR. ANTONUCCI: San Francisco has done Silver bullion. The high relief is going to pose some other challenges. It would require some further engineering development in San Francisco.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I would suggest if
those limitations were something that could not be overcome, then simply putting a “W” on the Gold Coin would still add something of value to collectors.

MR. MORAN: Gary, I wouldn’t want to overlook the enthusiasm of San Francisco striking Gold again in relation to the entire issue of the Gold Coin.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Any more discussion on that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All those in favor, please raise your hand.

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That is an unanimous vote. Thank you very much. The next issue, I will bring us back to that September 11th Medal again. It has been the tradition for lack of a better word for the Mint not to add reeds to the edge of a medal.

I think most of us here at the table
know there are many private Mints that do medals that are reeded and they are quite popular. It’s another added enhancement to the medal, in this case.

Our suggestion to the Mint is to consider adding reeds to the Silver Medal for this program, and if you look at the September 11th Medal at the edge, this is a beautiful medal, let me say that first, absolutely gorgeous medal, but one of the very few things that detract from it, I don’t know what to call them, the staff probably has a better word for it, like little lines or cut marks all around the edge, that presents the medal as a bit of unfinished feel to it.

The thing about the reeds is it dresses that up, it creates a little more interest, I think, and I will even suggest it adds to the design.

MOTION

CHAIRMAN MARKS: With that, the motion is that the edge of the Silver proof medal,
and “proof” is not an accident there, I think that is the direction the Mint is moving in, just to reaffirm that, the edge of the Silver proof medal be reeded to give the piece its best presentation.

Is there a second?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there discussion?

MR. JANSEN: Gary, I think what you are describing are best described as “shear marks,” when the blank is actually cut out of sheet metal. They are unavoidable from the shearing process. I’m not sure there is a dressing that really is an alternative to reeding here. I agree with you, I think we are trying to dress this up so it has its best presentation.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. Any other comments? Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: Steven, are you still on the line?

MR. ANTONUCCI: I am.
MS. WASTWEEN: Do you have any comments about the lines on the pieces?

MR. ANTONUCCI: I’m a little concerned about those in the production version. I would certainly like the reeds as well.

MS. WASTWEEN: Thank you, Steve.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are there other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All those in favor, please raise your hand.

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Unanimous vote. At this point, I’m going to recognize Mike Moran for the next motion and his explanation thereof.

MR. MORAN: I know the Mint is considering this as an one year only program. We feel like to enhance collector appeal, it’s necessary to go beyond an one year one off program. I think you cut the program off at
the knees when you tell them it’s only one year. There is nothing to collect. They either like it or they don’t. They either buy it or they don’t.

The other thing is the key theme of this Liberty Medal, particularly in Silver, was to explore the concept of a modern Liberty. I don’t think you can do that with one image in one year. I think it needs to be a series over a number of years in which you are allowed to develop this theme of the new Liberty, both ethnically and stylistically.

**MOTION**

MR. MORAN: Therefore, we are going to make the motion that the Liberty theme Silver Medal be an ongoing series in order to satisfy the anticipated strong reception in the collector community, and to allow Mint artists to fully develop the multicultural aspects of the new modern Liberty. That is the motion.

MR. URAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there discussion?
Erik?

MR. JANSEN: I know the CFA reviewed these designs last week, and they highlighted, I think, a really important aspect of the modern Liberty, and that is it is not as simple as simply Lady Liberty. I think there are many elements of today’s collecting community, today’s social community, today’s political community, who deserve attention that are just not completely heard or serviced in a single design or a single year’s snapshot of what Liberty is in the modern day.

One of the challenges I think we are going to have is soliciting artwork that hits directly on the idea of the modern Liberty. I think it is a very lively discussion. I think it is an extraordinarily rich artistic opportunity. I think anything short of just a continuous open-ended exploration of that cuts short everything we are trying to accomplish on this committee, and that is fine art, fine expression, and fine integration of ideas.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are there others?

DR. BUGEJA: Greg, I’d like to say something.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Please, Michael. Go ahead.

DR. BUGEJA: The concept of liberty, Sons of Liberty from the beginning of our great country, depicted on this beautiful medal, and the comments about Americans being a diverse nation, I wanted to say the concept of liberty has really become difficult for many to understand. It’s freedom of movement, freedom to go where we want, freedom to be with whom we want. It’s not about rights.

I think these designs, many of them, really capture that spirit of freedom. The idea of liberty cannot be expressed ethnically or numismatically in one medal. There has to be a series to remind people what liberty is.

While I’m on that topic, I’m sure there are many people in Congress and in Washington who embrace the idea of liberty. I
think we need to put that concept above what it might or might not do in terms of competition with other U.S. Mint products.

I wanted to add that, that liberty is important but it is also complex, historical, and artistically diverse. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Unless anybody else has comments, I will just add to the dialogue that really what we are doing here is just a reiteration of what this committee is on record already more than once with the whole art medal program idea, the importance of a dated yearly program.

The concept here, I want to make sure people are clear on it, we’re not saying that we are going to approve or recommend designs here and that is what is going to be on this medal every year and the only difference is the date. That is not it.

What we are talking about here is annual change so that every year there is a new fresh image of Liberty paired with an
appropriate reverse. That gets to what Michael Moran was talking about, exploring, discovering, and celebrating all the diversity that this nation has, and honoring those different elements, which is something we can’t do with one medal.

I think we want to have it programmed in a reasonable way, and it seems like an annual medal, just one, with a changing Liberty design would be at least in the view of this committee would be the best option going forward.

Jeanne, did you have something to add?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I don’t know if this is adding or just a question. We were talking about the Liberty Medal, we are going to propose that we change that obverse hopefully every year; is that correct? What about the reverse, is that also a change?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Our discussion, in fact, our resolution that we approved in September envisions changing designs for both
the obverse and reverse.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Ultimately, there is a test to all of this, whether this should be an annual series, and that is how well this first one is accepted by the collecting community. If we here on the committee are correct, I think the Mint will have thousands of reasons to make it an annual program. If we are not correct, well, at least we have added a modern Liberty in a one year program, and even that will be a success, I think, at least from an artistic point of view.

With that, Michael, do you want to read that again? Then we will go ahead and act on that.

MR. MORAN: The CCAC strongly recommends that this Liberty themed Silver Medal be an ongoing series in order to satisfy the anticipated strong reception in the collector community and to allow Mint artists
to fully develop the multicultural aspects of the new modern Liberty.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All those in favor, please raise your hand.

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We have another unanimous vote. For the record, I just want to say we have had six motions, every one of them unanimous. I want to thank the committee for your work on this. There was a lot of work that went into developing all of this, in a sense, to develop a recommendation platform, so that we were sure as a committee that we had articulated and discharged our duties appropriately for a program that we think is very important.

At this point, I believe with all the discussion we have had, we are ready to look at the designs.

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Chairman, before we begin the design discussion, I would say what
would be helpful to us as we go through the obverse and reverse designs because we really left the task wide open for the artists, you can see in the portfolio each artist came with the idea of a modern rendition of Liberty or an Eagle very differently, so whether it is on a future Liberty Theme Silver Medal Program or upcoming Platinum Program, it would be nice to have lots of feedback, lots of information we could share with the artists for those other programs, too, about what you are seeing that is working, what you would like to see more of, besides just a recommendation for this particular program.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think you are going to get it in a very productive way. Just a note on the time, I know we are short on time. I am going to do my best, folks, to manage it. This was just too important. I’m going to tell you that by the end of the day we are going to be where we need to be.

With that, I’m going to move to our
traditional culling process, c-u-l-l-i-n-g, where we go through whenever we have a portfolio of significant size, numbers of designs, we go through and we have an initial culling where we discover which designs have interest among the committee.

Any committee member who indicates they want to continue to look at a design, all they have to do is indicate so as we go through this process and it remains. If no one wants to look at a particular design, we will set it aside so we can focus our time on those designs that have interest.

With that, I want to start with the obverse. They are up on the screen. Number 1, obverse one, is there interest in one?

MS. LANNIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there interest in 2? Setting 2 aside.

MR. JANSEN: I heard a “yes.”

CHAIRMAN MARKS: For 2? I’m sorry. Three? CFA approved this one. Is there
interest in 3?

MS. WASTWEE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Four?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 4 aside.

I’ll encourage the members to include those you are serious about for discussion. We have a lot of these here. If it’s a mild passing interest and you aren’t going to give it a lot of support anyway, let’s try to narrow this down so we can really focus good time on those that we consider possible candidates for this medal and coin.

Five? Is there interest in 5?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 5 aside.

Six?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 6. Seven?

MR. HOGE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Eight?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Putting that aside?

Nine?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Putting that aside.

Ten?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 10. 11?

DR. BUGEJA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. 12?

MR. JANSEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: 13?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 13 aside.

14?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting it aside.

15?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 15. 16?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 16. 17?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: 18?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.

19?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting it aside.

20?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 20. 21?
MR. MORAN: I like it.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: 22?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.

23?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 23. 24?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 24. 25?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that one aside. That is the obverses. Now we will move to the reverses. Number 1?
MS. WASTWEEN: Yes.

MS. LANNIN: Yes.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes.

DR. BUGEJA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Two?

MR. JANSEN: Number 1 was left in?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. Two?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 2 aside.

Three?

MS. LANNIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Four?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 4 aside.

Five?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 5. Six?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 6. Seven?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing. Eight?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 8 aside.

Nine?

MR. JANSEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Interest in 9. Thank you. Ten?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Pass on that. 11?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on that one.

12?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting 12 aside.

13?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Passing on 13. 14?

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: 15?

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Interest in 15.

Thank you. 16?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Setting that aside.
I will review for clarity of the record that the following designs are in consideration by the CCAC. On the obverses, 1, 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, 21. On reverses, we have still being considered 1, 3, 9, 14, 15.

Now that we have gone through that exercise, folks, I will ask this question.

MR. HOGE: Number 10 is the CFA recommendation.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Did you want to include that one, Robert?

MR. HOGE: I think maybe we should.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Because you said so, we will. I’m going to fish that one out here, 10, reverse. We will add to that to those we are still considering.

Back to what I was trying to articulate to you all. Now that you have indicated here that certain designs you no longer wish to look at, I’ll ask that we focus -- that is the reason we did this exercise -- focus on these we have remaining. I’ve
noticed a peculiar thing in the past where we have done this exercise and people end up voting for designs that no one expressed interest in before. You have the right to do that if you wish, but as far as the discussion, I would ask that we focus on these designs.

With that, I’m going to start out and whoever else wants to go next, let me know. I’m going to be brief. I agree with one of the CFA’s recommendations for the obverse, and that is number 11, if we could bring that one up, for at least a couple of reasons.

I think this design allows us the ability to maximize the relief on that 40.6 millimeter planchet. The reason is the same reason the Saint Gaudens -- the iconic Saint Gaudens Coin image was able to lend itself well to high relief, and that is you have a human figure in the center which minimizes compared to other designs we have in the portfolio the raised elements.
The way I would think a sculptor would look at this project would be to consider the figure of Ms. Liberty as the raised element here while raising but minimizing to the dish or the bowl the flag image, so as to render it as in the background. It would lay flatter on the bowl, and maybe to some extent the letters, the text. I think that would give maximum medal flow to raising up Ms. Liberty.

From an artistic point of view, I really find this design attractive. We always want Ms. Liberty to be beautiful, to be something attractive, and that is why Ms. Liberty exists, the human personification of something precious to us. We image that as a beautiful woman, and that is part of our iconology in American coinage. I think this renders that idea very well.

I’m taken with the fact that the face is not an Anglo face. This woman could be a mix of heritage. The eyes tell me she’s perhaps multicultural. I really find that
appealing, with all the discussion we have already had about that subject.

I also like the large letters “LIBERTY.” I think if you put that on that 40.6 planchet, that is going to be really stunning. I want everyone to look at this -- you looked at the American Silver Eagle I passed around earlier and all the polish, all the blank space, the negative space on this design, imagine that as polish, just flashing polish the Mint is able to bring up. Imagine that contrasted with the frost that we’re familiar with.

In this case, I would ask the Mint to dial back some on the variations of frost. I think we want a bold contrast for this medal. I think a lot of this applies to the Gold Coin, too, the same things I’m saying, especially when it comes to the high relief that we are absolutely going to try to do on the Gold Coin, this image allows us to do that.
I think the torch, another icon of hope, of vision, of knowledge, is a wonderful image to have with Ms. Liberty, and of course, the Stars and Stripes. This says it all to me. I’m supporting number 3.

As far as the reverse design, I’ll be somewhat briefer.

MR. JANSEN: Did you say number 3 or 11?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Eleven. I’m sorry. I misspoke. On the reverse, we have visited a variation of this design number 1, reverse 1, before. This in fact is a variation of what the committee recommended back on April 8 when we were thinking in terms of the American Silver Eagle.

This is where on the Gold Coin, down at the bottom, where it says "$75," that would become "One Union," and then the denomination represented in numbers, "$100." That is where that would appear.

I think from a striking point of view
and as you look at relief, I would tend to think that you would lower the relief on this somewhat to favor the obverse, which I don’t think is an unusual practice when you are looking at a high relief coin, to try to put more of the power to the obverse. I think this Eagle is something with detail and such that if you dial the relief back a little bit, you would still have stunning designs. I think the pairing between 11 and 1 would be amazing.

The only criticism I have of this design is the olive branch. It doesn’t appear realistically to me that the Eagle would have gripped the olive branch from behind and flying at any kind of velocity, that the branch would be managing to stay somewhat horizontal.

I would suggest that if we approve this design, we talk about asking that at least part of this olive branch be eliminated, freeing up more of the negative space.
With that, who would like to go next?

DR. BUGEJA: Gary, I’d like to do, if that is okay with you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, Michael. I would be very pleased to have you weigh in.

DR. BUGEJA: First of all, I thoroughly agree with what you said, Gary. My favorite on the obverse was 11. I also have some good feeling for 7 because of the depth and the orientation. When I compare the two, 11 is my clear favorite.

I was intrigued with 3, which the CFA has recommended, because we do need to diversify Liberty. In all the other designs, and I believe I’m right in this, there are symbols of Liberty. The wheat here is for agriculture, I understand that. We are missing a lot of the symbols that every other design has.

In addition, the artwork on number 3 kind of makes the head a bust, if you look at everything else, for instance, number 6 or
even number 5, there is something in front of it that prevents the bust-like appearance. It is a noble face, but my main criticism of 3 is that it is lacking the symbolism that many of the others have.

When I look at the reverse, there are so many different ones that we could approve, I happen to have liked number 1 immediately. I take what you said, Gary, about the olive leaf. I think that is an opportunity to curl the end of that olive branch in, to give the coin a little bit more depth.

I could talk about others that would come close. I do like 9. There are so many that I could talk favorably about. I was impressed with all the designs here, so much beautiful artwork.

On a product as innovative as this, I think it is important to have the symbols of Liberty clearly stated. I like the idea of the very large Liberty, and I like the pairing of 11 and 1. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael.

MR. WEINMAN: Mr. Chairman, real quickly, as a point of information, and take it for what it’s worth. The CFA made a comment on that. They said they found that number 3 was a strong woman on her own terms, and there was no need for other symbols of Liberty around her. So, take that for what it’s worth.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you very much. Michael?

MR. MORAN: Thank you, Gary. On the obverses, I will start with number 21 and just admit to the group that I’m a sucker for Art Duboe. It’s nice, but when I go back to it and look at what we really want to do, which is provide an obverse that has a symbol and also is strikeable, it is number 11. That is where I’ll be voting.

I would say I’m a bit bothered by the staff of the flag. It’s a little too dominant. I’m also bothered because it
introduces an angle to the coin that’s not there in the rest of the design and in the motif. I would soften that angle to the flag a little bit, but that’s personal.

This is where I’m going to vote and this is what I support.

On the reverses, again, let me skip to what I’m not going to do, which is the one that I asked to be kept on there, number 14. I just think that is a very good design for a reverse with the Eagle. I like the way it is cropped with the oak leaves for strength. I think that is something that ought to come back again. That is why I did that. It deserves a runner up.

Let’s go to number 1. It’s been a favorite of mine from the beginning. I’m glad to see the CFA has recommended it and I think it’s probably going to get recommended here as well. I want to point out one thing here as you look at the two of these, and I think cropping the olive branch will help, but in
the Silver Medal rendition, you have an equal rising. In the Gold Coin, you do not. That cannot be. Either you move the inscriptions or you find a way to get that Eagle rising. You have damaged the image by having that Eagle fly level. It cannot be allowed.

Now that I have had my temper tantrum, let me also say that you are going to be putting the relief on the central figure on the obverse, it has to be that way. It’s important. But this Eagle with just a little bit of relief, those wings will pop, it will look really good on the polished field. I think it will jump out of the coin in much the same way as Augustus Saint Gaudens’ reverse on the Eagle.

With a dead hand on the sculpture, it won’t. It needs finesse because you are going to be working with a lower relief to get this done, and I know I’m treading in areas where I should not tread, but I will anyway. It needs to have the Mint’s best sculptor on it. I’m
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. We will go to a wonderful sculptor, Heidi.

MS. WASTWEET: Thank you, Gary. Let’s start with obverse number 3. I just want to applaud this design. I was real excited to see such a strong ethnic face in our packet, and that is exciting. I would have liked to have seen a longer and more graceful neck and maybe a softer expression. Considering the technical aspects of getting the most for our relief, I think this particular design is not going to be the most advantageous, so I’m going to pass on this design, but I do want to call it out and applaud it.

MR. MORAN: It’s tough to strike.

MS. WASTWEET: Obverse 11, again I want to commend the artist. I think this is a really beautiful design and a beautiful drawing. I like the face, as Gary mentioned, it calls to me a multi-ethnicity, which really attracts me to it. I like the boldness. I
like the way her drapery softens toward the bottom.

I hope we can keep that in the sculpture and have many depths to the sculpture when we see this in the coin, not just have everything coming as strong as possible, but have certain areas stronger and other areas softer, to really utilize the subtleties of this design. I strongly support this.

Slightly disturbed by the way the “We” runs over the pole of the flag. It is always a little awkward to have letters running up over the image. It’s tolerable but I would like to avoid that in the future.

Since April asked for some comments about pluses and minuses, in the packet in general, I noticed there tends to be a habit of crowding the space. The artists are feeling a need to put something in every corner and every space of the coin, so a lot of these designs have no breathing room, and
it could add a lot to just have a little open space, not empty space, but open space, so the image can breathe a little.

I’ve talked before about anatomy, and I need to say it again. Anatomy is really important. It’s basic. I get really discouraged and I know we all do when we look at our packet and we see basic anatomy flaws. We need to get that dialed in.

Even in the pieces that are stylized, the anatomy is still important. The gesture is very important. Also, the correct use of symbology. There were some labeling here that said they were olive branches when really they looked more like laurel or palm fronds, that looked like feathers instead of palm fronds, or assigning random meaning to established symbols.

A torch is always going to be the light. In one of these designs, we had a lamp, which in the language of American coinage, a lamp is a symbol of education and
knowledge, not of liberty. It is different than the torch. Let’s be careful about that.

Reverses, I’ll go right to number 1. We have supported this design in the past. I still like it very much. I am going to support design number 1. There are some compositional differences as Michael mentioned between the coin layout and the medal layout.

In the coin layout, the bird’s beak is right up against the edge of the coin and it feels like he is going to fly off the coin. It just feels very crowded, where the subtle difference is in the second medal having the Eagle slightly slanted upward. He is well within the space of the coin. He has enough breathing room, the beak isn’t right up against the edge. I think this layout would serve both the coin and the medal.

MS. STAFFORD: Yes, and actually, just for clarity, thank you for pointing that out. We apologize. Somebody had actually asked us to lift the Eagle. That was the change but it
didn’t migrate to the Gold.

MS. WASTWEE: Slight caution on the feathers, on the breast, they look a little like scales, so the shape of the feathers need to change, just a little, very minor. The olive branch, just a little too much volume of the branch. We can thin that out and make it a little bit less bushy.

Reverse number 3, I’ve talked about this before and I’ll reiterate that. That is a lot of foreshortening there for a relief, even when we are trying to do a high relief coin. It looks one way in the drawing. It’s going to look another way in the coin. I always want to steer away from that drastic foreshortening.

Towards the end of the packet there are some designs where it is just focusing in on the head of the Eagle. These might work for another project, but I don’t think it is going to work for this project because we are leaning towards this figure on the front, and
then if we have the head of the Eagle on the back, it confuses the heads and tails aspects of the coin, so I want to steer away from those.

Reverse 10, the CFA preference. We are going to talk about anatomy again. The underside of the wing and the way it flows into the body, the way it flows into the tail, is completely inaccurate. For that reason, I can’t support this design at all.

I think that is all my comments.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Heidi. Before we move on, I want to amend my comments. Could we go to Reverse 1, please? Not amend, add to. Michael Moran brought up the idea of the rising Eagle on the medal and the level Eagle on the coin. For two reasons I prefer the version on the medal, the rising Eagle, one, for what Michael talked about, but also it’s a little smaller than the other Eagle.

If we are talking about trying to
balance relief from the obverse and reverse and giving power to the obverse, I think having a little less medal flow on the reverse is going to help, so I think the medal image we see here is probably a better bet for us, for the challenging goals that we asked the Mint to take on. Just my thoughts on that.

With that, I will go to Erik.

MR. JANSEN: I’m going to echo some comments that Heidi made on the packet. Going forward, we have really highlighted the concept of the modern Liberty. If you look at this packet, we retained scan one of the back half of the obverse designs, and I think if I may read into the committee’s response to those, they look more classic than modern. I would say going forward, I want to make sure the charge that goes to the artists really emphasizes the new opportunity and not recasting classic designs in this case onto this product.

As I envision this, the real
opportunity here is to explore and integrate kind of the new think. That would be kind of my overall packet thoughts.

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Jansen, if I might share with you, the CFA actually made a similar comment about if it’s modern Liberty you’re looking for, we see a lot of classical elements repeating, and they actually called out obverse 11 for that, saying her frock is exceedingly classical.

I only share that because we did very much specify and repeat to the artists modern Liberty, a modern rendition, and many of them came back with questions about does that preclude us referencing classical iconography or images, so I don’t want to speak for the artists but I know a lot of them reached to that in reference to we are trying to serve it up in a new modern way. Your point is still taken and we will absolutely share that.

MR. JANSEN: It is interesting, it gets back to the old comment, I can’t describe
it but I know it when I see it. I will harken to say 11 in this case. The use of the very big font to me speaks to modern, even though her gown might be a little more classic. I couldn’t have described it, but I know it when I see it.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. Those comments are very helpful. We will make sure all our artists hear all of that.

MR. JANSEN: The last thing that I think any of us want to do is to shut off new ideas and new think. Your calling that out on 11 is just a really beautiful fact, golly, I couldn’t have described it the way I see it, but there it is.

MS. WASTWEET: If I can interject and add to what you are saying, I think it’s perfectly acceptable and desired to reference classic work in a modern way, and I think this design does it in a subtle way. It’s not in your face modern, but the face, the drawing, it’s just modern enough to be I would say
contemporary, with a firm hold on our heritage.

MR. JANSEN: Right. We are not trying to turn this into Cubist art, per se. It might be one way to do it. I don’t want to lean so heavily into that as to preclude some gentle integration of different features.

MS. WASTWEEET: There are some designs in the packet that are definitely trying too hard to be what our coins were in the past.

MR. JANSEN: Having said that, I found the art a little challenging to get through with a real strong sense of satisfaction.

I did appreciate some edginess here, if I can put a word in there that I can’t hardly describe it but I know when I feel it, the neck on design obverse 2 is pretty doggone edgy. I had seen an adaptation of this with kind of either hair or a bit of headdress which softened and took a little bit of an angular grace to what is a very, very stark neckline here, totally changed the look of it.
In this case, I’m going to kind of walk away from design 2.

Design 3, I’m going to make a comment that has been made before, I think. I’m going to encourage artists in the future, do not use so much grayscaling. Grayscaling just deceives us here. Obviously, the risk we always run in these designs are translating it. Somebody told me that earlier today, that they really want to focus on the translation, and I thought that’s really a great idea, because sometimes we have great intentions, we have great art, and then we look at the coin and we go wow, what happened. We got off somewhere.

The heavy use of grayscaling may be great if you’re looking for pen and ink drawings, but it really isn’t helpful here, and I think that especially will show up here in some of the reverse discussions.

I respect the CFA’s raising the issue of diversity here. I really think that is
wonderful. In this particular case, I’m not sure I like the actual artwork. It’s lacking in some symbols. I think we can do better. The idea and the effort is really notable.

When I look at 11 and 12, I think 12 is a problematic design in a high relief effort that we are making here, largely because I’m trying to envision how that bleed of the pole and the sword go to the perimeter, that very narrow bleed is actually going to make the relief look like golly, why did you do that. It’s not going to be attractive.

This will apply in the reverse designs as well. When I look at the heavy central elements, I think that is going to accentuate the relief.

My favorite here is 11. Gary made the comments about the big font, and whereas it’s a central feeling, I wasn’t able to identify that up front, so I appreciate that. There may be an opportunity here for texture. I really don’t want to over texture this thing
but the flag really begs it. That might be something -- I don’t think it will be part of our adoption, per se, I haven’t heard anyone else really raise the issue, but I would certainly like the artistic freedom to retain that degree of freedom when you are actually trying to bring this product to a production level.

I am going to pass on 21 as well. We talked about modern. My choice here really is singular on 11. If I look at 7, I think that’s going to strike out poorly in a high relief effort because there is just so much detail after the perimeter. I could be wrong. It could be that all that excitement actually creates complexity, but in this case, I’m going to put my bets on 11.

When I go to the reverses, I’m not as thrilled as many on this committee are on design 1. I think it can work. I think it can work really well. One of the features I will say I like about design number 1 is in
our set of opening six motions we advocated
the use of the “One Union” denomination, and
this particular design of the ones we
retained, gives me plenty of space to replace
the verbal $75 here with “One Union - $100.”

I think that can feature very, very
well, and I would like to retain that in a
fairly dominant font, 75 is written here as
the proxy is the second largest font on it. I
would like to keep it that way.

Design number three I think is a
really provocative design. The problem I have
with that is that could also be a Seagull. I
think we need quintessentially “Eagle.” The
foreshortening comment Heidi raised I think is
right on. I think high relief emphasis mode,
I think the striations in the background are a
little difficult to manage. I think it is an
interesting piece of art. I just don’t think
it is for our coin here.

Eight, it may be a digital design
technique that I suspect was used on this one,
but that feels like somebody has picked up an existing piece of sculpture somewhere. Something in me says is that an original image or did we copy something. I can’t tell you where that comes from. That is just what kind of shoots through me.

MR. WEINMAN: Number 8?

MR. JANSEN: Number 8 on the reverse. The bird feels almost scaly as opposed to light and feathered.

MS. STAFFORD: To let members know, this is one that was culled.

MR. JANSEN: I’m sorry. Number 10, I think anatomically this one is really troubling to me. The bird feels heavy. Again, I’ve got so much gray in there, it’s just counterproductive to me. I think the bleed would not work in this case. The perimeter, whereas, very often when we are in a flatter relief, having a nice high flat plateau perimeter that we can drop letters into can be really effective. In this case, I
don’t think that is what we are looking for here.

I actually like 14. I think it will strike up fantastically in high relief. Somehow again two headed. I want more energy out of the Eagle than just kind of neck and shoulders up.

I am going to weigh in almost singularly on reverse number 1. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Mary?

MS. LANNIN: In terms of obverses, number 11 is the one that does it for me in terms of being able to strike up what we are talking about, the goal that we have of sort of the wow factor. I would like to say a little plus for number 7, even though it leads to the edge. I thought that was not a bad choice at all. Followed in distant third place for me by number 1, which is one of the things I voted to keep. I think for me it is going to be number 11.

In terms of reverses, everything that
everyone has said about number 3 -- I’m sorry -- number 1 is true. I think the Eagle doesn’t need to carry quite that much weight in terms of the olive branch. It can be a smaller twig, whatever. I like the graphics of the art -- not the art, the epigraphy on it, especially the idea of adding the “One Union.” I think that is going to look really nice at the bottom.

I’d like to put in a plug for number 3. I was excited. I don’t think it looks like a Seagull.

(Laughter.)

MS. LANNIN: That’s an Eagle that means business.

DR. VIOLA: True.

MS. LANNIN: He’s coming right at me. I think there is a lot to recommend. For this one I think sadly it is probably going to wind up in second place, but I would like to put in my plug for number 3. That’s it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Very good. Herman?
DR. VIOLA: Thank you. I would have to say quite a challenge with some of these really wonderful designs, but talking about Gary’s eye blast, when I saw number 3, I thought my God, we are really breaking new ground here. I will agree number 11 is probably more appropriate, especially since it does give you the sense of multicultural, multi-ethnicity.

Let’s hope we can do something more visibly like number 3, but for this new coin, I think this is the one.

For the reverse, I have to say I agree with the discussions about number 1. The medal one is really quite, quite nice. I think we should recommend the feathering is a little more subtle like Heidi suggests, because it really doesn’t quite look like what an Eagle would look like. I think the sprigs, if you have seen a lot of birds flying, it really wouldn’t work right, as people have suggested, we have to cut off that one that is
dangling down and maybe have it curl around somehow, but when you put the “One Union” on, it will give it a very nice balance.

That is about all I have to add. Your comments have all been very enlightening.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Gary. I also want to comment on the entire packet and to the artists that work extremely hard for these designs. I think when we talk about liberty, everybody interprets it their own way. I was happy to see so many different representations of it.

However, to address what we look at here, and I’m sure the artists want to know why wasn’t my design at least talked about, why didn’t that one make the cut. To address all of those that did not make the cut, I think they all had too much information. There was just not enough negative space. I think the ones that we did look at and we kept within our discussion were those that were
more simple.

    I would again try to recommend or not try but I do recommend to the artists to think less. More is not always great when we are looking at such a tiny field of information.

    I wanted to speak about number 2 for the simple reason that I thought she was quite lovely. She was ethnic. She was positive. I liked her except for her large, long neck. I think if she had a little bit of a collar on or a little bit of something in the background to help anchor her neck a little bit, it would be a better design for me. I do like her.

    However, I think I am going to have to go with the rest of the committee on number 11. It does speak of modernity. I think nobody really has addressed the fact that garments change from year to year. Please, gentlemen.

    (Laughter.)

    MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I think this is fine. This could be today, this could be
yesterday. It could have been 100 years ago. Kudos to whoever invented this dress. I think it’s lovely.

I have a problem with the flag, the pole coming down. That is a little annoying for me. I know Heidi was not wanting to move “Trust” too close to the flag. I’m wondering -- it seems like we are going to choose this one -- if we can make the flag a little smaller so we don’t have that.

MS. WASTWEEN: Is that wording required?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: “In God We Trust.” If we could sort of do something with that. I think it’s a great design.

MR. EVERHART: I have a thought on that. Don Everhart. If we could leave the flag the way it is but rotate the pole clockwise so it overlaps or underlaps the “We.”

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: That would be great. I think that would be super. Moving
on to the reverse, I have to agree with my colleagues that number 1 is quite elegant, and I think the rising Eagle in the medal is a good idea. We need to do that.

I do want to point out in number 10, I know the CFA chose this, I wonder if they were out to lunch for this. Sorry.

(Laughter.)

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: This is just an amazing choice for that committee to make. There needs to be more study on how this bird is put together. It is just really sad. I’m finished now. Thank you very much. That’s about all I can say.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thomas?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I’m just going to make my comments directed towards a couple here but particularly number 11 on the obverse. I look at this Liberty as being a very inquisitive Liberty. I like how she is looking out to the future. I think she
is questioning what liberty is. I think she is asking you to look beyond. I like the fact that the flame is there. The whole movement is just great, and her eyes versus looking straight ahead like it was on the 2007, which is a little different, this is a much more questioning Liberty in my opinion.

Don, I did have a question for you as I was looking this over. I think what was said about the pole and moving it to give it some more flow, but what if we just reduced the “2015” down a little bit and had the whole “In God We Trust” on the left side freeing up some more movement for the flag as it would be in the field, so you would have almost three-quarters of this with the large LIBERTY, the smaller wording of “2015” and “In God We Trust” on the left, and that total movement of three-quarters of the coin.

MR. EVERHART: You could put “In God We Trust” on the left and then decrease the size of “2015” and put it underneath. I would
recommend horizontal.

MR. URAM: I think that would give you a lot more motion with the flag as it is in the medal over there. As you can see, there is nothing there. I think if you could get that depth perception in the wind and movement, with her holding her arm out, looking out, and then the flag moving backward and changing that pole slightly, then you don’t have your eyes directed at all towards any wording in that right bottom corner.

MR. EVERHART: That would work.

MR. URAM: Also, going to the obverse, I agree with Mary, and whoever the artist was on number 3, I do like -- that is a powerful depiction of the Eagle there.

MS. LANNIN: Reverse.

MR. URAM: Reverse. I’m sorry. Reverse number 3. I just hope the artist does bring it back because I agree, I think it is going to be a successful runner up here.

Speaking to number 1, I agree. I
think that is going to make a tremendous reverse as it relates to the medal side there seeing how the lift would be for the Eagle.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Tom.

Robert?

MR. HOGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was impressed with the high quality of beauty of many of these designs. I think it is a pleasure to have had a chance to study them.

I particularly thought that number 2 of the obverses was very striking. I liked the use of “Liberty” on the headband, which ties back to some earlier issues, but this is a very modern looking Liberty. The neck does have a little bit of a problem. I think this is a nice strong image.

Number 3 is very attractive, but like many of the images we are reviewing here, this is probably an example of something done by an artist accustomed to working in two dimensions rather than a sculptor. We see so much of
this over use of grayscale, and I think that is somewhat problematical.

Number 11 I think is an extremely beautiful piece and probably that would be my favorite, too. I do have a little bit of a problem with the use of the relief that would be necessary to show the flag in its proper detail. We are talking about this as though it is a vertical image but it is really not. It is something that is both central and skewed to the right-hand side.

Maybe Don or somebody could comment about this in terms of the relief and use of this design with an appropriate reverse.

MS. STAFFORD: Don or Steve, can you make a comment on that?

MR. EVERHART: I agree with what you said. I still think it is basically a vertical composition. You could have the flag as a secondary element as far as high relief.

MS. STAFFORD: Steve, do you have anything to add?
MR. ANTONUCCI: I agree with Don on that.

MR. HOGÉ: The folds of the flag would really not be distinguished very much?

MR. EVERHART: Yes, but they are still vertical for the most part.

MR. HOGÉ: Okay. On the reverse, I, too, favor number 1. I like the depiction of it. I think we should be careful in use of the Eagle heads in those final designs, like 14 and 15. They are somewhat reminiscent of Elizabeth Jones’ Olympic Dollar in 1983. That was the head side on the Olympic Dollar. I think probably we should reject that sort of thing.

We have a number of beautiful designs here. I think we really can’t go wrong.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Robert. We have had a good discussion. We are over time right now. If you haven’t passed in your scoring sheet yet, I would ask you to do that.

What is the pleasure of the committee?
I sense there may be a few motions to adjust our recommended designs. Is that something you want to deal with now or do you want to break for lunch?

MS. WASTWEEN: I think we should break for lunch.

MR. MORAN: Why don’t we have lunch and talk about it over lunch.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. What we will do is the agenda says we are coming back at 1:15. Let’s make that 1:30. I will remind the committee members and the staff that during lunch we are going to have the remainder of our administrative meeting upstairs. We would like to get on with that and then come back down here at 1:30. I think with the items that we have on the agenda this afternoon we are going to make it within the finish time of 4:15.

I want to thank everyone for a tremendous job with this program. Folks did their homework. I want to thank the staff for
all the wonderful work you did to prepare the packet and for the artists and the hard work they put into this, and all the administrative and technical people whose work on this project is ongoing.

I will ask that Michael Bugeja send his scores to Erik via e-mail.

DR. BUGEJA: Thanks, Gary.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: With that, we will break for lunch and be back promptly at 1:30. Thanks. We are in recess.

(A luncheon recess was taken.)
AFTERNON SESSION

(1:39 p.m.)

REPORT BACK ON SCORING

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Back on the record. The first item, I want to report back to you on the results of our scoring for the 2015 Liberty Gold Coin and Silver Medal. We have a bit of a first here to report.

This is a first time in a program that involves a single obverse image and a single reverse image that we have an unanimous scoring on both. There are ten members here with a maximum of three votes for each design. What that means is for the selected designs, every member gave the design his or her top score.

I will report the individual numbers now. On the obverse, for design number 1, it received two. Design number 2 received five. Design number 3 received six. I will be skipping over those that were culled out before.
Design 7 received six. Design 11 received a perfect score of 30. Design number 12 received one. Design number 21 received two. That is the obverse.

On the reverse, design number 1 received a perfect score of 30. Design number 3 received eight points. Design number 9 received one. Culled design number 10 received one.

MR. JANSEN: Actually, reinstated.

MS. WASTWEEET: It was put back in.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Reinstated. I correct myself. Design number 10, without editorial comment, received one. Design 14 received three. That is it on the reverse. A pretty powerful statement I would say.

We leave those scores in your trusting hands. I will be preparing the letter to the Secretary very soon.

I’m assuming there may be some motions as a follow up to the now recommended designs. Let’s do this in an orderly fashion. If you
have items to discuss concerning the obverse, which would be 11, let’s have that discussion now. Are there any comments? Tom?

MOTION

MR. URAM: Mr. Chairman, I’d just like to make the motion that based on the fact Don said it would be possible, to reduce “2015” in smaller font and place horizontally “In God We Trust” on the left side freeing up the right.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Restate that, please.

MR. URAM: I’d like to reduce the size of “2015” and place horizontally “In God We Trust” on the left side.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: “In God We Trust” would be only for the Gold Coin.

MR. URAM: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You have heard the motion, committee. Is there a second?

MS. LANNIN: I’ll second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It has been moved and seconded. Is there discussion?

DR. BUGEJA: Gary, I’d like to hear
the reasons why. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Go ahead.

MR. URAM: He’s asking why. My thought is it just frees up and makes it more look like the medal when it is the coin, and based on what Mike’s thoughts are, and he might be making a motion regarding the staff and the pole, and just some of the comments that were made on the “We” being in the field of some of the design. By reducing this and placing it over there, I think it would give the coin itself a truer flowing from left to right there.

DR. BUGEJA: Are you talking about putting “2015” on the right side?

MR. URAM: No, “2015” would stay where it is except in a smaller font, and then “In God We Trust” horizontally below it in smaller font as well.

MR. JANSEN: Horizontally, one or two lines?

MR. URAM: Two lines.
MR. MORAN: Gary, can I follow up on the comment about the staff?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Let’s handle this first.

MR. MORAN: It involves this.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Then please, go ahead.

MR. MORAN: First of all, I think it looks good to stack those three lines there, the date, and “In God We Trust.” Secondly, I had no intentions of making any motions on the staff because nobody supported it. That is not an issue here.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. The motion is to reduce the font of “2015,” stack “In God We Trust.” Let me ask a question for probably one of the guys in Philadelphia. If we do that, a lot of that bears on the Gold Coin, would we need to reduce the date on the Silver Medal?

MS. WASTWEET: No.

MR. EVERHART: No.
MR. ANTONUCCI: I don’t think so.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We’re talking about a motion that deals only with the Gold Coin. I wanted to clarify that. Right, Tom?

MR. URAM: That’s correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Does everyone understand the motion?

MS. WASTWEEET: I have a comment.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Go ahead, please.

MS. WASTWEEET: I would rather leave that motion more open to instead of directing exactly where and how and what size to simply give free reigns to the Mint to rearrange the text in a more pleasing fashion based on our earlier comments in the meeting.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. We do have a motion on the table, and unless the author of that motion makes a change to it and the second agrees, we do need to act on that motion.

MR. URAM: I think it is to their discretion as far as the size and the font, as
long as it is on that side and stacked.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: So, it sounds like you still want your motion.

(Laughter.)

MR. URAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Let’s act on it. If it passes, fine, we will move on. If it doesn’t, maybe Heidi would want to volunteer a motion. With that, is there any further discussion?

MR. JANSEN: Just state the motion clearly in terms of discretion, non-discretion.

MR. URAM: The motion is to stack “2015” and “In God We Trust” on the left side with the discretion of the font being in the same fashion as “Liberty” is or however the engraver and the Mint feels would be suitable.

MR. JANSEN: So, there is a discretion there.

MR. URAM: I will put that in there, yes, as long as it is stated it is stacked.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: I read that to mean just make it look good.

MR. URAM: Make it look good. It looks good now. There is nothing wrong with the font as it is now, just reduced in size.

MR. JANSEN: May I read back a representation of your intent? To modify within the Mint’s artist’s discretion, the selected obverse HR-0-11, Gold version only, to reduce the font size on the date and to place “In God We Trust” horizontally on the left side in two lines below the date. Silver version remains essentially unaffected.

MR. URAM: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We all understand now. I’m going to call the question. All those in favor of the motion, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Seven. All those opposed?

(Show of hands.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Two. Motion carries.

DR. BUGEJA: Opposed.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’m sorry. Michael, what is your vote?

DR. BUGEJA: No.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Three opposed, seven for, motion carries.

Other motions? If you have another one for the obverse, let’s deal with that. If not, I want to go onto the reverse.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Let’s go to the reverse, please. Is there a motion addressing anything about the reverse?

MOTION

MR. MORAN: I move we trim the lower branch off the olive.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Second.

MR. JANSEN: Discussion?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It’s coming.

Michael, would you address your motion, please?
MR. MORAN: I think it is obvious it needs to go, it also complicates the Gold Coin, and I think that was the reason why the Eagle was left in the position it was on the Gold Coin. If you remove that lower sprig, chop it off right there at the fork, you will have room to make the Eagle rise without any problem at all. It doesn’t hurt the design. In fact, it clears up the field, and let’s do it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: As the second, I agree with Michael’s position. Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I have to modify that. I don’t like the fact that we are going to prune that olive branch way down where it comes out of the main branch. I think we can leave a few of those leaves, to give some integrity to what the artist was trying to present to us. I think it will still free up that field but it will not look like a plain old stick.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Do you agree that
some of it needs to be trimmed?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Some of it may need to be trimmed but not all of it. I think not all of it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I don’t think the motion is to trim all of it.

MR. MORAN: I don’t think it was and I’d be willing to amend it to accommodate Jeanne.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: How about to recommend the artist use discretion to trim the olive branch?

MR. MORAN: In a manner that allows the Eagle to easily rise on the Gold Coin.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Is that agreeable? We have laid it to the discretion of the artist.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes, I think so. I don’t think that is the only thing that is going to make that Eagle rise.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: But this is the
motion that is on the table.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Do you have another one after this? Think about it. We have a motion on the table for an olive branch -- sorry.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I want to move us through this, guys. I don’t want to belabor it. Are we ready to act on this? Do we understand what we are saying is we want to reduce this olive branch and we want to ask the artists to do it as they think would be best. Correct?

MR. MORAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All those in favor, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Michael?

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I believe that is an unanimous vote.
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Can I ask just one question? I’m so confused right now. I think we are only talking about the medal because the design on the medal is going to be the design on the coin; correct?

MS. STAFFORD: You will see that Eagle depicted in the medal design depicted in the coin design.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: With my personal presence on social media, I was having discussions with collectors this past week. When they saw what the CFA had done with picking two designs for both obverse and reverse, there was a jump to a conclusion that meant there were two different designs, one for the Gold Coin and one for the Silver Medal.

For the members of the press who are either here in the room or on the telephone, I wanted to clarify that there is one set of designs, obverse and reverse, and they will
both appear on both the medal and Gold Coin. Enough said about that. Are there other motions addressing the reverse? Robert?

MR. HOGE: I believe we discussed changing the inscription to “One Union – $100.”

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Absolutely we did. That is a motion from Robert to change $75 to -- actually, we already did that.

MR. WEINMAN: It’s covered in your previous motions when you began the discussion.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes. I think we can dispose of that.

MR. HOGE: That’s fine.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there anything else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All right. We are done, folks.

MR. MORAN: Can we congratulate ourselves for job well done here?
(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It was a team effort. I’ll just leave it at that. You guys are awesome. Thank you.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF CANDIDATE DESIGNS FOR THE JACK NICKLAUS CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Moving on now to review and discussion of candidate designs for the Jack Nicklaus Congressional Gold Medal. April?

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you. Public Law 113-210 authorizes a Congressional Gold Medal to Jack Nicklaus in recognition of his service to the nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

As described in the findings of the legislation, Jack Nicklaus is a successful business executive, a prominent advertising spokesman, a passionate and dedicated philanthropist, and a devoted husband, father, and grandfather.

He has amassed 120 victories in
professional competition of national and international stature, 73 of which were on the Professional Golf Association Tour. His 18 professional majors, the first of which he won at the 1962 U.S. Open, remain the standard by which all golfers are measured.

Mr. Nicklaus is a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom and other awards, such as the Individual Male Athlete of the Century by Sports Illustrated, one of 10 greatest athletes of the century by ESPN, Golfer of the Millennium, Mohammad Ali Sports Legend Award, the ESPY Lifetime Achievement Award, and the Vince Lombardi Award of Excellence.

He has received the PGA Player of the Year Award five times and was inducted into the World of Golf Hall of Fame at the age of 34.

Mr. Nicklaus remains a tireless philanthropist who has made a life long commitment to a myriad of charities, most of
which support pediatric health care.

Today, we are lucky to have with us Scott Tolley, Vice President of Nicklaus Corporate Communications, and our liaison to this medal program. Scott, would you like to address the committee?

MR. TOLLEY: I just want to thank you for allowing me to participate today.

MS. STAFFORD: Thank you for being here. We will move on to the obverse and reverse designs. Today we have five obverse designs for consideration, all feature a portrait of Jack Nicklaus, his signature, and inscriptions noting his professional victories.

Obverses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Here are obverses 1, 2, 3, 4. This is Mr. Nicklaus’ preference. It was also the one the CFA recommended. Five.

Moving on to the reverse designs, we have four for review. Reverse 1 depicts laurel leaves, golf clubs, and six stars to
represent Mr. Nicklaus’ wife and children. It is inscribed with “Passionate and Dedicated Philanthropist to Charitable Causes, “Children are the Root of the Heart,” and “Act of Congress 2014.”

Reverse 2, which is preferred by Mr. Nicklaus as well as the CFA’s preference, depicts laurel leaves and six stars. It is inscribed “Excellence in Sport,” “Promoting Integrity and Sportsmanship,” and “Dedicated to Philanthropy and Children’s Health Care with a Life Long Commitment to Family,” and “Act of Congress 2014.”

Reverse 3 depicts laurel leaves and six stars and is inscribed “Children are the Root of the Heart” and “Act of Congress 2014.”

Finally, Reverse 4 depicts a hand supporting hearts, which is symbolic of Mr. Nicklaus’ commitment to family, children’s health care, and philanthropy. It is inscribed “Sportsmanship, Excellence, Philanthropy,” “Children are the Root of the
Heart,” and “Act of Congress 2014.”

That concludes the presentation, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, April. Given that we only have five obverse designs and four reverse designs, I will dispense with the culling process. Before we get into our discussions, I’d like to ask members if you have any questions of a technical nature, if you would ask those now. Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Are we just dealing with obverse or the whole --

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The whole thing.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: April, the leaves on reverse 2 are?

MS. STAFFORD: Laurel leaves.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Laurel leaves. I think those might be olive leaves.

MS. STAFFORD: Our description says laurel leaves.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: We have berries there. I think the laurel leaves are more
like what is on reverse 1.

MS. STAFFORD: We will check into that. Thank you.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Any other technical questions that do not bear on your assessment of the designs but questions you want to have cleared before we get into our design discussion?

MS. STAFFORD: I should add the Commission on Fine Arts made one strong recommendation along with obverse and reverse they prefer, and that is that the obverse and reverse font be uniform. They also noted that the obverse might benefit from incorporation of landscape as is depicted in obverse 2, I believe, but I know our lead sculptor engraver thought that would crowd the obverse.

Mr. Tolley, while the committee discusses the designs, if you don’t mind muting your phone, that would be great.

MR. TOLLEY: Yes, I’m happy to do
that. Are there any questions on why Mr. Nicklaus and his wife chose some of the design elements, don’t hesitate to ask.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay, thank you, we will do.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We will move into our discussion on the designs. Is there someone who would like to lead off? Mary?

MS. LANNIN: I have a question. I’m a reformed golfer, which means I don’t do this stuff any more.

(Laughter.)

MS. LANNIN: As I understand it, from what I was told my swing did not look like, in obverse number 1, I think that is the correct finish for a golf swing. All the rest of the reverses, he’s way too far back, but he won the championships, I didn’t. I just wanted to bring that up. In number 4, the one that he wants, which I also like, I can see where the club is dropped down to make room for the epigraphy, but it’s just a question of correct
golf swing, and that’s it.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Let’s go to Herman.

DR. VIOLA: By coincidence, there was an hour special documentary on Jack Nicklaus this weekend which I watched. I was a caddy for two years. I found the whole thing very impressive and I can see why he merits a medal.

I would just say we should go with his preference, and if he saw this design and he likes the way the swing looks, he can have it.

(Laughter.)

DR. VIOLA: He’s won all these championships. I’d say let’s go with his preferences, and job well done.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Herman. Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I think number 4, which is Mr. Nicklaus’ choice, is also my choice. I love the way the arms, whether they are in the right position or not, circle that
medal. I think it makes it quite an embracing piece.

The landscape in the back, I have to agree, would just be too much. I think it is what is not so great about number 2 and number 1. It’s just too much information. The power of his swing, I think, is really in number 4. Congratulations on executing that.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Tom?

MR. URAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would echo the same, I feel the same way, if he strongly feels that is the right image and that is what he likes. The only comment I would have is number 3 looks like he’s looking at the shot where he hit the golf ball. I think what bothers me a little bit about number 4 is maybe the way the head is placed there, and I can’t see him, like what Mary was saying, we got the club going one way and his head and eyes going another way. If you look at number 3, everything is -- even number 1 and the other ones, they are all looking at
the shot. This just needs a little positioning. I don’t know if it’s an issue or not.

I would tend to go along with their decision, but either the eyes or the head or something is just not following through. I will go with the wishes of the committee on that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. Robert?

MR. HOGE: I think the selections are fine. I would be in accord with them. I notice there is some question about what would be the inscriptions. In fact, when I was trying to research him on the Internet, I found discrepancies in the number of victories or professional championships or whatever. It seems a little bit redundant to have these things and also confusing, saying 120 professional victories, worldwide record, 18 major victories worldwide.

Just what the wording is I think we should probably look into a little bit. The
numbers didn’t seem to be exactly correct either necessarily.

MS. STAFFORD: Mr. Tolley, would you care to address that, the specific question regarding 120 professional victories and 18 major championships, the inscription on the obverse?

MR. TOLLEY: Sure. I hope I don’t get into too much detail. The 120 represents all victories, including the major championships. Those who know a little bit about golf, each year there are four major championships at a professional level, the Master Tournament, the U.S. Open, the British Open, and PBA Championship.

Jack has the record. That record is what he is most synonymous with. That is why we felt it was important to put the 18 major. The 120 was just to put in context how many times he won worldwide over his career.

MS. STAFFORD: Did you want to comment on the swing, the position of the hands on
obverse 4?

MR. TOLLEY: Sure. That was very impressive for someone to bring that up. The design is based on a photo that the Nicklaus’ chose when they were trying to find an appropriate shot. They wanted something that was sort of a tight torso shot, and it was a shot from a 1978 British Open.

I actually called it up on my screen when you were discussing it. It looked like the designer did a very fine job in capturing the position of the hands, the club, and even head position.

I wish we had the ability to show that image just so the committee would see if they agree that the design captured that.

MS. STAFFORD: We appreciate that.

Thank you.

MR. HOGE: One further comment. We see a little bit of what we have sometimes described as “spaghetti hair” here. In the images of Jack Nicklaus that I’ve noticed on
the Internet, his hair didn’t really look like that. It was sort of smoother and finer looking.

MR. TOLLEY: Can I make a comment on that?

MR. HOGE: Yes.

MR. TOLLEY: That was probably one of the most significant issues during the design process. Mr. Nicklaus seemed to have some problems with the hair. He wanted to see if it could be smoothed out. I think they tried to make some effort, but I think they were at the point where he said okay, that’s fine.

Even if you look at the image the designer used for inspiration, the hair is finer, smoother, and he doesn’t have quite the wave in the front. After a couple of attempts, Mr. Nicklaus didn’t want to push the issue.

MS. STAFFORD: Can we go to our lead sculptor engraver, Don Everhart? Don, can you comment on that, if we could do some further
tweaking to finesse that?

MR. EVERHART: Yes, that can be taken care of in the sculpture. It’s not really a problem. Sculptors have rakes that have teeth in them and they can draw them over and simulate hair in a much finer texture.

MS. STAFFORD: What we are really seeing here is the difference between two dimensions and what can be translated into three.

MR. EVERHART: I think also with what we use, such as plaster, you can only get a certain fine line out of it or it will break, so you have to have some kind of substantial line, even in a strand of hair. It will break off, it doesn’t work if it is too thin.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Robert, do you have anything more?

MR. HOGE: No.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Mary, did you have a question?

MS. LANNIN: Sort of, one more comment
about the reverse. He prefers reverse number 2. I actually really like the crossed golf clubs at the bottom of number 1. We never would have heard of Jack Nicklaus unless he was really good at that; right? Is there a way we can combine the best elements of number 2, which is probably that wording, and do the golf clubs somehow?

MR. MORAN: I would suggest if that is something we want to recommend, once we have the approved the designs we revisit like we just did with the other program, consider a motion and proceed from there.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Mary. Let’s go to Michael Bugeja on the phone.

DR. BUGEJA: Yes, Gary. I don’t have much to say. On the obverse, I liked 3 and 4. I couldn’t discern which I liked more. They both have interesting design features. I liked the comment that in 3, there is the gaze at where the ball went. Number 4 comes across
mostly as a portrait. I’m inclined to go with the preferred designs, 4 and 2. That’s all I have, Gary.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. I will go to Michael Moran.

MR. MORAN: First, I have a question for Mr. Tolley. I’d like to ask the reasoning for selection of design number 2, how strong the family was towards that. I feel like the art is better on 3 and 4. I have a personal dislike of inscriptions.

Could you comment on that, please?

MR. TOLLEY: It came down to really they felt like the image in 4 just looked more like him.

MR. MORAN: I’m sorry, the reverse. I’m find on number 4 on the obverse. On the reverse, you have that long inscription there. There is not much art to it. You go right to the third one with the star and heart, and from an artistic point of view, it’s good. I just wanted to know the strength of the
family’s feelings about number 2 compared to 3.

MR. TOLLEY: They feel like he’s being honored with such a great recognition and it is because of a career or life that certainly transcended what he did with golf. When we were designing this, I guess we didn’t know exactly how the process worked. We sort of jumped into it and then we learned a lot about having to follow really the letter of the legislation.

Some of the elements they really wanted to capture on the reverse side were his priority, which is his family, that life long commitment. He’s someone that is well known for obviously achieving success without foregoing the family concept. He has a wife of almost 55 years, five children and 22 grandchildren.

He was never on the road for more than two weeks because he didn’t want his kids to grow up not knowing who their father was.
Family was an important element. That is why when we learned we couldn’t have any images related to his wife or kids, we chose the stars, which the five stars at the top represent his children, and the larger singular star at the bottom represents his wife.

The laurels on the side, at one point, he wanted the logo of his two home clubs, his Florida home club and his Ohio home club. He is well known as being a native of Ohio but he spent the majority of his life now in Florida. Both those club logos have as the foundation of their design laurel leaves.

As far as the text, he is a true sportsman. He has always been known as such an above board honest man, promotes integrity. Obviously, it mentions his commitment to philanthropy, mostly pediatric health care. As I mentioned earlier, his life long commitment to family.

That was a mouthful. I hope I began
to answer your question.

MR. MORAN: That is the issue. It’s a mouthful when you look at it on the back of the medal, too. When you go to number 3, and I’m not trying to convince you of anything here, the symbolism here seems to say the same thing without the clutter of all the words.

You have the laurel sprigs. You have the big star, the five stars for the children, and the heart of his philosophy in terms of children are the root of the heart.

Like I said, I’m not going to belabor the issue. If he wants number 2, he has it.

MR. TOLLEY: “The Children are the Root of the Heart” is actually his wife’s quote. It is one that is used often in some literature talking about the Nicklaus Children’s Health Care Foundation. It is probably her favorite line, as he pointed out, it’s his wife’s quote, and he felt like he would be stealing it. It’s not a short catch all quote that we can contribute to him.
That’s why we steered away from that one.

MR. MORAN: Okay. I think that has pretty well settled me in terms of what I’m going to do. I don’t have anything more to add.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. We will go to Heidi.

MS. WASTWEEET: I would like to commend the obverse design number 4. I think it is the best choice and I think it really focuses on him as a human because it focuses in on his face and deemphasizes the golf, while the golf element is still there. It’s a terrific balance.

The hair, I agree, can be softened in the sculpture stage, and also we are looking at this at a very large scale on our page and on our screen, and when it is reduced down to the size of a coin, it will actually look a little softer.

For the reverse, I like that they chose the one without the golf clubs. Again,
it pulls emphasis away from the single dimension of him as a sportsman and speaks more to the multiple dimensions of his life.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Heidi. We will go to Erik.

MR. JANSEN: My only thought is I think the Nicklaus camp wanted to harmonize the fonts. To the extent I like fonts at all, I like the fonts on the reverse to replace the font on the obverse. That’s all I have.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’ll be brief. I believe obverse number 4 is the obvious choice. It’s a good example of what we are talking about when we talk about a modern design and his body motion is put in course with the roundness, if you will, of the medal. I just like the way it flows. It’s attractive. It’s a good example of what we have talked about, about modern design.

On the reverse, I think Jack Nicklaus gets what Jack Nicklaus wants. However, I will just make a comment that I think reverse
number 2, the one with stars, is a wonderful design. I think it’s a wonderful tribute to his family that he would represent them as stars. If I was his wife, I would feel honored that he had put my quote on his Congressional Gold Medal.

However, that is his choice to make. I just want to commend the artist for number 3. That would be my preference but I’m going to support Mr. Nicklaus with his decision for the design with the text on it.

In doing that, just for future reference and to be on the record, many of you have heard me say this probably too many times, but a medal and a coin, they are not a plaque and they are not a book, they are not a leaflet that has text on it. If this was a plaque, I would fully embrace the idea that you have text on it, that is what a plaque is for.

A coin or medal, I would much prefer to see art and let art speak for itself
because I think it can speak at a level to a human being that words often can’t.

However, if this is the design that Mr. Nicklaus wants, I will support it.

With that, I will ask the members to score their sheets, if they would pass those to Erik so he can tally the scores, and we will report the results of that process as soon as we have totals.

Are we ready to move on to the American Eagle Platinum Proof?

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION FOR THE 2017 20TH ANNIVERSARY AMERICAN EAGLE PLATINUM BULLION COIN PROGRAM

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The first item is the 2017 issue. That would be one that would relate to its 20th anniversary. April, can you update us on this program?

MS. STAFFORD: Sure. The discussion for today centers around a potential product, the 2017 20th Anniversary One Ounce Platinum Proof Coin.
To provide some background, 2017 will mark the 20th anniversary of the American Eagle Platinum Coin Program. To commemorate this milestone, the United States Mint proposes offering an one ounce platinum proof coin featuring both a new Liberty obverse design as well as a new Eagle reverse design.

Proposed formats and finishes for this coin include high relief, reverse proof or enhanced proof, and if the concept is pursued, the United States Mint would seek Secretary of the Treasury approval to strike this platinum coin under authority of 31 USC 5112, Subsection (k).

A little bit about the design history, of which I’m sure all the committee members are familiar with, since its debut in 1997, the United States Mint’s American Eagle Platinum Proof Coin has featured Lady Liberty on its obverse as a symbol of vigilance and faithfulness to duty. It, of course, was designed and sculpted by former United States...
Mint sculptor engraver John Mercanti, and as you also know, reverse designs have changed year to year.

With that, I’d like to open it up to the committee for discussion.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: April, what you are looking for from us are concepts or ideas that would be relevant to a 20th anniversary?

MS. STAFFORD: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: For the members of the committee if you are interested, I have a book here that has illustrations of all the issues running up until 2012. I think we are familiar with the ones that came after that. We were involved with them. If you are interested in looking at this, just wave at me, and I’ll pass it down to you. Maybe we will just pass it around.

Is there a member that wants to lead this discussion off?

MS. STAFFORD: I’m sorry, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that was not
included in the background information but I do recall having with Sales and Marketing that you might want to be aware of as you discuss it, they are looking for all sorts of ideas to enhance such a product, including such things as privy marks that might feature “20” or other features that might make it special and enhance the 20th anniversary.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I do think the idea of a privy mark to denote 20 years would be a welcome concept that I’m pretty sure the committee would like to look at. I’m going to appeal to members of the committee for other ideas. Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: Just to clarify, you are looking to change the design for the anniversary or just enhance the existing?

MS. STAFFORD: The proposal on the table is to have a new obverse and a new reverse for the program. When we talk about the 2018 to 2020, it would keep the reverse of that and change out the obverse. I don’t want
to get ahead of myself. The 2017 as it is being proposed for discussion would have both obverse and reverse with a new design.

MS. WASTWEEET: Completely new design?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes. Certainly, if the committee wanted to look at somehow enhancing the original, that could be discussed as well.

MS. WASTWEEET: To me, it would make more sense to do something with Mercanti’s design to honor the 20th anniversary rather than something completely new as a specific anniversary thing. We have just reviewed designs with the same theme, something about this has to be different because we just talked today and chose designs for a Liberty and Eagle combination for Gold and Silver. It feels a little repetitious.

MS. STAFFORD: Understood. That certainly is something we would be interested in hearing the committee comment on.

MS. WASTWEEET: I will wait and see what the others say.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’m going to weigh in on that but first, I want to ask Michael Bugeja to send his scores for the Jack Nicklaus Program to Erik.

DR. BUGEJA: I’m so sorry, I will do that right now. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. I’m going to take a little different direction from what Heidi just suggested. I really think this is an opportunity, especially coming from a committee that has been very vocal in asking for new and modern designs. I think this is an opportunity to do that. I would rather not go back to something old. We have done that too much, I think.

I would like the opportunity -- I won’t be here by that time, but I would like the committee to have an opportunity to look at new and fresh. We have brought on a whole new group of artists through AIP. We saw some of the examples they gave us here. We found some really good ones among that collection.
I’d like to do that again.

I don’t think it is repetitious because it will be different. That is what we have asked for in the Silver Medal Program and asked for it to be a multi-year program, the whole idea that we would change out the designs every year, that is not repetitious, that is different.

I just want to make sure we are looking at this clearly and we are staying true to the values that we have so often and I think today so clearly articulated. It seems like walking backwards to say oh, by the way, let’s just go back, let’s do something old. I don’t think it is time to do something old.

Is there someone else who would like to comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Don’t be shy.

MS. WASTWEEN: I’ll continue the discussion then. We will just have a conversation between ourselves.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: I would love to engage you in that, Heidi. Please go ahead.

MS. WASTWEET: If we started a new program, then I would say yes, new and fresh. If we are specifically celebrating a 20th anniversary, what are we celebrating the anniversary of? Of the design? Of the program?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I don’t think it’s the design.

MS. WASTWEET: We are not celebrating the 20th anniversary of the design, but the Platinum Program.

MR. WEINMAN: Of the Platinum Program.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Of the coin itself, and the coin by its nature has been a coin that changes its design. If you want to celebrate a changing coin, I think you stay with that idea and you change it. I would say to denote it is a 20th anniversary issue, I really like what April suggested with the privy mark. I have heard Michael Bugeja talk
about privy marks. Maybe he would like to weigh in on that point.

MS. WASTWEET: I like the privy mark.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think that would be a significant element to add to this. I would still ask for something new.

MS. WASTWEET: My hesitation is we have been asking and asking for modern and fresh and new, and I have yet to see anything really, really creative, so how do we ask in a different way so we get something a little more creative.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I say full speed ahead. We have charted a new direction. We have asked for modern concepts. Why would we deviate from that. I’m repeating myself now.

MS. WASTWEET: I’m not saying deviate, but be more specific.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Be more specific? You are asking me to be more specific?

MS. WASTWEET: I’m not suggesting deviate from asking for modern. I’m saying
let’s be more specific when we ask for modern.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We can certainly do that. I guess to be clear in what I am saying it seems very wrong to me that with all we have articulated and believed here on this panel that we would now ask for something old. I don’t see how that fits with the direction we are moving in.

MS. WASTWEET: I am agreeing with you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You are? Now I’m confused.

DR. BUGEJA: Gary, I’m agreeing with both of you, but the privy mark, world Mints have been using the privy mark so creatively, Canada in particular. We should consider privy marks as a design element to give the artists more freedom to do precisely what you and Heidi have been discussing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. Are there any other comments or suggestions for the 2017 Platinum Coin?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Did you get enough?

MS. STAFFORD: We have two members speaking very clearly, so thank you for that, yes. If there is nothing else, we can take that away.

MS. WASTWEEN: I would welcome some new techniques. One of my favorite coins has been the $5 Gold Indian that was incused. I don’t think we have done that incuse technique in anything else. Maybe that would be a technique that would spark some new creativity to design specifically for an incuse design.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: For those who might not be familiar with that coin, that is where the profile of the Native American is recessed into the coin rather than raised out. It’s an unique coin among American coins.

MS. WASTWEEN: It’s not difficult technically to produce. It’s not particularly complicated.

MS. STAFFORD: Just for the record, we
take your point about making sure we clarify our language back to our artists about what we are looking for regarding modern designs, what is working, what is not. I think we will have further conversations with the committee about how we can give that feedback loop further to the artists.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Delicately, I want to address something we saw in our package today on the Liberty theme. There seems to be -- I’ve seen it in some other programs lately -- this kind of nuevo, art nuevo, this revival art nuevo being presented to us as if it’s modern. It’s really not.

MS. WASTWEET: That is a good point.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: A good portion of our portfolio today had that kind of thematic feel to it, the wispy presentation of bodies floating as if they are in space. Disagree with me, members, I don’t think you will, but I don’t think that is where we really want to go. We struggled with that when we looked at
the two year program, and I believe that was for the Platinum, and because of what we had, I think we ended up using one or two, probably from the same artist.

When we talk about Liberty in a modern context, I just don’t think that is what we are talking about. I think we are talking about modern but down to earth, you know. Liberty has her feet on the ground, that kind of approach.

MS. WASTWEET: Refer back to our visual definition of excellence, there is a lot of good examples in there.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Right. Is there anything else on the 2017 Platinum?

(No response.)

REPORT BACK ON SCORING

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Before we move on to the 2018 to 2020 Platinum Discussion, I have some results from the Jack Nicklaus Congressional Gold Medal. No surprises here. I will just run through the scores by design.
number.

For obverse number 1, it received two points. I should add here that a perfect score is 30. We have 10 members present. Each member can assign up to three points per design.

Number 2 received zero. Number 3 received two. Number 4 received a perfect score of 30. Obverse 5 received zero. Our recommended design for the obverse is 4.

Reverse design number 1 received two points. Number 2 received 29 points, a very strong showing. Reverse design 3 received five points, and number 4 received four.

There are your tallies for that program. I’m looking forward to seeing that medal when it is available.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON THEMES FOR THE 2018-2020 AMERICAN EAGLE PLATINUM BULLION COIN PROGRAM

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That takes us to discussion on concepts and themes for 2018-
2020 American Eagle Platinum Proof Coins. April, can you update us, please?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes, thank you. Since its inception, the American Eagle Platinum Proof Coin Program has traditionally been offered as a multi-year series. With the 20th anniversary of the program, a single year offering will be presented for 2017. This requires a new series to begin in 2018.

In 2009, the United States Mint introduced a new six year Platinum Coin Program. This series explored the core concepts of American democracy by highlighting the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution.

The 2018 series can be viewed as a natural follow up to the 2009 U.S. Constitution Preamble series in that it is based on a portion of the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, specifically the phrase “Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”

The series as it is proposed will
feature a new Eagle reverse design which will remain constant for the three year series. That could, of course, be the reverse from the 2017 Program. A new Liberty obverse design centered on the theme for each year will be featured. That proposed schedule would be Life for 2018, Liberty for 2019, and Pursuit of Happiness for 2020.

If this concept is pursued, the United States Mint would seek Secretary of the Treasury approval to strike these Platinum Coins under authority of 31 USC 5112, Subsection (k).

We have the design history of the program but the committee is entirely familiar with that. I will close the remarks there.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Let me ask you, April, what we are suggesting here is a three year program that the obverse would change, so the Liberty image would change somehow in concert with the themes “Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.”
MS. STAFFORD: Correct, as it has been conceptualized and is offered as a proposal.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We would have a fixed reverse design for that three year period?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think that is possible. Maybe my idea is one that could follow afterwards. I’d like to see what the committee would think of doing a 10 year program focused on the Bill of Rights.

MR. JANSEN: I had the same idea.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think it’s rich with potential art images. I don’t think it is something the Mint has addressed before, and it gives you a stable long term 10 year program that creates some critical mass just by the number of years that it goes. It would be a substantial collection over a decade.

I would ask for the committee to weigh in both on the idea presented by staff, which I think is a fine idea, and I don’t think these two that are on the table now, that one
needs to exclude the other, perhaps it is a matter of timing.

If that is the case and it is viewed that the three year program described by April is the way to go now, I would like the committee to go on record now for what happens afterwards. If you find the Bill of Rights’ idea appealing, let’s put a motion out there and recommend that for 2021 going forward.

MR. JANSEN: I had the exact same thought.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We didn’t talk.

MR. JANSEN: We didn’t. I had the exact same thought. What occurred to me in the wake of that is do we have to take them sequentially, could we take them in an ad hoc order, and do we want to limit it to the Bill of Rights, can we in fact embrace all the amendments, again, in programmatic order as opposed to necessarily a sequential and kind of one to one.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I believe the
collector mentality would ask for a linear approach to the amendments.

MR. JANSEN: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I don’t think you would want to do Amendment three, seven, and then one. I don’t think that would appeal. I think you would want to start with the First Amendment, Second Amendment, Third Amendment. Is that what you were suggesting?

MR. JANSEN: I was actually thinking all the amendments as candidates, but I don’t think we need to do one abolishing alcohol only to do one the next time un-abolishing alcohol.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Aren’t there like 29 amendments at this point? Some of them, I think, would be difficult to translate into a visual. I’m pretty confident our artists could tackle the first 10. There is something called “The Bill of Rights,” so it is a finite set. I think 10 is a manageable number of years. It’s a nice round number. For coin
collectors, I think it would make a lot of sense.

DR. BUGEJA: The Bill of Rights is an interesting notion. Some of the amendments are not really conducive to numismatic art, if you take a close look at them. Certainly, the First Amendment has five freedoms in it, and each one of those freedoms, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Press, Freedom for and from Religion Assembly and Petition, those are very good.

When we get to militia and common law, I am not so sure that is going to be a very inspiring type of amendment. Many of the amendments restrict what we used to believe are freedoms. I think in the first 10, you have some amendments that have several freedoms that we cherish, and others, speedy trials.

They are more journalistic in my view than artistic. That is just my opinion. Thank you, Gary.
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Michael, actually that is why we have a committee like this. I think you have a wonderful idea there. I think I might agree with you. I would gleam from that a five year program for the five liberties of the First Amendment.

DR. BUGEJA: I think if you do that, what you are going to get is a real wide response. All the issues that we deal with in some way are embedded in those five freedoms. Assembly, we had just seen assembly at work in Ferguson, for instance, just as one example. One of the Orphan Freedoms, we don’t necessarily understand how powerful assembly can be.

Petition is really something that has changed life in the United States for the better historically. The idea that the establishment clause of the First Amendment that separates church and state also has a lot of freedom. The state is not going to mandate a religion nor on the other hand is going to
prevent it. That is pretty unique in modern society.

Of course, press and speech are fundamental to liberty, which is associated with the series of medals that we just got done addressing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael.

DR. VIOLA: I think this is a brilliant idea, and in thinking about trying to reach out to youngsters, I could just see if you roll out one of these medals every year you could have some schools come up with their own drawings for this. I can just see a great excitement putting this thing together education wise, civics classes, social studies classes.

I think this one really has legs and we should really give it serious consideration.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Herman. Others? Do we think this is a good idea, five freedoms?
(Heads nodding.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: How would we proceed with that, in context with the other idea of Life, Liberty and Happiness three year program? Are these two programs, do we want to keep both? Would we want to do the five first and the three later? Three now and the five later? Does it matter to us?

MS. WASTWEE: I’m having a little trouble visualizing Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness, thinking as a designer, if I were given this task. We are already doing the series of Liberty, and Life and the Pursuit of Happiness are pretty non-concrete.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are we suggesting the five freedoms is something we should recommend that would begin in 2018?

MS. STAFFORD: For the committee’s information, actually part of the Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness concept was at least in part drawn from a really great vigorous conversation that we had on Platinum
Coin designs in which part of that quote was utilized, so kind of riffing off that idea it came to be.

There were designs that were depicted in the Platinum that we couldn’t go with, but that kind of sparked other ideas.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think Heidi is right. I think it would be a challenge, some of those themes would be challenging. Maybe we shouldn’t shy away from it because of that.

Committee members, we need your input here. What do you want to do with these two different concepts?

MR. JANSEN: I don’t know that the Platinum series sells on its thematic concept, per se. In some respect I think it is more important the series continues then necessarily we expect it to grow because of one concept versus another.

Having said that, I think Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness are pretty big, and in some sense, we have kind of
dealt with certainly the middle one pretty heavily here. I actually think the five different freedoms would be pretty provocative.

MS. WASTWEET: Or we could do the branches of government. We did that; sorry.

MR. JANSEN: That was done earlier.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: In the interest of drawing you all out, I’m going to put a motion on --

DR. BUGEJA: Gary, I would like to make just a quick comment, talking about how we would like the design to be more modern, and not to necessarily fall back on old motifs. Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness are concepts related to the philosophy of natural rights and what governments are supposed to protect.

That is probably by convention going to bring us back to older symbolic ideas. However, the five freedoms in the First Amendment keep evolving with generations.
They are always modern. We have just been through an ordeal with First Amendment rights with North Korea and the interview.

I’m not saying that should be on a coin, of course. The fact of the matter is these five freedoms are very modern because they keep being challenged. We might want to keep that in mind, and that challenging nature, which has substance, Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness are philosophical concepts, not necessarily American, but the five freedoms are distinctly American, distinctly modern, and distinctly challenging to each generation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you, Michael. You made some very good points and you back up what I am about to do, and that is to make a motion.

MOTION

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That the committee recommend that for the years 2018 through 2022 the thematic ideas of the five freedoms in the
First Amendment of the Constitution be used for the American Eagle Platinum Proof Coin.

DR. BUGEJA: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I have already discussed and Michael has discussed reasons for this. Is there anyone else who wants to weigh in? I thought it was time for me to put something on the table. When you know you have to vote, maybe you will find some words you want to share.

MS. WASTWEET: April, are you looking for one single formal recommendation or just throwing out some ideas?

MS. STAFFORD: Ideas; absolutely. Sales and Marketing will take the input and get customer feedback on all those ideas as well.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think it is a wonderful idea. Are there any comments before we move to a vote?

MS. WASTWEET: We are focusing a lot on the governmental, constitutional, what
about some more cultural things, music, theater, dance? The things that make the country rich.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We can certainly do that.

MS. WASTWEEN: Diversity.

MR. URAM: The arts.

DR. BUGEJA: What will make the country rich is the First Amendment.

MS. WASTWEEN: I’m not disagreeing. I’m just adding more ideas. I’m not contradicting what we have already put on the table. I’m just adding more ideas.

DR. BUGEJA: The point I’m making is the First Amendment also lends itself to art, music, dance, expressions, not only for the written word. That is why it is so rich.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I would suggest here at this point that we stay on task. There is a motion on the table. It has been seconded. We need to act on that one. If we would like to have a discussion about other thematic
ideas, I think we need to dispense of this motion first. We need to do this in an orderly fashion and we have the motion on the table.

Are there any comments that go to the motion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I’m going to call for the question. All those in favor, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Eight. Is there opposition?

MS. WASTWEE: Abstain.

MR. JANSEN: Two abstentions.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The motion passes with eight in favor and two abstentions. Is there other discussion?

MR. JANSEN: Does the staff need direction beyond 2022 at this point?

MS. STAFFORD: No.
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Gary, this was only for discussion, is that correct? You are going back to the Mint to say we discussed this, this is a good idea, but it doesn’t necessarily mean you are going to adopt it?

MS. STAFFORD: Correct. Sales and Marketing will go out with several ideas to receive customer input, surveys, focus groups, and collect information. Lots of really great things have been discussed here.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: The fact that we made this motion for the five freedoms, does that mean we can’t make another one to say here is another idea?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: You can.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Like the Bill of Rights’ thing. I just feel like we only did one motion, and that is not the limits to this discussion.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I recall saying while we have the motion on the table, if we wanted to talk about other ideas after we dispensed
of the motion, we certainly should do that. We are a recommending body. We recommend. That is our role. If there are other recommendations that a majority of the committee believes are appropriate, certainly, let’s proceed and get it done.

MR. WEINMAN: Gary, in fact, this is just because I’ve been around a long time, this is the fourth time, I believe, we have brought this question to the CCAC and received ideas. Heidi is right. I remember in past meetings animals was one that came up. I think there was a diversity conversation at a meeting back in 2006 or so.

If you want to articulate anything more or think about that, this is probably a good time for that. Otherwise, we will probably go back and pull from previous transcripts and provide them to Sales and Marketing.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: The motion right now
is not exclusive. If there are other ideas, put them out there and let the Mint staff wade through that and evaluate it and make decisions as they need to. Certainly, you are not limited, Jeanne, in what you want to do.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: If you have an idea, let’s bring it forward.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I think I have to agree with Heidi, it would be rather nice to see the arts depicted, to sort of expand upon what Michael Bugeja mentioned, it is part of our freedoms, but I think we could maybe indicate more music or whatever. If we could make that suggestion to the Mint staff that here could be also a program to do whatever, dance, sports.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a motion?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: It needs to be in a motion?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That would be the clearest direction, I think.
M O T I O N

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I move that we recommend to the Mint staff to explore the idea of an arts theme.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a second?

MS. WASTWEEET: I’ll second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Moved and seconded, motion by Jeanne and seconded by Heidi, for an arts theme. That sounds like it would be open-ended as far as how many years and whatever, but just to put that on the table for consideration.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Hearing none, all those in favor, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think we have eight to zero. One member has left the meeting, another member was out of the room, the point is the motion carries. That would be an
additional idea that we would forward to the Mint staff.

Are there other ideas?

MR. HOGE: Gary, I would make a brief comment on the four freedoms articulated by Franklin Roosevelt. I just remembered it. Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Worship, Freedom from Want, and Freedom from Fear. It would be interesting because Roosevelt, of course, inspired many people in the generation who still collects coins, and it is a summation of what this country defended in World War II.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Are you making a motion for the four freedoms?

MOTION

DR. BUGEJA: The four freedoms as articulated by Franklin Roosevelt, Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Worship, Freedom from Want, and Freedom from Fear. Those were delivered December 8, 1941. Of course, they were depicted by Norman Rockwell paintings, but to be honest with you, this is what the Bill of
Rights and Declaration of Independence hoped to preserve.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Okay. Is there a second for this motion?

MS. WASTWEEN: I would second that.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We have addressed the five freedoms and now arts, and we have four other freedoms. Is there any discussion?

MR. JANSEN: Would you ask him to reiterate the four?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Michael, can you reiterate the four?

DR. BUGEJA: Yes. Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Worship, Freedom from Want, Freedom from Fear. Roosevelt embraced those concepts to articulate why we needed to defend our way of life and culture after the attack by Japan on the United States.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a comment on the motion?

(No response.)
CHAIRMAN MARKS: I will move to the question. All those in favor, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: It looks like we have an unanimous vote of 9-0. We have one member out of the room. The motion carries. Are there other ideas?

MS. WASTWEET: Would there be any legal trouble with representing maybe our top five largest cities in the country, New York, Chicago, San Francisco?

MR. WEINMAN: There is no legal issue with that.

MS. LANNIN: I don’t know if this is appropriate for a Platinum Proof Coin but one of the things that strikes me that makes America unique is under creativity in terms of what Americans have invented that makes the rest of the world run. I guess I could nominate a microchip, right? Top inventions
that have spread throughout the world since America was founded. It could be the inventor or the actual invention. Just a thought.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Intriguing thought. Is there a desire to put that into a motion?

MOTION

MS. LANNIN: I move that one of the topics to be considered for future Platinum Coins would be a series that could be open-ended for American inventors and inventions.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there a second?

MR. JANSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Is there discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: All those in favor, raise your hand.

(Show of hands.)

DR. BUGEJA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Unanimous vote, again, 8-0. Thank you, Mary, nice one there. Is there any other idea you would like to put forward?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I think we have done a good job of giving you several concepts to chew on, and we will look forward to seeing what you come back with.

DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL REPORT

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That takes us to our annual report discussion. In the packet, I will direct the members to the annual report. This document is something that as chairman I prepare for you as a result of direction you provide to me throughout the year and years.

There are programs in here that have been in here for a while and some new ones we are putting forward. I will just kind of quickly go through all this. I don’t want to belabor it. I think we are fairly familiar with what is in here.

Under the circulating programs, circulating commemoratives, which starts on the first page, of course, we have our American Liberty Commemorative Coinage Program
which the committee by resolution in 2013 recommended that sort of program be developed, be enacted by Congress, and in fact, a bill was introduced in the last Congress to implement that very program. It is my understanding it is going to be introduced again.

We talked about it in reference to this annual report during the course of 2014 and the committee wanted to go forward with it.

Under new numismatic commemoratives, this is the portion where statute gives us the ability to recommend up to two programs per year, going five years out from the date of our annual report.

In that case, there are several enacted programs already that fill those two slots each year, and that is the case for 2015, 2016, and in 2017, the Lions Club International Century of Service Commemorative Coin Act is already in place. However, there
is not a second one unless something has
happened that I am not aware of. Boys Town
almost happened, but at the last minute, it
didn’t quite work out in the last Congress.

We have the recommendation from our
committee, which was one that originally came
from Mr. Jansen about the 150th anniversary of
the acquisition of the Alaska Territory. That
one has remained in that slot for 2017.

The World War I American Veterans
Centennial Commemorative Coin Act is one that
has been enacted. In fact, this is one that
we had previously recommended a version of.
This was one that actually came first into our
dialogue, I believe it was the last meeting in
Colorado Springs for a summer seminar where we
held a public input session, and the main
discussion from the public was the fact that
we needed to have a commemorative program for
World War I and that year would be 2018. I am
pleased to see that come full circle.

For the second program for 2018, there
still is nothing that has been enacted. However, a program that came to us through Michael Bugeja to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the United States Air Mail Service fills that slot for us in our recommending sense. That remains for this annual report.

For 2019, the committee has already by motion approved for insertion into this report a commemorative for the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial. This is one that I brought forward to the committee for several years now. It has been out of our report for the last two or three as we have made room for other commemorations.

This one is important to me. I have spoken on this a number of times. In 1997, there was a similar commemorative actually produced to honor the National Police Memorial, which is actually located here in Washington, D.C.

I would like to do the same for their
brothers and sisters in arms as first responders and honor our fallen firefighters.

A motion that was put forward by now former Vice Chairman Mike Olsen is the 50th anniversary of the Apollo 11 moon landing. For me, I think this is a very logical program for 2019. I certainly hope that Representatives and Senators in the Congress will pick this up and make this one a reality. I think it would be a wonderful program.

That is our second recommendation for 2019. Under other recommendations, we have now for the past three years, and I addressed this earlier under the Liberty program, we have recommended a redesign of the Silver Eagle. It reached its 25 year threshold for design change in 2011. That remains in our report. Frankly, I am doubtful that is going to happen. However, we are making tremendous strides forward, of course, with the Liberty Medal and Gold Coin.

That brings us down to the Arts Medal
Program, which we recommended in 2014 with Resolution 201401, which details our Medals Program, which we have characterized as two series, one being a dated Liberty Medal, Silver Medal, that is renewing with new designs each year, and then truly an Arts Medal series that allows artists to develop American themes and subject matter and relate them in artistic form, and then for the Mint staff to evaluate and cull out designs for appropriateness and bring forward to us portfolio’s where we would make selections.

In the Arts Medals category, we are on record expressing the importance of such a program to advance experimentation, research and development, and to give the artists a chance to develop and hone their skills in new and I would think exciting ways.

That, of course, is in our report stemming from enactment of our resolution.

This next one is something we just acted on today, the 2015 Liberty Theme 24K
Gold Coin and Silver Medal Program. This report is for fiscal year 2014. I would suggest we keep this in the report. However, this is one where we have actually seen this come about and we are now progressing with that.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, this calls for an ultra high relief. I know we originally talked about ultra high but we modified it to high relief, I believe.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We can certainly edit that. I know there is one other typo or correction we need to make. I don’t know if we need a motion. I think before I submit the final version to the staff, I will remove the word “ultra.” Actually, I have specified here that the program is as we recommended it in the Arts Medals Resolution, which would cover the 40.6 millimeter planchet.

I think Mary has an item to call to our attention.

MS. LANNIN: Actually, sorry, I guess
I’m the resident typo person. On page three, for the 100th Anniversary United States Air Mail Service, the second to last line, “To collaborate with a joint coin and postage stamp program,” not “join.”

On page seven, the Congressional Gold Medal honoring the Code Talkers associated with the Lake Superior Band, it should say “Fond du Lac.” It is the meeting of September 23.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I will just make those changes. We need to proceed with final approval of this report. Unless there is other discussion that you believe is necessary, I would ask for a motion to approve the report with the edits so noted.

MR. WEINMAN: Mr. Chairman, back to the 2019, the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial, I believe this conversation has come up before, that is an existing place; correct?

CHAIRMAN MARKS: There is a memorial. It is in Maryland.
MR. WEINMAN: The reason I say that is the paragraph doesn’t say where it is. The jurisdiction of the CCAC is to recommend events, persons or places, as opposed to an organization. It is in fact a place; it just needs to be identified.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: That is interesting. Originally, when I brought this forward probably six or seven years ago, we named the place, and somewhere along the line, I can’t remember the details but there was a version of this committee that decided we should make it more general. I welcome the idea of bringing it back to the specific and naming the place.

MR. WEINMAN: Typically, the committee recommends events, the so and so anniversary of something, which is an event.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: A memorial is a physical place, or a monument.

MR. WEINMAN: I remember having this conversation. I believe it is a physical
CHAIRMAN MARKS: Right. It bears the plaques with all the fallen firefighters in the nation. If the committee is comfortable knowing that I will go in and adjust that --

MS. LANNIN: Crofton, Maryland.

MR. WEINMAN: How bizarre.

MS. LANNIN: Unless Google is wrong, and Google is never wrong.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: I will put in the appropriate locale and make this more specific. It is also where the National Fire Academy is, on the same grounds.

MS. LANNIN: I’m sorry, Gary. Emmitsburg, Maryland.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Yes, thank you. That is it. All is right in the world now.

MS. LANNIN: Crofton is obviously a mailing address.

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Thank you. That is the correct locale.
MOTION

MR. JANSEN:  I so move to approve the 2014 CCAC annual report as submitted for the January 27-28 CCAC meeting with amendments and edits as described on the record.

CHAIRMAN MARKS:  Is there a second?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN:  Second.

CHAIRMAN MARKS:  It has been moved and seconded to approve the fiscal year 2014 annual report of the committee with the amendments and edits as recorded on the record.  Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS:  All those in favor, raise your hand, please.

(Show of hands.)

DR. BUGEJA:  Aye.

CHAIRMAN MARKS:  Unanimous approval, 9-0.  That brings us to the end of our agenda for the day, but I will first ask the staff if there is anything more you wish to bring to our attention today.
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: We did well today, team. We are a well oiled machine. I will now ask the committee is there anything further you wish to bring to your colleagues’ attention?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MARKS: Hearing none, we are adjourned, and we will see you in the morning.

(Whereupon, at 3:13 p.m., the committee meeting was concluded.)
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MR. MARKS: Can I get everyone to come to the table?

Good morning. I’m calling this January 28th, 2015, meeting of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee to order.

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here for our second day of meetings. We have a shorter agenda today. We have some discussions on concepts and themes.

The first one’s going to be for the National Park Service 100th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Program and then we’re going to talk about some potential 2016 special products.

So, April, if you’re ready to tell us about the Park Service Program, please go ahead.

MS. STAFFORD: I am. Thank you and good morning.

It is Public Law 113-291 that commemorates the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service, or NPS, with a three-coin commemorative coin series up to 100,000 five-dollar gold coins, 500,000 one-dollar
silver coins, and 750,000 half-dollar-clad coins.

According to this Act, the design shall be emblematic of the 100th anniversary of the NPS. Surcharges are to be paid to the National Park Foundation for projects that help preserve and protect resources under the stewardship of the NPS and promote public enjoyment and appreciation of those resources.

The NPS and the National Park Foundation liaisons have presented the following recommendations for the coin designs:

Basically could be boiled down to the obverse design, including elements that focus on the NPS tradition and celebration of the NPS centennial. And the reverse would include a focus on the service-wide thematic images. So let me go through some suggestions related to both of those.

So for obverse, again, elements focusing on NPS’s tradition and the celebration of their centennial, which is from 1916 to 2016. Ideas might include featuring the official NPS arrowhead logo on one side of all three coins or featuring the official NPS arrowhead and/or other NPS badges and insignia as
they evolved over time or featuring traditional elements of those insignia to include bison, the Sequoia tree or pinecone, Native American plants or pots, et cetera, on one side of all three coins.

Basically an idea here would be to somehow showcase the evolution of the NPS logo in three main steps including the pre-1954 pinecone, the 1954 arrowhead, and what is used now and was enacted in 2001, the present arrowhead logo.

Another idea for the obverse would be to feature iconic National Park sites and/or people associated with them on one side of all three coins. And some iconic sites to consider, you have the list in front of you so I won’t read them all, but they include the Statue of Liberty National Monument, the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial in D.C., Yellowstone National Park, et cetera.

For the reverse design, again, it would be to include a focus on service-wide thematic images such as the ideals of stewardship, community, volunteerism, and recreation with supporting images such as rivers, trails, parklands, bicyclists,
Kayakers, urban skyline to illustrate the rivers, trails again, and Conservation Assistance Program.

Another thematic image service-wide theme would be preservation, conservation, and recreation with supporting images that might include President Theodore Roosevelt and John Muir at Yosemite, bison at Yellowstone, California Condor at Great -- the Grand Canyon or in Pinnacles.

Another service-wise theme, pride, heritage, culture, and history with supporting images including the Statue of Liberty, Latino dancers at Border Folk Festival, and the Tuskegee Airmen; or discovery, education, science and learning with supporting images such as Thomas Edison’s first lightbulb, the Wright flyer propeller, artists’ pallet from where from the National Historical -- the NS- -- NHS. What’s that?

MS. BIRDSONG: Site.

MS. STAFFORD: National Historical Site.

Thank you, Betty.

And lastly, protection, connection, and inspiration with supporting images such as a scenic landscape or wilderness area with a hiker.
Obverse and reverse inscriptions might include excerpted texts or phrases to express the meaning of the Organic Act of 1916. Anything to celebrate the NPS centennial and reflect the NPS centennial themes.

To talk more about that, we have our two liaisons with us here today. Okay. Well, we have one liaison with us here today, Mr. Donald Ledbetter, who is the partnership coordinator for the Centennial Office of the National Park Service.

Mr. Ledbetter, would you care to address the -- address the Committee?

And also we do have our second liaison with us. He is Mr. Jason Rano, who is director of Government Relations with the National Park Foundation.

So if you gentlemen would like to address the Committee?

MR. LEDBETTER: Do you want me to come down?

MS. STAFFORD: You can go to the podium and take this mike with you. That’ll --

MR. LEDBETTER: Okay.
MS. STAFFORD: Uh-huh.

MR. LEDBETTER: Well, I’ll just have a seat maybe over there.

Okay. Well, thank you all so much for having us here today. So my name is Donald Ledbetter with the National Park Service.

MR. RANO: And I’m Jason Rano with the National Park Foundation.

MR. LEDBETTER: So I’d love the opportunity to take a few moments to talk about the Park Service Centennial and some of the themes and the focus of what we’re working on over the next two years to augment what was in the suggestions that we sent over.

So I work in the National Park Service’s Centennial Office where we’re busy planning all sorts of aspects of our Centennial Commemoration. And I think it’s fair for the Park Service to say that the Centennial is two things for us; it’s both a looking back to celebrate the 100 years of preservation of the cultural and natural heritage of the country that has been assigned to the -- to the National Park Services, the mission of the Park Service, but at the same time
we’re very much focused on looking forward.

And a lot of the Centennial work that we’re doing is thinking about what the Park Service is going to be in its second century, how it’s mission is going to evolve, how it’s position in society is going to evolve a way to be related to the American people.

And so research has shown that a lot of the American public, when they think about the National Park Service or they’re asked about the National Park Service, think about the big parks out west. They think about the Yellowstones and the Grand Canyons and the Yosemites and the iconography and all of the sites that we’re obviously amazingly proud to be stewards of and continue -- you know, will be into the future.

But at the same time, for us, the Park Service, we’re much, much more than that. We’re visible in communities through our reservat- -- our Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program, through various tax incentives programs that we do to facilitate heritage conservation in communities.

We work on the Main Street USA Initiative and programs in communities around the country. We do
a lot of work in education, volunteerism, scientific research, ecosystem monitoring. You know, our work is much, much more than, you know, just those iconic sites.

So I think just one thing we want to convey in as we think about the design of the coin series is how to show that -- that diversity. And so recognizing that, you know, the market for these coins, though, is also somewhat of a traditionalist, you know, market as well in some ways and the iconography, the visual landscapes on those sites need to be incorporated, as well.

So I think that’s the challenge from our perspective that, you know, we have in the thinking about the design for the coin series. Something that appeals and pops out and screams, you know, National Park Service on the one hand, but also has something about those other elements of our mission, the other themes that are woven throughout the Park Service and the work that we do.

And so that’s some of the thought we put into some of the recommendations. And so just wanted
to expand on that for a moment.

MR. RANO: I’ll just say for those who don’t know, the National Park Foundation is the congressionally chartered official charity of the Park Service and we’re the recipient organization for the proceeds from the Centennial coin.

And just to kind of elaborate as -- as Donald said, you know, it is about looking back on the 100 years and looking forward for the next generation. And one of the missions of this Service and the Foundation for the Centennial is engaging the next generation of park stewards and park advocates and park visitors.

You know, I think we agree that one of the most important things is to show the breadth of what the Service does. And I think a great example of this is at the National Jazz Historic site in New Orleans there are rangers who play and teach jazz to New Orleans inner-city youth. Not something a lot of people would think that our National Park Service rangers are doing on a daily basis, right?

And so when you think about it, there are
401 National Park Service units in the United States. Only 59 of them are the iconic park parks. And so to Don’s point, I think it is important to have that iconography because that’s what Americans know.

But the Park Service does so much. The breadth of what the Park Service does is so impressive that I -- that we think that it’s important to integrate that as much as possible into the designs.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Before we get into our thematic discussion, I just want to cover any ground for questions the Committee might have about the program, itself? I’d like to get those answered.

Erik?

MR. JANSEN: Every national park location’s got a gift shop and every gift shop’s got National Park stuff -- hats, coats. And very often I find various ad hoc medals.

Are you planning on selling these products through your channels?

MR. LEDBETTER: I can, with great confidence, say yes. We will -- we look forward to working with the concessioners and the cooperating
associations that operate the bookstores and the retail operations in the National Parks.

And although those discussions haven’t kicked off, I can say, with great confidence, that they will be in the mix and we will absolutely do everything possible to make that happen. We think that’s a vital channel to have as part of the program.

MR. JANSEN: We -- yeah. We occasionally get a really -- a really consumer-oriented charge from Congress like this with Girl Scouts, a handful of others, that really have such broad appeal, especially to -- to kids.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yep.

MR. JANSEN: And I would just love to walk into Yellowstone lodge or -- I live in Seattle and I -- you know, I’m a card carrying, you know, annual pass member.

MR. LEDBETTER: Absolutely.

MR. JANSEN: I’ve been --

MR. LEDBETTER: Great deal. Great deal.

MR. JANSEN: -- all kinds of stuff. They all -- yeah. It is a great deal. It’s the best
investment money can buy in this country.

So I just love what you guys do.

MR. LEDBETTER: Thank you, yeah.

MR. JANSEN: And especially the Foundation.

MR. RANO: Thank you.

MR. JANSEN: And I just hope we can -- we could expand this because the Mint does produce these against the budget and the business plan. And when you’ve got a channel like you have it would be terrific to see it go to work.

MR. LEDBETTER: I think this represents a great opportunity to leapfrog off of this and leverage that. And a lot of our constituencies overlap and I think there is a lot of potential there.

And I know some colleagues from our Business Services Program have had discussions with the Mint in the past so I think that’s certainly a thread to carryforward.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Are there any other questions that we’d like to ask, either the stakeholders or the staff?

Jean?
MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Is this program going to continue through 2016? I mean, how many -- how many -- how many designs do you expect to have or produce? I mean, how --

MR. LEDBETTER: Well, I -- yeah.

MS. STAFFORD: So I just would go back. This is a -- the night -- the 2016 Commemorative Coin Program so there --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Correct.

MS. STAFFORD: -- would be a gold, silver, and clad.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. STAFFORD: So we would need designs for each of those sides. And there’s up to 100,000 gold coins, 500,000 silver coins, and 750,000 half dollars.

But the discussion today would be about if all -- all three coins in the -- in the program would have one side in common or if each of the coins --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay.

MS. STAFFORD: -- would have a unique obverse and reverse.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Thank you, April.

MR. MARKS: Are there other questions?

Mary?

MS. LANNIN: Do you have a problem with -- as you said, you know, people remember the iconic parks, you know, like Yosemite and things like that. Do you have a problem with one of the coins having one of the western parks on it? I’m thinking of the two guys that just did the free climb --

MR. LEDBETTER: Uh-huh.

MS. LANNIN: -- in Yosemite which really focused on --

MR. LEDBETTER: Uh-huh.

MS. LANNIN: -- the National Park. And with -- but you don’t want to have it look like it’s a commemoration of their ascent.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yeah. Oh, yeah. Yeah. I would say definitely not a problem --

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MR. LEDBETTER: -- you know, with looking at those as options.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.
MR. LEDBETTER: I think not leaning too heavily on the iconography --

MS. LANNIN: Right.

MR. LEDBETTER: -- I think finding that balance.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MR. LEDBETTER: But, you know, a nod to the fact that those elements are very attractive and --

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MR. LEDBETTER: -- have a certain appeal, you know, to the marketplace --

MS. LANNIN: Uh-huh.

MR. LEDBETTER: -- is certainly in the mix.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MR. RANO: I think also an interesting point is if we think about other things that are commemorating that are being commemorated throughout the National Park Service --

MS. LANNIN: Right.

MR. RANO: -- is not only the Centennial, you look at Civil War and --

MS. LANNIN: Uh-huh.
MR. RANO: -- Civil War battlefields and things like that. Various individual parks are celebrating anniversaries this year and next, so I think that’s another consideration.

But we would agree with Donny that we would have no problem with --

MS. LANNIN: So in other words --

MR. RANO: -- using the iconography.

MS. LANNIN: -- it may -- it may be interesting to have three different obverses and three different reverses.

MR. RANO: Yeah.

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MR. LEDBETTER: I think there’s so much to draw from it’s a good possibility. And when I was taking a look at I think it was the Army commemorative coin series from a couple of years ago, I think it was the Army series that took the advantage to have different designs on all six sides.

And it was -- it was just a great approach, I thought, because they had at least one design that was very traditional, men in uniform, very much what
you thought of as Army. And then they had some other

designs that spoke to some of the work they do in
disaster relief and communities --

MS. LANNIN: Uh-huh.

MR. LEDBETTER: -- for example. And it
showed a little bit more of the breadth of the Army
mission and activity. So that was a good approach I
noticed in some --

MS. LANNIN: Okay.

MR. LEDBETTER: -- of the past series.

MR. MARKS: Erik?

MR. JANSEN: This is really maybe a question

for the Mint and Greg.

I’m especially focusing in on the fact that
we have an opportunity to impact kids here because you
want to win the next generation you’ve got to start
early and often. And I’m a huge, huge fan of kids
experiencing all the dimensions of the National Park,
whether it’s culture, whether it’s natural wandering,
whatever.

The point I’m driving towards is is I look
at a sales channel here, you know, the gold coin is
not going to sell to that kind of family vacation collector, things like that. And probably not the silver either at 50 bucks, plus or minus.

Clad half dollar, now I know the legislation speaks to surcharges and covering costs and all of that, but is there any way within the pricing strategies in the Mint that clad dollar could be absolutely at the lowest possible price so that -- so that every channel they’ve got has got a very reasonably priced item which -- because I would love to see that half dollar sell out.

And baseball didn’t quite sell out. I don’t know if they’ve sold out yet or not. Close. Yeah. Well, yeah, and like, for instance, the 9.95 price put on the two Kennedy half dollars, that’s kind of what I’m looking for here.

MR. WEINMAN: The only thing I’ll say on that is the legislation has revisioned it of course we have to -- we must cover our costs.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. WEINMAN: And if we don’t, then they can’t get their surcharges.
MR. JANSEN: Absolutely.

MR. WEINMAN: And so we have -- we have to take that into consideration with pricing otherwise everything would be taken under advisement.

MR. JANSEN: What’s the surcharge on the half dollar, 3 bucks?

MR. WEINMAN: It’s $5.

MR. JANSEN: Five?

MR. WEINMAN: $5 for the half.

MR. JANSEN: All right. All right. So I guess that rules out 5.49, doesn’t it?

MR. MARKS: Or 5.95.

MR. JANSEN: 5.95 might work. There you go. I’m trying, guys. I’m trying.

MS. BAILY: If I could add, I’m Anne Baily. I’m the products manager that manages our Commemorative Coin Programs.

We are very conservative with our pricing because of the requirement to break even. With the $5 surcharge it does it very difficult. We’ve got also to build in a small margin in case things don’t sell as well as we anticipate.
We are probably more conservative than ever after the Girl Scouts because we all thought that would sell very well and it did not. So we do try to price as low as we can, particularly for the half dollars. But it is a legal requirement we have to meet that we take very, very seriously.

MR. JANSEN: Sure. Sure. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Are you done, Erik?

MR. JANSEN: I’m done. Thank you very much.

MR. MARKS: Are there any other questions?

I guess I have one. Ask the gentlemen if you had to pick one person — personality that we would put on — on one or multiple of these coins, would it be Theodore Roosevelt or someone else?

MR. RANO: I mean, I would say off the top of my head, probably. This is — that’s the start of what we now see as the National Park Service, so I would -- yeah. I would say probably.

MR. MARKS: Or if we wanted to — just for discussion sake, if we wanted to put an image of three people, one on each of the coins, who would the other two people be? Who would you suggest?
MR. LEDBETTER: Probably John Muir and Stephen Mather.

MR. MARKS: Okay. All right. Back -- back when the America the Beautiful Program for the quarters was beginning there was a movement here on this Committee that we felt for the period of time that the America the Beautiful quarters would be issued that rather than having George Washington on the obverse that we put Theodore Roosevelt.

That would have required an act of Congress and it just didn’t get legs. But we -- we felt it was kind of a shame that we’d have National Parks and national places honored and the role that T.R. had played in all of those.

So I do have a great interest in seeing Theodore Roosevelt appear somewhere in this program. So anyway, just food for thought. And did you want to --

MR. WEINMAN: Well, the only thing I’ll mention on that is that, once again, the charge is that it must be emblematic of the 100th Anniversary of the National Park Service. Not that -- nothing that
says it’s exclusive of somebody who’s no longer living or an iconic figure. Obviously we don’t -- we try to stay away from putting living people on -- on the coin for a number of reasons.

But we want to be careful not to be commemorating an individual as opposed to commemorating the --

MR. MARKS: No.

MR. WEINMAN: -- larger --

MR. MARKS: I --

MR. WEINMAN: -- the larger -- the larger mission.

MR. MARKS: Isn’t -- wouldn’t it be appropriate, though, if we have one, two, or three individuals who were seen as founders of -- of the Park Service or major contributors to it happening?

If we’re celebrating a 100th anniversary, it seems those might be people in context for the purpose of this program.

MR. WEINMAN: Yeah. I think context is everything.

MR. MARKS: Yeah.
MR. WEINMAN: And I think -- I mean, there’s nothing that prohibits it so long as it properly ties into the emblematic nature of the charge.

MR. MARKS: Okay. All right.

All right. So if there aren’t any more questions, is there a member who would like to begin the thematic discussion?

MR. MORAN: Or you can just go around.

MR. MARKS: Michael, go ahead.

MR. MORAN: Well, first of all, I want to caution both the Mint and the Park Service. There is a rich, rich listing here of subject materials for these coins. And the tendency will be, and it is a trap, to try and be all inclusive with your subject matter. And you cannot do it particularly on the $5 gold piece. That’s the size of a nickel.

And I would encourage all that are involved in it, particularly on your inner-review function, to look at designs that keep the themes simple. You can’t put the Grand Canyon on any of these coins. It just doesn’t fit.

We’ve seen this same trouble in the America
the Beautiful quarter series. We get from the
superintendents of the various parks their favorite
postcard and it will not fit on a quarter.

So and this Committee always tries to take
the recommendation of the stakeholder at heart and we
try and satisfy them so you all will have some say in
this. And I encourage you to make your selections
focus on the designs that keep it simple.

Now, I do have a suggestion. I am biased.
As a member of the Theodore Roosevelt Advisory Board,
I sure want to see T.R. on one of these coins. But I
really think that the best way to do it, not
necessarily to have he and John Muir standing, looking
out over Yosemite, but to put bust and jug head on one
of these coins. I think that would really work.

I understand Frank Mather, he’s the heart
and soul of the start of the Park. But three of them
is too many. And it’s really -- in terms of the
spiritual beginnings it’s Muir and Roosevelt.

MS. WASTWEEET: Well said. I would echo that
sentiment also that there would be a tendency to try
to overcrowd these -- these designs. And while all
these things may be important, above all we want them
to be attractive coins because that’s going to draw in
the new people who don’t already know and bring new
audience in and have that chance to educate because
they’ll be attracted to the look of the coin.

So I caution against busy collages. I think
that there’s going to be a tendency to try to squish
everything together.

And on the flip side, we don’t want just a
single image either that’s going to narrow the focus.
Because what you said that most people think natural
-- these big parks and not all of the smaller
entities, the landmarks and so forth that you
represent. And so that is a chance to talk about the
connection between those two.

When I was looking at the images in our
packet I was noticing the picture of the bridge and
the picture of the arch from the National Arches and
how that they are similar, but contrasting.

It would be fun to split our coin down the
middle and have half the bridge on one side and half
the arch on the other so we see the connection and the
relationship between the landmarks, the management, and the natural world. And that way we’re not getting too busy, but we’re speaking about the scope of what you do.

And you also had the Statue of Liberty and then you had Old Faithful and they kind of make the same shape. So if we split each down the -- have the statue on one side and Old Faithful on the other, it talks how they -- they connect so that might be fun.

And I do support having unique pictures on each side of the coins. The more the better. The more the merrier.

And then some of the wording suggestions were quite long, so let’s try to cut back on the wording. Again, we like to look at the coins and read the literature, not read the coins and look at the literature. That’s it.

MR. BUGEJA: Gary, this is Michael Bugeja. I just wanted to let you know I’m here. And when you think it’s a good time for me to speak I’ll -- I’d like to say a few words.

MR. MARKS: Well, Michael, now that you
mentioned it, I think right now is a fine time.

MR. BUGEJA: I can’t see anybody and it’s my loss.

I’m very excited about this discussion for a lot of reasons. One is, you know, I work with young people at Iowa State University. And I can tell you, at least in the big west, how many students love national parks in our for conservation and sustainability, which I think is going through every university across the country.

The Organic Act of 1916 has some fundamental words in it. And that is, you know, preserving nature, historic objects, and the wild for future generations so I think that’s a nice theme to go on.

But, you know, I was intrigued when folks were asking about the three people they would put on a -- on a -- to symbolize the National Park System and, of course, Theodore Roosevelt.

But there are two others who did more for the Park Service, I think, than anyone could imagine. And one Ansel Adams and his photography. And in addition to that, the National Parks can trace their
existence to Henry David Thoreau, the first
conservationist and who was a symbol, in the United
States at least, for conservation.

So I thought I’d throw those things out.
The theme seems to be, you know, conserving the
scenery and nature, historic objects, and the wild for
future generations. The theme is sustainability or
conservation.

And Ansel Adams certainly promoted the park
in a way that no other person really had for future
generations through the mastery of his photography.
And Henry David Thoreau reminded everybody about the
need to conserve nature. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Michael. Well, I
guess I’ll end my comments now. And this is going to
pick up on the theme of a couple of my colleagues
here.

And that’s the idea of keeping a balance on
these designs, that we don’t clutter them up. And you
mentioned the -- the Army Commemorative Program that
happened a few years ago. And that’s a great
illustration of what we’re talking about.
If you look at the half dollar from that program, if you look at the obverse it is cluttered up. And I know the attempt was well meaning, but it’s cluttered up with people doing all sorts of things.

And it happened because -- because it was -- and I’d like to speak positively as much as possible when I’m in this chair, but it was ugly. And it was one of the lowest mintage commemorative half dollars in modern commemorative times.

It didn’t sell. People didn’t want it. So there -- there is an interest for you, as stakeholders, to pursue something that is not a storyboard. It’s not like you’re looking at the comics or, you know, we want to -- we want to give attribution to a whole array of different ideas and things and we’re going to put them all on these -- the six coin faces that we have here.

I think that would be an awful mistake. People like me who have -- I’ve been collecting for 40-plus years and there’s -- believe it or not there are people on this Panel with me who have been collecting longer than that. And generally we collect
what we like.

We are -- we are art people. We like to buy art and many of us are buying other types of art, too. But you want to strive for something that’s going to be attractive and something where it’s not going to set record low mintage levels. Because if that happens, you’re probably not going to get your -- your cut of the deal and at the end of the day it’s not really going to honor your cause.

So what we find is that simplicity is better. So if there are singular, iconic images that we can identify, be it flora, fauna, personalities. I like the idea of the double profile of maybe T.R. and Muir. I’d like to explore that.

And, as I said before, I would like to see T.R. on here somewhere. And but I also agree with Heidi that I’d like to see six different unique faces here for the program because there is so much of the story to tell. One way we can approach that and cover different areas is to utilize all six of those for something unique. So I guess that’s what I have to contribute.
And, Erik, are you prepared?

MR. JANSEN: I’m ready.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. JANSEN: I had to give a speech to a large crowd at a convention one year at an engineering school. And somebody wisely, fortunately, pulled me aside and gave me a piece of advice.

And they said, “I don’t know what you’re going to talk about, but think of the following.” I’m talking to a bunch of engineers. “What you tell somebody in terms of the facts, they’ll forget. But how you made them feel, they’ll never forget.”

And so I would say when I look at this charge we have got, I can’t hardly even imagine in the time I’ve served here a more rich selection of icons and locations and arches and mountains and trees and sunsets and, I mean, the list is actually swamping. It just floods you. You can’t even find your way through it all.

So I would say I think in this one, and subject to another thought I’ll mention in a minute, I would -- I would think that it would be worth the
effort for the artists to think back on their times when they’ve visited a site at the National Park Service and how that made them feel and what they wanted to take away and what they ultimately did take away. And that needs to drive their conscience and their creativity as to what to turn this coin into.

Because if we can strike a chord not with someone’s knowledge of the parks, but their recollection of being at the parks, I think we will really hit the heart of the matter here.

Now, a different thought. Between the esoteric, the academic, and the gut sense of presence and place, I take these three coins with three different cuts to that mix.

The gold, we’ll probably -- if the numbers aren’t too obvious, we’ll sell -- on the high end we’ll sell 60,000 of these. On the low end we’ll sell 15. I hope and I truly believe it’ll be more towards the 60 end. Maybe we’ll max it out.

It happened in baseball. Baseball’s not about -- well, to some people it’s about the stats. But most people it’s about the time they went with
their dad or their mom or their brother or their uncle or whatever.

The National Park system could be just as good. But I think the gold probably asks for the esoteric, the -- the -- maybe think of it as, well, that’s the adults coin in this set.

The 50 cent piece, I alluded to it previously. Man, if that doesn’t have a picture of a family enjoying some iconic experience, I think we’ve missed the boat. My point is not to dictate the art. My point is to drive towards a direction of our sense of experience and emotional take away from the parks.

So that leaves the silver dollar in the middle and, of course, that’s always the workhorse of volumes here. At least it has been in the past. And it certainly is the workhorse in the economics to -- to the National Park Service.

Do these funds go to the Service? The Foundation?

MR. RANO: The Foundation.

MR. JANSEN: So much for the better. So that’s the workhorse here. But it’s also a $55 priced
coin at silver today,blah,blah,blah. So that’s --
that’s kind of what works against you here.

The silver dollar is also the largest coin.
And into what we do, a big pallet is -- is really
freeing to the -- to the artist.

So we have three very different kinds of
decisions here. We have the esoteric at the gold end.
I think we have just the -- put your child’s eyes on
and design the half dollar. And then the dollar in
the middle, the gold dollar in the middle is --

MR. MARKS: Silver.

MR. JANSEN: -- is where we really, really
will make the numbers work for you guys. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Erik.

Mary?

MS. LANNIN: Okay. Wow, six different
sides, six different opportunities. I like very much
Heidi’s idea of pairing the modern parks that we don’t
necessarily think about with the national parks that,
you know, Yellowstone erupting, whatever.

I would like to see the obverses remain the
domain of the founders, the people that we need to
thank, the Teddy Roosevelts. You know, whether we put Ansel Adams, as Michael said, on it, I mean, I think of Ansel Adams a lot. I don’t necessarily think of Thoreau.

But I would like to see the obverse remain the people side and the reverse remain a contrast between the actual natural park and the man-made created parks. So that’s it.

Herman?

MR. VIOLA: Excuse me. The opportunity here is just remarkable. And the idea that you’re going to try to encompass all these parks, all these themes in the six designs -- I wish we could have like 60.

And, you know, I’m trying to visualize how this all could work. I mean, are you going to have these like in a box set that all three could be in a box that could then tell the story? Would there be education printed materials with it?

I’m imagining there’ll be some postage stamps and all, as well, that goes with this. So I can see really a remarkable collector’s item.

But one thing I would like to make sure we
don’t avoid is we have to remember the Native Americans who were all around all this. And so somehow if we can incorporate some of that theme in there. But I -- I think the challenge is just going to be overwhelming.

But I do like Heidi’s thought on pairing up a couple of these sites into one coin. And then I’m wondering, you know, just off the top of my head, are we -- you know, there’s so many different types of sites, like battlefields.

I mean, it could be that, you know, one coin represents the battlefields, one coin represents flora and fauna, another one represents, you know, some kind of sites like, you know, the bridge you’re talking about or whatever.

So I do feel that we have to let the artists have free rein here and a lot of designs come in and that we can just kind of really analyze them and say, oh, we never thought of that but this could work.

But, I mean, my own thought is that I’d love to see Native Americans somehow included one way or the other. But it is really an amazing opportunity.
And I just wish this not was a one-year program, but a multi-year program. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Herman. Jean?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I think my mike is -- thank you, Gary. Whoops, thank you.

As an artist, I -- I look at this program as a hugely overwhelming and terribly exciting project. It’s -- it’s rather taking my breath away because I am also, like Erik, a member -- a lifetime member of the National Park Society so I feel strongly about what you’re trying to do or what we’re going to do.

And I would urge you to accept simplicity on this, but a lot of power. You know, I can see one or two icons on each coin. We have six sides. That’s pretty exciting. And when you think about the coin that would be bringing in our young people, you know, that really has to address their interests.

And, again, like Erik said, you know, we have to esoteric gold coin that could be, you know, really positive, but that’s just so tiny. So we have to think about what’s going to wow these people that will be putting them -- the coins in their
collections.

So I’m urging the artists to think really simple, really positive, very powerful images to bring to the public so that, you know, they’ll have either a boxed coin set as Herman said and maybe we can, you know, encourage more people as collectors.

I’m excited about this, but overwhelmed. So thank you. Thank you for bringing it to us.

MR. MARKS: Thomas?

MR. URAM: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I think it’s a tremendous opportunity both from the collecting side. And I’m not going to reiterate some of the things that have already been said by my colleagues, which I agree with on all of them.

Just a couple thoughts. And I think that what you’ve said is you want to remember the past and look to the future as far as the -- the designs and so forth. And I think I would have the obverse being what you’re looking for for the future and the reverse being the symbolic past, is how I’m thinking.

I recently -- and when it comes to the
dollar -- and I agree with Erik and the rest, the half dollar could be so exciting if you keep it in the avenue or area of educating -- the whole thing will be educational, but particularly the affordability for the kids and so forth with the halves since that can be done.

But when it comes to the dollar where you do have the larger planchet, I recently designed a medal with three busts on it. And I would -- it was an inch and three quarters. And it would be an ideal planchet for the three busts that you were discussing with T.R. And I would envision it almost to be with a Stone Mountain background.

In other words, having their images like it was a very rough looking planchet with their images, which could also, you know, be part of any of the park scenes. But it could be a mountain behind them, not just the busts on the platter. But making it look like a Stone-Mountain type design. So just a -- just a thought on that.

But I think that the three on the dollar, the three busts on the dollar could be where you could
set it off and then work from -- from that scope.

Thank you. Good luck.

MR. MARKS: Robert?

MR. HOGE: Is this on? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am very interested and happy with all the suggestions that my colleagues have made here. And I’d like to espouse all of these suggestions, as well.

One thing -- pardon me -- which struck me some years ago in which we haven’t discussed at all yet is that the National Park Service is the custodian of an enormous repository of specimens. I mean really important artifacts, natural history specimens.

And I was actually surprised, myself, to have learned about this some years ago. And I wonder if we couldn’t make some kind of selection of particularly iconic specimens, key, important pieces because this is something that most people are not aware of.

We think in terms of the wild, the wide-open spaces, the great landmark sites, but there’s an enormous, enormous body, I think it’s in the millions
of items, that are in the Park Service’s care. And including many, many very important pieces from our entire cultural and natural heritage.

So this is just one perspective. I know this would be a very difficult portion of the materials related to the Park Service to address. Much more problematical than portraits or important landmarks, but I think it’s something we shouldn’t overlook because of the vast quantity and importance of these kinds of materials.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Robert. Before we wrap up this -- this discussion, I wanted to address the staff.

And when I think about this program, I think about other commemorative programs where we’ve had multiple coins involved. What comes to mind for me is the Star Spangled Banner and more recently the Marshal’s series through the program.

And in both of those, when we looked at the designs, we received portfolios where the artist or someone at the Mint had decided beforehand, for example, on reverses that bared the denominational
designation, which one was a half dollar, you know, designs -- which designs were half dollars, which designs were silver dollars, and which designs were gold coins.

And what we have found and ultimately approved was different. We would take -- like the other one was the Five Star Generals. We ended up taking reverses that were provided to us that all said half dollar and we ended up assigning some of -- we had assigned one of those in our recommendation for the silver dollar, one for the gold. And in that process it became very confusing for the Committee to manage and keep straight.

So my request, and I’ll put it in motion form if my colleagues agree with me, is that this time I’d like to try something new. I’d like to try a portfolio where the artists have prepared a series of obverses and a series of reverses.

Maybe you -- you have a placeholder, a nonsense indicator for denomination, X’s, whatever it might be. And then in our evaluation we’ll do what we usually do. We’ll pick the three highest obverses,
the three highest reverses and then we can sort out a recommendation of which we believe is more appropriate for which coin.

I think it would simplify what we need to do. And I know the members have been confused in these multi-coin programs before. So I see some heads nodding.

What would your reaction be, April?

MS. STAFFORD: So, as you know, we are always open to try something new. I think everything that we try yields results that informs how we move future programs forward.

Certainly from -- from our point of view there are many of our artists who design with the size in mind. They work very hard to conceive an idea for a gold coin that will read very differently than the silver.

So because we have to be very careful with our budget for each program and the number of artists that we assign, and especially in this case where we have a multi-year -- sorry, a multi-coin program that have so many possible ideas that we really do want to
see ultimately in a portfolio to see if they work together, we often have to try to steer our -- not steer our artists into a particular direction, but let them -- make sure that we break that apart so that we have a portfolio that covers that breadth.

So I would just say those are considerations. I don’t know if that would impede or how that may affect the idea that you’re -- that you’re talking about, but those are some of the considerations.

The design program managers are here, though. And I invite you to also share thoughts about that.

Anybody? Yeah, Megan. This is Megan Sullivan, design program manager.

MS. SULLIVAN: I can just say that, from experience, the artists are currently working on the Mark Twain designs, for example. And that was something that we had considered that -- that the obverses and the reverses could -- could mix and match. And it’s still true.

But I kind of ran it by some of our artists,
both staff and contracted, and said, you know, what do you think? And a lot of them do design for size.

They’re thinking, oh, my gosh, I can put -- I can do different things with a silver than I can with a gold.

And so to try to ask them to do a design that could work for either I think could be limiting to some of them. You know, not everybody works that way. But that would be my biggest concern is that they really -- some of them really do try to work for a certain -- a certain area.

In addition, there is the appearance that the gold is the more prestige product among those three. So I think that a lot of times even with an open idea, they try to put -- I don’t know how to describe it -- you know, a higher element, again, so that -- so that a silver or clad is more -- more popular, more friendly to young people whereas the gold might be a more esoteric idea. It’s hard to describe.

MR. MARKS: Yeah. I appreciate what you’re saying, but I will respond by saying that the obverse of the gold Star Spangled Banner was presented to us
as a silver dollar obverse. The obverse of the silver dollar was presented to us as a $5 coin. Clearly, it was better on the silver dollar.

We mixed up the Marshal’s program because what we wanted to recommend and what we -- with some of the experience that’s on this Panel have, we didn’t see it the same way.

And what I’m asking for is some simplicity for your recommending body to try to sort this stuff out. Now, if you can’t do it, what I will do at the next -- when we review these is I will change how you’ve presented the portfolio to us. I will take all the obverse --

MS. STAFFORD: We’re not saying we can’t do it.

MR. MARKS: Okay.

MS. STAFFORD: But we’d like to share with you the considerations that go into passing out these assignments and working with the artists. I know you all appreciate how much work goes into --

MR. MARKS: Right.

MS. STAFFORD: -- presenting them in a way
that we are properly managing our budget, our time to get the portfolio to you in a way where we’re not -- we’re limiting the possibility of having to come back to you.

Of course, this is a 2016 program so that’s especially of a concern here. Perhaps there’s more conversation that we need to have around this. Perhaps it’s a hybrid where we do assign these to our artists in the same way, but ask them to have placeholders for denomination and such.

MR. MARKS: Sure.

MS. STAFFORD: So I think there are opportunities. We just wanted to make sure that we -- as we do so, we’re not overcorrecting and getting ourselves into --

MR. MARKS: Yeah. You know --

MS. STAFFORD: -- a different pickle.

MR. MARKS: -- we shouldn’t make too much of an issue out of this. I mean, if -- if the artist wants to put a certain denomination on it, okay. Fine. We may just look at it differently, you know.

We may, when we get the portfolio, if it’s
-- if it’s segmented up by denominations, we may just reorder in our own way how we want to look at the -- the review.

So if it’s -- if it’s too much of a hurdle, it’s easier for you just to go ahead as you’ve done, that’s going to be fine. But I know that in the past it has been more of a challenge for us to try to --

MS. STAFFORD: Sure.

MR. MARKS: -- sort things out.

MS. STAFFORD: We can also -- to your -- just to expand on it. We can also support you in reordering the presentation based on a conversation that we have with you in between delivering you the portfolio and the actual presentation.

MR. MARKS: Okay. I’m confident we could work that out.

MS. STAFFORD: Yeah. Absolutely.

MR. MARKS: All I’m doing is looking for a way where the Committee can be focusing more on the art, itself, and not be confused about what -- what -- how it was presented, so we’ll work it out.

All right. Erik?
MR. JANSEN: I was -- I was just going to call out a couple of things. The legislation here does not -- it’s one of the more loosely-worded pieces in terms of required inscriptions and designations and things. Certain devices are required, but they’re not stipulated as obverse devices, reverse devices. So that gives us a ton of freedom here, which also makes it a challenge to harmonize kind of a free-for-all process. We’ve seen that happen, we’re removing “In God We Trust” and it sometimes messes with the visual balance and so forth.

I’m curious, when you -- Megan, when you put out the specs and the invitations to artists, does your accounting system require you to -- to tag given solicitations to a given end project? So we don’t have six designs here, we actually have three projects.

MS. SULLIVAN: In terms of our accounting systems?

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. SULLIVAN: We do in our -- in our system -- not put in the accounting system, but in how we put
in the requisitions and how we put in paperwork --

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.

MS. SULLIVAN: -- and all the --

MR. JANSEN: And that’s what I’m trying to understand.

MS. SULLIVAN: We do have to specify, you know, you’re assigned the gold obverse.

MR. JANSEN: So if we end up taking a design which is nominally for the gold and saying, hey, that’s a half dollar design, guys, do you change -- does that cause you a bunch of --

MS. SULLIVAN: It causes no problems. It causes no problems.

MR. JANSEN: No problem? Okay.

MS. SULLIVAN: It’s just a paperwork pain for us, but --

MR. JANSEN: Okay.

MS. SULLIVAN: -- (indiscernible).

MR. JANSEN: Okay. Okay. Yeah. It sounds to me, Gary, like -- like they’re really aware of what we’re trying to do. Because, gosh, we’ve all watched and seen the kind of mayhem that besets this process
sometimes when we are mixing and matching.

It sounds like a presentation where I think out of respect we need to give the artists the ability to identify what they’re intentions were, but at the same time reserve the flexibility. Because I agree with you 100 percent, it will really make the process better if we, upfront, realize we may be moving designations around.

I am so excited about this project it makes me crazy.

MR. MARKS: I do think one other very easy thing to do that we should is budget a little more time when we look at this program. I think some of those other multi-coin programs we maybe shorted ourselves a little bit and then we started mixing things up and it -- it cost time and then the members started feeling pressured that we were running out of time. And I don’t want to go there. So when we put the agenda together, let’s make sure we can avoid that.

So are there any other comments that we’d like to put forward for the National Parks Program?
MR. JANSEN: What’s the general timeline here for solicitation, presentation of art, so forth?

MS. STAFFORD: We will be bringing these designs back to you in June. And, as everyone understands, we need to make that work. So we want to bring a fulsome portfolio, deliver it in a way where we can make some very good recommendations. Because the manufacturing time table dictates that we’ll need to be moving very quickly on the afterward.

MR. JANSEN: Would there be any interest on your side, guys, from the National Park system, to develop any educational aids that go along with these?

I know the Mint has done a superb job of doing some historical education products. I’m seeing such a rich opportunity here and at the same time I’m seeing an opportunity where dozens of world-class pieces of artwork are going to fly by us here and only six are going to make it to the, quote, “light of day.”

And I hate to see so much effort maybe not go where somebody might want to use it.

MR. LEDBETTER: No. I think so, absolutely.
We haven’t had any internal discussions about that, but I think our interpretation -- interpretive and education program and our design folks would absolutely be interested in, you know, augmenting and looking into other pieces that could be a part of this.

MR. JANSEN: Would designs that don’t get selected for inclusion actually on a coin be available to the Park Foundation?

MR. WEINMAN: Was the -- repeat the question.

MR. JANSEN: Would designs that would be part of our solicitation that we would --

MR. WEINMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. JANSEN: -- would whittle out from the six ultimate designs, would the Park Foundation have access to those?

Can we use -- could they use --

MR. WEINMAN: We certainly could, yeah.

MR. JANSEN: -- them for other things?

MR. WEINMAN: The answer -- yes. We would -- when we -- and we’re talking about designs that
come out of our contract artists that are our IEP artists?

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. WEINMAN: We purchase the designs.

MR. JANSEN: The U.S. Mint or --

MR. WEINMAN: And so --

MR. JANSEN: -- U.S. Government?

MR. WEINMAN: U.S. Mint. But -- but -- but that means we could transfer them, yeah. So as long as -- probably they would need to be related to the coin program and we’d need -- we would need to construct whatever transfer it was accordingly so they couldn’t use the designs for other purposes.

But if it was related to the -- to the project --

MS. STAFFORD: The educational part.

MR. WEINMAN: Right. And then, in fact, the assignment and release that comes with each design that comes in is written broad enough to encompass use with the -- with the coin program.

MR. JANSEN: Has that ever been done before? I don’t remember having the discussion before.
MR. WEINMAN: Have we ever used designs that weren’t on the coin?

MR. JANSEN: Have the client or the constituent --

MR. WEINMAN: The recipient organization?

MR. JANSEN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. WEINMAN: Not that I’m aware of. I’m not -- I’m not aware of a recipient organization utilizing a design that was not selected for the program, but that doesn’t mean it couldn’t happen.

MR. JANSEN: Thank you.

MR. MARKS: All right. Is there anything else?

Are there any comments from the stakeholders before we break?

MR. RANO: I would just say to Heidi’s point, I think it’s a really interesting one. And, you know, the Foundation and the Service, this is one part of a push around the Centennial to engage Americans in celebrating the parks.

And I think, Heidi, what you put forward ties into things that we’re talking about in other
aspects of our engagement and publicity and getting people excited about different parts that we’re talking about internally and with the Service.

So from that perspective, I think it’s a great idea, as are all the others. This was very informative. And I want to thank you for having us so.

MR. MARKS: Great. Thank you. We’re going to take a break -- I’m sorry.

MR. LEDBETTER: Oh, yeah. I’d just like to say --

MR. MARKS: I’m sorry.

MR. LEDBETTER: Oh, no -- no problem. Just some parting words and also echo the thanks for the opportunity to be in front of the Board.

A lot of great ideas were -- were surfaced through this discussion. I want to echo the need to use this opportunity to depict the aha moment was mentioned earlier. And at the heart of the Park Service’s mission we very much try to lead people to those aha moments. I think those encapsulate an awful lot about what the Park Service is about.
The -- the debt that we owe to Native Americans and the need to be respectful of that and inclusive is also an absolutely spot-on recommendation.

I’m going to take back the recommendation about our collections and just do some initial reach out to some of those folks and see if there’s something that might surface there. That was a great thought, as well, and the match-up designs. Something that echoes some other things we’re doing.

So just thank you very much. A great discussion. A lot of food for thought and we really appreciate it.

MR. MARKS: Thank you. We’re going to take a recess for 15, 20 minutes. And when I can gather you all back, we’ll get going again.

We’re in recess.

(In recess at 10:32 a.m., until 10:50 a.m.)

MR. MARKS: Okay. All right. We’re back on the record. And our next item is a discussion about concepts and themes for potential special products for 2016.
So, April, can you enlighten us on all of that, please?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes, sir.

These are potential special products for 2016. They would include 24-karat gold 100th Anniversary coins for the Walking Liberty half dollar design, the Standing Liberty quarter dollar design, and the Mercury Dime design.

So some background. 2016 marks the 100th anniversary of three iconic United States Mint coins, specifically the designs for Standing Liberty quarter dollar, the Mercury Dime, and the Walking Liberty half dollar. So to commemorate these milestones, the United States Mint is considering offering each of these coins, coin designs, in .9999 24-karat gold.

On these potential products the original 1916 designs would be featured on each coin as the artists originally intended. If pursued, the exact size and weight of each coin will be determined through research and development.

But, of course, if the Committee has any ideas or thoughts on these, we’d love to hear them.
today, as well.

Potential finishes for these coins might be proof, reverse proof, enhanced proof, or uncirculated. And, again, as with all of these 24-karat gold coins, if this concept is pursued, the United States Mint would seek secretary of the treasury approval to strike these gold coins under authority of 31 U.S.C. 5112(i)(4)(C).

To give you some design history on each of these, the Standing Liberty was designed by Herman A. MacNeil to replace the Barber half dollar. The initial design included a bare-breasted Liberty, which proved scandalous for some influential individuals. The complaints against the design were sufficient to force a change in 1917.

The redesign was extreme to the opposite degree or thought by some. Instead of covering Liberty’s breast with the same flowing material as the rest of her gown, MacNeil clothed her in chainmail.

The reverse was also redesigned in 1917. The eagle was centered on the coin and three of the 13 stars were placed beneath the eagle. Beginning in
1925, the dates on the coins were recessed giving them more protection from wear.

For the Mercury Dime, of course it was designed by Adolph A. Weinman to replace the Barber dime which had been in use since 1892. This new design featured a portrait of Liberty facing left wearing a winged cap.

Due to the resemblance to the Roman God Mercury, the coin became popularly known as the Mercury Dime. The reverse features a Roman fasces and an olive branch indicating America’s military readiness, but also her desire for peace. The Mercury Design -- Dime is considered one of the most popular in all of American numismatics.

For the Walking Liberty, after winning a competition created by the Commission of Fine Arts in 1915, Adolph A. Weinman’s now iconic Walking Liberty was born.

Since 1986, a modification of Weinman’s obverse design has been used for the United States Mint’s American eagle silver program. So with that background information, I’d
like to turn it over to the Committee for questions and discussion.

MR. MARKS: Yeah. I have some immediate questions. Are you retaining the denomination for each of these?

MS. STAFFORD: So I would like to invite Jason Laurie, one of our program managers from sales and marketing, to come up or Nanette Evans, who works in our sales and marketing, to comment.

So -- okay. So would you -- I’m sorry. Would you repeat the question for --

MR. MARKS: The question is we’re looking at a dime, quarter, and half dollar.

MS. STAFFORD: Uh-huh.

MR. MARKS: Well, we -- if we’re going to celebrate these dimes, quarters, and half dollars, are we celebrating those or are we celebrating something else?

What are you going to do denominations?

MS. EVANS: The intent was to emulate the coins in its original design back in the time. But the denominations, we wanted to keep the denominations
the same as what it was years ago.

MR. MARKS: Okay. So we’d have a gold dime?

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MARKS: Okay. I’m loving that. I think that’s -- so are -- on the quarter, are we keeping the controversial bare breast?

MS. EVANS: That’s open for discussion. Because initially that was our thought, but it was controversial back in the day. So we just wanted to get your recommendations on whether we continue with the design knowing that the bust is going to be revealed and it’s going to be controversial.

MR. MARKS: For my two --

MS. STAFFORD: Of course --

MR. MARKS: I was going to give --

MS. STAFFORD: -- and --

MR. MARKS: -- my two cents on it.

MS. STAFFORD: Well, of course --

MR. MARKS: Or my 25 cents on it.

MS. STAFFORD: And I would just add, of course, that would mean if -- this would impact whether this were pursued or not because this is all
predicated on the idea of honoring the 100th anniversary. So if it were not that design, it would not be the 1916 design and --

MR. MARKS: Right. I -- thank you. I think if you want to honor the 1916 Standing Liberty quarter, you need to honor it.

MS. EVANS: Absolutely. And we just wanted to get your feedback on that.

MR. MARKS: I’d like to think we’ve come a little bit of a distance since 1916 and we can handle what was intended for this -- this coin.

MS. EVANS: Absolutely.

MR. MARKS: My next question is are we talking -- if we want to honor the design, these designs were created for these coins in the diameters that they were issued. So it was a dime, a quarter, and a half dollar, each of them were the size, obviously.

So if we’re -- if we’re doing that, are we talking about fractional gold?

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MARKS: We are?
MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MARKS: Okay. So what -- what would be the bullion content of each? Do we know that or is it just going to be whatever it happens to be or are you going to try to strive for a tenth, a quarter ounce, what have you?

MS. EVANS: That’s what we’re striving for, a tenth --

MR. MARKS: So a round --

MS. EVANS: -- and a quarter. Yes.

MR. MARKS: -- some kind of round, fractional indication?

MS. EVANS: That’s correct.

MR. MARKS: Okay. I had -- those -- those are my questions. Someone else?

MS. STAFFORD: So if I -- so I could add really quickly. So, of course, that latter I think is what sales and marketing intended when they indicated that some of that would have to be worked out through research and development.

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MARKS: Yeah.
MS. STAFFORD: And just -- just for the record because we’re discussing it, I would be remiss if I did not share with this Committee that when we presented the high-relief designs to the Commission of Fine Arts last week there were comments from two of the members that some of those obverse designs they found to be offensive.

They did not specify which designs. And but I would want to share that with you. Of course, you know you are familiar with that portfolio and understand that they are fully clothes.

And if I could ask the callers who are joining in via conference call to mute your line, please.

So I just wanted to introduce that because I think given that information, and it has been picked up by some of the numismatic press, it would be helpful if this Committee could speak to that specifically in regard to the 1916 Standing Liberty design. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Well, I appreciate your direction. There have been private mints that have
taken these very designs and they’ve put them on one-ounce silver planchets, you know, without the denomination. And I think that’s wrong because the artist designed these particular coins to fit the pallet, the size of the coin. And I think it would be a shame to try to put them on some other different size. It’s just not what they were designed for.

So, Mike?

MR. MORAN: I’ve got a couple questions first. What date are you going to place on these coins?

MS. EVANS: We’re looking to put a range.

MR. MORAN: In the 16, 16?

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MORAN: Okay. Be a little tough to fit that in, particularly on the Mercury Dime. Are you going to saddle these coins with the inscription .999 Fine one or --

MS. EVANS: Yes. We have to.

MR. MORAN: You’re going to ruin them, quite frankly. Because you end up with the one dime, then .999 Fine, and I don’t -- well, maybe you can find
someplace to put it that is unobtrusive. I hope you can because I feel like you’re going to do this.

Please stay to the original planchet diameter. If you end up trying to deal with the gold, do it through the thickness of the planchet and not the diameter. Please stay true to the designs.

And I think you’re going to have a difficult time with those dates. I think you have to think about that. You may want to -- I would suggest a 2016, but I just don’t -- you know, you look at that time and you put it on a dime-size planchet, yeah, I think you’re headed for trouble there.

So to the quarter, first of all, that was not MacNeil’s intended design. There were modifications made at the Mint. You can check. That’s a historical fact. And that is really why they went back in 1917 and modified it. MacNeil never saw or signed off on the 1916 version. This is just history for you.

And the Mint was so embarrassed about it that they waived the 25-year rule, just overlooked it, even though the design was placed in circulation and
allowed the adjustments.

As to the covering up of the breast, there’s all kinds of numismatic lore and most of it’s crap, by the way, about those kinds of things. And you should ignore it.

And you should ignore the comment about, as Gary said, the breast being exposed. I having personally owned a 1917 version and it is handsome, it is well done, it’s tastefully done. And you should stand the -- I don’t think you’ll get any criticism out of that at all. You may -- there’d be one or two prudes, but I was very surprised that you got that out of CFA of all places.

So if you go forward with the gold, I think that’s the format you need to go with. And if you’ve got to put the 999 Fine on it, okay. Hide it somewhere. Don’t put it out there where it’s bold.

I’d also like to throw out another suggestion particularly on the 1916 quarter. There were only 52,000 of those minted. Most of them are not in uncirculated.

And I think it would be really neat if you
guys would come out with these coins in silver and make a package of it or sell them separately. But in the terms of the silver, I think you really ought to look at putting the date 2016. You absolutely cannot put 1916 on these because you’ll mess up the marketplace and cause all kinds of controversy.

And one way you might do it is also have them strike at West Point so you’ve got a W Mint mark. But there’s some things to think about on that. But I really think that if you’re going to put them out in gold, you ought to put them out in silver, too.

MR. MARKS: I guess I have a follow up for legal counsel. Greg, does the Mint have legal authority to strike these as coins in silver?

MR. WEINMAN: Questionable. And I can’t give you an answer sitting here.

MR. MARKS: That’s okay.

MR. WEINMAN: We don’t have the same legal authority for silver coins that we do for gold.

MR. MARKS: Right.

MR. WEINMAN: It’s unlike -- it’s unlikely.

MR. MARKS: I love the idea, Mike.
MR. MORAN: Yeah.

MR. MARKS: I wish it could happen. And if it can happen, I would -- I would be very supportive of it. But --

MR. WEINMAN: I think it’s -- I think it’s -- I think it’s unlikely that we would have the authority right now without legislation.

MR. MARKS: Okay. I would agree with Mike’s comment not to do the dual dating.

MS. EVANS: Okay.

MR. MARKS: These are classics.

MS. EVANS: Okay.

MR. MARKS: I would have preferred you not to do the dual dating on the Kennedy half dollar, too. I guess it turned out all right. But especially two of these are smaller planchets and the way the dates on the Walking Liberty half dollar, it’s going to change the feel of it because you’re -- I don’t know. I’m not a big fan of the dual date.

MS. EVANS: Okay.

MR. MARKS: Heidi, do you want to go?

MS. WASTWEEET: First of all, I like this
program. We talk a lot on this Committee about doing modern designs and looking ahead to the future, but we still do want to honor our heritage in this organization. And so I think this is a very exciting project and I’m looking forward to seeing it.

As far as the metal content information, is it possible to edge letter that? I know the dime is very, very tiny. Is that a possibility?

MS. STAFFORD: Do we have -- Steve Antonucci, are you on the line?

MS. KELLEY: Not Steve.

MS. STAFFORD: Okay. Stacy Kelley?

MR. ANTONUCCI: I’m here. I’m here.

MS. STAFFORD: Oh, go ahead, Steve.

MR. ANTONUCCI: No. I’m sorry. Ask the question again.

MS. WASTWEEET: Hi, Steve. Is there any possibility of edge lettering these with the gold content information?

MR. ANTONUCCI: Oh, on the dime?

MS. WASTWEEET: Yeah. It’s pretty small.

MR. ANTONUCCI: Yeah. That’s extremely
tiny. I would have to say no, Heidi.

MS. WASTWEET: Okay.

MR. BUGEJA: You -- this is Michael. You might also want to consider privy marks. I mean, their intention is for issues just like this. If you have to put the -- the 999 percent gold, you might want to experiment with that.

MS. WASTWEET: Okay. Okay. My second comment is we’re talking about being true to the original image of the sculpt. Let’s also consider the original finish to the coin.

Some of our -- I’m presuming you want to do a proof version of this.

MS. EVANS: Yes.

MS. WASTWEET: But let’s also think about the original finish of these coins. They were not highly frosted like some of the modern gold pieces that we’re doing right now. And that might unintentionally obscure some of the original design. So let’s be sensitive to the finish. That’s it.

MR. ANTONUCCI: What was that finish, Heidi? Do you know?
MS. WASTWEET: Say that again, Steve.

MR. ANTONUCCI: What was the finish, do you know?

MS. WASTWEET: I’m not the historian.

MR. MARKS: Chime in there, Mike.

MR. MORAN: Steve, it was basically uncirculated. I’m not even sure they did proof issues of any of these. In fact, I’m sure they did not do proof issues of any of the three of these.

MR. ANTONUCCI: Okay.

MS. KELLEY: And, Steve, this is Stacy. Just looking at the pictures here it -- I agree with what Michael just said. It looks like it’s just basically a circulating finish.

MR. ANTONUCCI: Okay.

MR. MARKS: I guess I would add to that that the way you did the Kennedy series, I think that was nice. There was proof finish, there was uncirculated finish, and so forth. I don’t know if you need to do it to the extent you did it with the Kennedy.

If you had to do just one finish, I’d say do the uncirculated because that’s what going -- if you
want to honor the design, the guys who designed these never intended it to have those sharp contrasts. It might be interesting to see if you get itchy and you’ve got to do it, okay. It would cause a buzz. But I would first make sure you’ve covered your bases with the -- something that approximates to the original, uncirculated finish.

MR. ANTONUCCI: Okay.

MR. JANSEN: I -- I would stand here and really encourage you to trust the judgment and advice of the two really world-class historians we have on this Committee, Robert and Mike. I mean, these guys know what they’re talking about.

MR. MARKS: Numismatic historians.

MR. JANSEN: Absolutely, the numismatic experts here. They really know what they’re talking about. And I would only echo specifically stick to the original diameters, make your -- make your gold assayer work on thickness, stick to the original finish, don’t -- don’t shotgun blast the market. Well, we’ll offer this in proof and uncirculated and this and that, no.
Go with the original finish. Don’t buff it out, don’t make it crazy. Just do the best possible -- I mean, do it with the integrity that they did it in 1916. They did it with heart.

I love the idea of some kind of a silver cohort piece. Greg, does copper nickel get a different answer than silver?


MR. JANSEN: No. I was hoping, but I knew better, didn’t I? Yeah. And I wouldn’t -- I wouldn’t -- I wouldn’t push to the point of breaking one’s self on that effort. That is to say, don’t turn these into like-diametered metals in order to get out from under the monetized currency governing law.

If you can’t do it in a kind of 2016 restrike mode, don’t hurt yourself. Just go forward with the gold. I would tell you, this would be a knockout product. I mean, we’re not talking tens of thousands of units. This would be a knockout project if there was a silver 2016 restrike available in the three coins in a set. Bar the doors knockout product.

MR. MORAN: Everybody that -- everybody that
collects these coins will have to have it, period.

MR. JANSEN: I mean, you would go through seven digits of product volume. But I would strongly encourage stick to finish. I’m a little different than Gary on this. Don’t -- don’t muck up the dates with 1916 - 2016. Don’t do it. You’ll make -- on the dime you’ll destroy the date field, on the half you’ll destroy the -- the plateau that she’s walking on, and on the quarter you’ll just run out of space and you’ll have to split the lines or make the font so small it’s just crazy. Don’t --

MS. WASTWEEET: So you’re saying just do 2016?

MR. JANSEN: 2016. Don’t change the relief profile, don’t fix the wear problem on the quarter, don’t do it. Don’t worry about public comments about the -- the propriety issue on the Standing Liberty quarter. Truly, all press is good press.

It isn’t political truth. It happens to be a marketing truth. And stand in the wind, as Mike encouraged you. You’ll get a few letters. You’ll get a few letters if you don’t do anything at all. We’ve
already seen that. So don’t worry about a few letters you get.

I think it’s a great product. Keep it simple. Don’t do 18 different varieties and we’ll have a great product. Thank you.

MS. LANNIN: I find it amazing that in 2015 somebody is complaining about something that’s almost 100 years old, a design. That just blows me away. I agree with my colleagues, I think it should remain one date. I think it should remain the original finish. I think the art should remain as intended.

And but I’m really concerned, I want the diameter to be the same. Worry about the thickness, do whatever. But and if there’s a way to make this in silver, sign me up.

MR. VIOLA: Well, I just concur with my colleagues. The -- I love the idea of a silver product if at all possible. And I certainly would hate to see double dates on that. I think it would really just ruin the appearance.

So I do think it’s a brilliant idea and let’s try to have the silver as an option.
MR. MARKS: Thank you, Herman. I’ve got a quick -- quick question for Greg. Greg, something in the recesses of my mind tells me that in statute it says the Mint has the authority to strike platinum in any denomination.

MR. WEINMAN: That’s true. We have broad platinum authority.

MR. MARKS: So we could produce a silver colored version of this coin or these coins?

MR. WEINMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. MARKS: Do it.

MR. JANSEN: You wouldn’t sell a million of those.

MR. MARKS: No. But you’d sell -- you’d sell a number. Oh, yeah.

MR. MORAN: Yeah. Guys, that’s a good idea.

Don’t -- don’t --

MR. MARKS: Don’t dismiss that idea.

MR. MORAN: No. No.

MR. MARKS: That’s powerful.

Jean?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Gary. I
would like to congratulate the Mint on your recent
Lincoln penny where you restruck that basin. It’s
absolutely superbly beautiful.

And my question is are -- are you intending
to do the same thing with these coins to strike it
with a depth in the basin or are you going to make it
flat?

MS. EVANS: I defer to you, Stacy.

MS. KELLEY: Yes. I think that that’s
definitely an option --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Good. I would
encourage --

MS. KELLEY: -- that we can look into.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I would encourage you
to do that because, you know, that’s what makes these
coins so fabulous is that, you know, we have that
depth. The thing that has been so annoying to me is
our recent coins have been struck so flat we’re losing
-- we lose the image. And I think it’s unjust to the
artist that worked so hard to do these designs and
then we -- then we strike them so quickly and so
shallowly we don’t have power in them.
So that’s my only comment except if you could put the 9999 on the edge would be great. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Go ahead, Tom.

MR. URAM: Okay. I think it’s a great idea. I guess what I’m thinking about, though, is the -- are you going to sell all three together?

I think the packaging should be different to commemorate this event versus the traditional packaging that is for the three-piece sets now. I could see this more in the Teddy Roosevelt portfolio type where you could have the story of all three artists and the history behind the packaging. I just think that the packaging can create a get historic event versus just the piece with a -- with a bifold and so forth. So I would encourage some creativity in the packaging.

Are you going to sell them by the threes -- a three pack or you’re not that far along or?

MS. EVANS: We’re not that far along. But the thought was actually to offer them individually as well as a three-coin set.
MR. URAM: Okay.

MS. EVANS: But it’s still under discussion.

MR. URAM: Right. Well, however you did it, you know, each one should -- if you did a standalone, once again, not the normal just flip box with the encapsulations. I think it ought to be something that’s very creative and artistic in design.

I have to kind of respectfully consider the silver aspect that everyone’s talking about because I look at it if I own a 1916 quarter and you give me a silver one that even though it’s dated 2016, I don’t know, it’s kind of like when Redbook -- the original Redbook was reproduced again. You own the original Redbook, you own the original one and it taints the market.

So I understand where my colleagues are coming from, but if I owned the 2000- -- the 1916, I wouldn’t want it redone in silver personally.

MR. MARKS: How do you feel about platinum?

MR. URAM: Platinum, I don’t know. I’m op-- platinum’s different. Silver in color, though.

MR. MARKS: All right.
MR. URAM: But I under- -- I respectfully just have to consider that further. But I would be very concerned if I owned the original that --

MR. MARKS: Yeah.

MR. URAM: I love that I think we’re going down a different path on that. But the three -- three-piece gold one, just make sure that it’s really -- this is a great opportunity to honor and celebrate this occasion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARKS: I don’t think you need to worry, Tom. And I think it’s off the table. I don’t think it’s there.

MR. URAM: So I can go out and buy one now.

MR. MARKS: You know, actually thinking more about the gold and platinum, if I’m a person on a limited budget and I want to buy one of them, personally I’d buy the platinum.

MR. JANSEN: Are you?

MR. MARKS: I would.

MR. JANSEN: I would, too.

MR. MARKS: I’d buy the platinum first.

That would be --
MR. JANSEN: So would I.

MR. MARKS: -- my priority.

MR. JANSEN: Yeah.

MR. MARKS: Robert?

MR. HOGE: I concur with all my colleagues’ comments here. And I think it’s really thrilling to see these wonderful designs from 1916 being honored in this way because these are such an important part of our entire heritage of American coinage.

I think we missed the boat, for instance, with the March of Dimes coins in not doing them in the dime format. And here I think we’re going to be able to capture something that will be really desirable for collectors. Thank you.

MR. MARKS: All right. Thank you, Robert.

Are there any other follow ups or comments?

Heidi?

MR. BUGEJA: Just to -- just to --

MR. MARKS: Oh, go ahead, Rob- -- Michael.

MR. BUGEJA: -- Michael --

MR. MARKS: Go ahead, Michael.

MR. BUGEJA: I just wanted to weigh in on
the 1916 bare breasted Lady Liberty. I think you have to go with that. And, you know, there are other designs of wonderful coins that are coming up in the next few years. And I’m thinking of the 1921 peace dollar. I know it’s somewhat off, but, you know, the original design was the eagle breaking the sword.

And I don’t know if you’ve ever seen that design. It’s truly fetching. A wonderful coinage package would be to -- to reproduce the 1921 peace dollar in gold with a concomitant silver with the original reverse. Just a numismatic curiosity, but I thought I’d throw it out there. That’s all.

MR. MARKS: Okay.

MS. WASTWEET: I just want to add, thank you for bringing us in this early in the conversation so that we can have this --

MS. LANNIN: Yes.

MS. WASTWEET: -- this input. I really appreciate that.

MS. EVANS: Thank you.

MR. MARKS: And so we’ll just wrap it up. And I’ll just make a final comment that as far as
putting the bullion -- the designation on there, I wouldn’t do it. You’re not selling a bullion coin here. You’re selling a commemoration of these coins as they were in 1916.

I think the people who buy them, they’re going to know. You’re going to put it on the packaging, you know, obviously what -- what it is. I think that’s enough.

MS. EVANS: Okay.

MR. MARKS: Everyone will understand what it is, what the content is. I would -- I would totally honor the art as it is.

MR. JANSEN: I’m in on that one. Michael Bugeja had a really insightful comment that I don’t want to get lost in here. Privy marks. Use a privy mark on your .999 thing if you can --

MS. EVANS: Okay.

MR. JANSEN: -- if that’ll cover your bases because that will allow you to -- to include it, hopefully not destroy some important negative space in the design, comply, but not overwhelm.

Because if you were to take just for the
Mercury Dime, for instance, if you were to take that dime designation -- well, that was well done whoever’s running the screen here.

If you were to take the dime designation and just kind of flatten that font and then lay the .999 above it, it’s pretty subtle. But I’d rather see a privy mark in some soft, subtle field.

MR. WEINMAN: Gary?

MR. MARKS: I would indicate that that privy mark would simply be small letters AU for gold.

MR. JANSEN: There you go.

MR. WEINMAN: Gary?

MR. MARKS: A small AU would say that it’s gold.

MR. WEINMAN: Just a comment on that, just briefly. While we probably have legal authority to have flexibility with respect to any inscription on this type of a gold coin, there might be other -- other reasons why we need to identify the gold content. There could be consumer protection reasons that we need to do so.

MR. MARKS: Okay. Would --
MR. WEINMAN: And so I would take it under advisement, but I can’t say here sitting at the table without doing the research that there might not be other authorities or other --

MR. MARKS: Understood.

MR. WEINMAN: -- regulations out there --

MR. MARKS: Sure.

MR. WEINMAN: -- that would require us to identify it.

MR. MARKS: Is it possible if you have to do that to minimize it? Like, I mean, it’s understood what AU means or would it have to be the English word gold?

MR. WEINMAN: Although that doesn’t necessarily identify the fineness. It could be --

MR. MARKS: Okay.

MR. WEINMAN: -- it could be 24 karat or 22 --

MR. MARKS: If you had to do that --

MR. WEINMAN: -- be 22 karat.

MR. MARKS: -- use the complete .999AU.

MR. WEINMAN: But there might be other ways
to do it.

MR. MARKS: I’m suggesting if you have to do it, find a minimal way of doing it. I think everyone would agree.

MR. WEINMAN: Understood.

MR. MARKS: All right.

MR. MORAN: Let me add one more thing. I would suggest also that it be basically where the Mint marks were on those original coins and that’s where you would put the privy mark. I think you put it -- you can do an AU and a 24 right above it and that says -- it gives you the pureness.

MR. MARKS: Yeah. Okay. Is there anything else?

Anything from staff?

Okay. I just want to, while we’re still on the record, talk quickly about our meeting in Portland. This Committee will be taking our road -- our show on the road and appearing for public input -- I’m pulling up the calendar here -- on March 5th. We’ll be having an all-day meeting in Portland, Oregon, as part of the American Numismatic Association
money -- what do they call that -- money show. The money show.

And then the morning of Friday the 6th we’ll be conducting a public input session between 9 a.m. and 11. And at that session we anticipate taking input from the public about various coin design issues, thoughts, ideas for commemoratives perhaps, and also providing some educational opportunities for those who want to attend.

So I just want the press here to know of our plans and that we will be in Portland, Oregon, in March.

So is there anything members would like to add before we go?

MR. MORAN: A point of clarification, Gary, or a question. What nights are we on the Mint’s clock for this meeting in terms of what they’ll pay for?

MR. MARKS: I think -- I think we can get an answer off line, but let’s -- let’s get an answer for you when we’re done here.

All right. I think we’re done here. And I want to thank everyone for a fabulous two days. I
think we accomplished a lot. Thank for the -- to the staff for all of your -- both your preparation and your support here as we went through all of the issues. So thank you all and until we see you again in Portland.

We are adjourned.

MR. BUGEJA: Thank you, Gary.

(Adjourned at 11:22 a.m.)
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