

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

CITIZENS COINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TELEPHONIC PUBLIC MEETING

American Innovation \$1 Coin Program

Tuesday, July 31, 2018

1:02 p.m.

Department of the Treasury

U.S. Mint

801 9th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20220

Reported by: Nate Riveness

A P P E A R A N C E S

Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee:

Mary Lannin, Chair

Robert Hoge*

Erik Jansen*

Michael Moran*

Jeanne Stevens-Sollman*

Donald Scarinci*

Dennis Tucker*

Thomas J. Uram*

Heidi Wastweet*

Herman Viola*

U.S. Mint:

April Stafford, Chief of Office of Design
Management

Megan Sullivan, Office of Design Management

Vanessa Franck, Office of Design Management

Pam Borer, Office of Design Management

Betty Birdsong, Acting U.S. Mint Liaison to the
CCAC

Greg Weinman, Office of Chief Counsel

A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)

U.S. Mint (Continued):

Sheila Barnett, Office of Chief Counsel

Elizabeth Young, Office of Chief Counsel

Ron Harrigal, Manager, Design & Engraving

Mike Gaudio, Sculptor-Engraver

Joseph Menna, Sculptor-Engraver

Phebe Hemphill, Sculptor-Engraver

Press:

Paul Gilkes, Coin World

Mike Unser, CoinNews

Brandon Hall, Coin Update

*Appears via telephone.

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR LANNIN: It is 1:02 p.m., and I would like to call to order this telephonic meeting of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee for Tuesday, July 31st, 2018.

And before we begin, I would like to introduce the members of the Committee. Please respond "Present" when I call your name. Robert Hoge?

(No response.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Erik Jansen?

MR. JANSEN: Present.

CHAIR LANNIN: Michael Moran?

MR. MORAN: Here.

CHAIR LANNIN: Jeanne Stevens-Sollman?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Here. Present.

CHAIR LANNIN: Donald Scarinci?

MR. SCARINCI: Present.

CHAIR LANNIN: Dennis Tucker?

MR. TUCKER: Present.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thomas Uram? Tom, are you here yet?

(No response.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Not yet. Heidi? Heidi

Wastweet?

CHAIR LANNIN: Heidi Wastweet?

MS. WASTWEET: Present. Present.

CHAIR LANNIN: Herman Viola?

MR. VIOLA: Present.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Herman. Okay. I am Mary Lannin, and I will chair today's meeting.

We have a very abbreviated meeting today, and we are going to consider only one item. We are going to review the candidate designs for the 2018 American Innovation \$1 Coin Program.

But before we begin the proceedings, are there members of the press on the phone that we can take your names?

MR. GILKES: Paul Gilkes, Coin World.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Hi, Paul.

MR. UNSER: Mike Unser, CoinNews.

CHAIR LANNIN: Hi, Mike.

MR. HALL: Brandon Hall with Coin Update.

CHAIR LANNIN: Hello there. Anyone else? Are there any --

MR. MORAN: Mary? Mary? This is Mike? Who is there from the Mint?

CHAIR LANNIN: I am just about to ask that, Mike.

MR. MORAN: Okay.

CHAIR LANNIN: For the record, I would like to acknowledge the following Mint staff that are participating in today's public meeting: April Stafford, Chief of Office of Design Management; program managers from the office: Pam Borer, Vanessa Franck, Betty Birdsong, acting liaison to the CCAC; Greg Weinman, senior counsel to the CCAC; Megan Sullivan, lawyer extraordinaire, who is attached to the Office of Design Management. And who else?

MS. BARNETT: Sheila Barnett, Office of Chief Counsel.

CHAIR LANNIN: Sheila, Sheila Barnett, Office of Chief Counsel.

MS. YOUNG: And Elizabeth Young, Office of Chief Counsel.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Thank you.

And who do we have on the phone from

Philadelphia, please?

MR. HARRIGAL: Ron Harrigal here, manager,
Design and Engraving.

CHAIR LANNIN: Hi, Ron. Anyone else?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Mike Gaudio.

CHAIR LANNIN: Hi, Mike.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Hi.

MR. MENNA: Joe Menna.

CHAIR LANNIN: Hi, Joe.

MS. HEMPHILL: Phebe Hemphill.

CHAIR LANNIN: Phebe. Okay. You guys had
better --

MR. HOGE: And Robert Hoge. I am here.

CHAIR LANNIN: Oh, hi, Robert. Glad that you
made it. Okay.

MR. HOGE: I had trouble.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Are there any issues
that need to be addressed not relating necessarily to
this program or anything that the Mint would like to
have to say?

MR. TUCKER: This is Dennis. I have something
I would like to say about the legislation if that is

not inappropriate.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. When we get to that point, Dennis, I will be sure and call on you. How is that?

MR. TUCKER: Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: But before we have any discussion of the legislation, I would like Betty Birdsong to go through the story behind this and the need for quickness on all of our parts. So, Betty, could you talk about it just a little bit, please?

MS. BIRDSONG: Okay. So, as everyone knows, H.R. 77, the bill, actually passed on July 20th. So that condensed the timeline for the Mint to get this design going. We are looking at the 2018 coin today. And the 2018 coin specifically says -- and it should have been on that page, but it specifically says that a representation of the Statue of Liberty -- and that is a common obverse. And the reverse is -- it has to also feature the inscription the "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA," "AMERICAN INNOVATORS." And the reverse is a representation of the signature of George Washington on the first United States patent ever issued. So those

are the conditions of this particular bill for the 2018 coin.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Thank you very much. And, by the way, I was online looking at the patent, and it was signed today, July 31st, 1790. So that is kind of cool that we are talking about it.

Okay. Now, Dennis, would you like to make a comment?

MR. TUCKER: Yes. I just wanted to bring up some complaints that I heard within the hobby community and my own observations on the legislation for this particular coinage program. And I know that we have spoken with the Mint and folks in the Treasury Department about this. Putting the date and the Mint mark on the edge of the coin, rather than on the obverse and the reverse, where collectors can see them easily, is problematic from a pneumatic standpoint. So I understand that this legislation has been written and passed into law. So the ship has sailed. But it is really something that the Congress should keep in mind in the future.

Another thing I wanted to bring up is I think

there is a fundamental error with the wording of the legislation of this coin program. The program is clearly titled "American Innovation," but the wording for the first coin is mandated to be "American Innovators." And from an editorial viewpoint, it is weak. It is very problematic. I don't know why there would be that error there. The program is called "American Innovation." The text is "American Innovators."

And it might seem minor, but it is an important semantic strengthening because if a state or territory innovated in some nonphysical way; for example, if it is the first day to allow women to vote or if they innovate in a religious freedom or some other intangible sense, then "innovators" might not be the right word. "Innovation" continues to be a right word.

I don't know if it is too late to get that changed, and I realize that all of these designs that we are looking at do obey the mandated wording, but if there is any way to changes that, I would recommend that we change it to "American Innovation," which is

probably a little bit --

MS. BIRDSONG: Dennis, if we would look at the amended bill, section 1 says that the act should be cited as "American innovation dollar coin."

MR. TUCKER: Okay.

MR. WEINMAN: Maybe. Yes, it may be cited.

MS. BIRDSONG: So the Mint will look at it in that way. And thank you so much for those observations.

MR. TUCKER: Well, what I am saying is --

MR. WEINMAN: It is the way you want to do it.

MR. TUCKER: -- they call it "American Innovation," right? But the --

CHAIR LANNIN: Dennis, you are fading out. I don't know if you have got a bad connection. Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: Yes? Can you hear me?

CHAIR LANNIN: Yes. You were fading out.

MR. TUCKER: Yes. The distinction is that the legislation --

MS. BIRDSONG: We need to hear the phone.

MR. TUCKER: -- is "American Innovation."

Right?

CHAIR LANNIN: You are still fading out.

MR. TUCKER: Yes. Can you hear me now?

CHAIR LANNIN: Yes.

MR. TUCKER: Is that better?

CHAIR LANNIN: Yes. Please?

MR. TUCKER: So the wording of the program is "American Innovation." Right? The American Innovation \$1 Coin Act. So what I am getting at is the name of the program is "Innovation," but what was mandated to be on the coin is "Innovator."

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Excuse me. This is Jeanne. But if each coin has an innovator on it, as George Washington is on this one, wouldn't that be correct?

MR. TUCKER: Each coin might not necessarily have a human innovator. It might have something symbolic or representative of an innovation. So it is not necessarily going to be a human form. And the example I gave was if a state was innovative in some nonphysical way; for example, if it was the first day to allow women to vote or if it was innovative in religious freedom somehow, you see, those are more

intangible --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Right.

MR. TUCKER: -- innovations that don't necessarily lend themselves to being represented by a single person or group of people. And then also but the bigger thing is, just from an editorial viewpoint, why not make it the same word? I mean, it is the American Innovation Coin Program or Dollar Program. Why not have that wording on the first coin be "American Innovation"?

MR. WEINMAN: But, once again, you understand that this is what the legislation requires.

MR. TUCKER: I do, yes.

MR. WEINMAN: Okay.

MR. TUCKER: And I did preface my comments with that. I know that the ship has sailed.

MR. WEINMAN: Right. So this is your comments for the record that the way the legislation is drafted could be a bit ambiguous for the larger program as far as what is featured, not to put words in your mouth?

MR. JANSEN: I actually had the same comment. I would further add I think we are going to be heading

into difficult territory in the next few years as this first one features the innovators, yet -- and I don't have the bill in front of me, and I can't recall it exactly, but I think it specified that we can't have the bust or the visage on the reverse of any of these coins.

CHAIR LANNIN: That is correct.

MR. JANSEN: And I think we are going to run into trouble there.

MR. HOGE: Hello. This is Robert. I would like to comment here also. It seems to me that the inscription put on this proposed new coin is in violation of the legislation.

MR. TUCKER: No, no. This is Dennis. Robert, there is an exception made within the legislation for this first coin. In fact, this first coin is the only one that is mandated to have the words "American Innovators" on it. The others will not. So they won't even have that --

MR. HOGE: I understand, but this seems very peculiar because this thing is really not honoring the innovator, Samuel Hopkins, who had the first patent.

He is not involved at all in this except in background knowledge.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIR LANNIN: All right. Understanding, of course, that these are the eight designs that we must work with today. I would like to ask April to begin talking about this program.

MS. STAFFORD: All right. Just to reiterate the information Betty provided, the common obverse for this 15-year program must feature a likeness of the Statue of Liberty as well as the inscriptions "\$1" and "In God we Trust." As, I believe it was, Dennis Tucker noted, as specified in the legislation, the year of minting, the mint mark, and the inscription "E. Pluribus Unum" will be incused on the edge of the coins.

And as for the reverse, beginning in 2019, four coins will be released every year, one for each state, territory, and the District of Columbia. To start the program, the legislation allows for an introductory coin, to be released in 2018, with the

reverse featuring George Washington's signature on the first United States patent as well as the inscriptions "American Innovators" and "United States of America."

We will, of course, be talking to this Committee as well as the Commission of Fine Arts in the future about the 2019 coins, but today we are looking at the candidate designs for 2019.

There is a single candidate design for the obverse. It features a --

CHAIR LANNIN: Twenty-eighteen. Excuse me.

MS. STAFFORD: Sorry. There is a single candidate design for the obverse of the 2018 coin, which will continue as a common obverse throughout the program. It features a rework of the iconic Statue of Liberty design used on the reverse of the presidential dollar coin.

I know we will come back to a discussion on that, but, just moving ahead, the legislation for the 2018 dollar coins must feature the inscription "United States of America" as well as "American Innovators" and a representation of the signature of George Washington on the first United States patent issued.

And we have eight designs for you, which I know the Committee members have in front of them. So Madam Chair?

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you very much, April.

Robert, would you like to begin our discussion?

MR. HOGE: Okay. Fine. I am afraid that these designs are really pretty insipid, and I am kind of disappointed. I would prefer one like number 1 or number 2 or number 7 or number 8 that has George Washington's signature plainly written right across the center of the thing, rather than having it floating.

I think that showing individual feathers is not a very good idea because they don't necessarily translate as the pens, for which they are probably intended.

And, number two, I don't like seeing the disembodied hand. It reminds me too much of the Addams Family's Thing.

CHAIR LANNIN: It.

MR. HOGE: Seeing the 13 stars on number 5 is attractive, but I don't think it really adds to it

particularly.

Number 6 has too much empty space. And having the name of Washington on the scroll I think is really not too great because the scroll is not explained.

The little ink pot on number 4 looks too much like a teacup to me. You think of how tiny this is going to be.

The great seal is not going to be a great seal. It is going to be a very tiny seal if it appears as number 3.

My favorite of these probably would have to be number 8, although I can't really justify it very much. Sorry.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you very much, Robert.

Erik?

MR. JANSEN: Yes. Good afternoon. I feel pretty much like Robert does. Given the magnitude of a new series here, even though the 2018 design is described pretty explicitly, I think we are missing the entire message here, which is that there is a system called the patent system, which is designed to

essentially -- I dare use the word "reward" -- maybe incentivize is the better approach -- innovation in the form of granting the innovator a monopoly for commercialization. We call that the patent system. And I feel like it is totally being missed here and all we have done is glorify George Washington's signature, calling that art. And I don't think it is any of those things.

I think there is just an enormous creative gap here. And so, as a result, I am probably not going to support any of these. And I would encourage the rest of the Committee to vote their conscience in that sense and potentially withhold a recommendation on that basis.

Forced to choose something here -- and I use the word "forced" as in if the Committee is to rubber-stamp something here, I think we have to pay attention to the context here, which is a legal document, a legal system called the patent system. And in that sense, I think a number of the symbols in these eight designs that we have are inappropriate. Certainly a cap, as in design number 2, a hat is probably inappropriate. I

think design number 1 lacks any creative content whatsoever. It is graphical layout only.

Design 3 at least has the implication of a sovereign endorsement with the eagle symbol and a written script of feathers or the written product of a feather.

Design number 4, the symbols are wrong.

Design number 5 is just an amalgam of things.

Design number 6 at least carries the concept of there is a legal document or some form of human writing involved.

And 7 and 8, it is kind of a cute design with a sunrise, but I am not quite sure why that is appropriate here.

I am not impressed. I am, quite frankly, not happy that the Committee is being asked to rubber-stamp a process here under the mandate of deadline, deadline, deadline.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you for your thoughts, Erik.

Mr. Moran?

MR. MORAN: Thank you, Mary.

First of all, I want to point out that while this is basically a one-off coin for 2018, the obverse is not. It is going to be with us for 14 years. To begin with only one, which is a retread, to me in terms of what to choose from is unacceptable. This was simply unacceptable.

I mean nothing in the way of disrespect on Don Everhart's work, though I think it is a slam against the Mint that we can't come up with a new rendition of the Statue of Liberty.

Now, then, as to the reverses, I think if they conform to the letter of the act in terms of the specific quadness of the reverse, that they are far from the spirit of the law itself. This goes back to what Erik said about the fact that it involves the patent. Why couldn't we do more on the reverse theme that includes both Washington's signature, which is required, and the Patent Office? The Patent Office was and I think should be an important aspect that fosters our American innovation by protecting the people who do the innovation so that they can be rewarded and

compensated for their time and effort. It is an issue that is just as valid today as it was in 1790, as you can see from the issues we have in China.

As to the reverse designs, I would throw them all out. They are terrible in terms of what I would want them to see. They could have at least put a seal from the Patent Office on there, anything. But what we did was just go through the motions.

And I go back to the law itself. And the exact wording as to why we are doing 2018 is that the secretary may, not shall, issue a coin for 2018. In fact, it goes exactly like this, "If the secretary finds that it is feasible and cost-effective, the secretary may mint and issue a \$1 coin in 2018 to introduce the series of coins described in this subsection."

Well, first of all, it is obvious from the quality of these designs that it is not feasible. Secondly, if you think that you are going to make some money on this in the collecting market, you have got something else coming.

I am sick looking at this. It makes me sick

because it shows the man in a very poor light. Somebody has decided to force this thing through, and it is a big mistake. And I, for one, am going to decline to review this. I will not submit any ratings on any of these designs whatsoever. It is just unacceptable.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you.

MR. HOGE: Excuse me. This is Robert. I would like to second what Mike just said.

CHAIR LANNIN: All right. Thank you very much, Mike.

Dennis?

MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I agree with Mike. I think it is unfortunate that we don't have choices for the obverse, and I agree with Mike. The work of Don Everhart is excellent, but it would be nice to have a portfolio to review, rather than just one design, especially since this will be part of a 14-year program.

When it comes to Erik's and Mike's comments on the U.S. Patent Office, I would again just mention that American innovation is not necessarily about invention,

physical, tangible invention, or patents, you know. And, again, we have got many years ahead of us and many states and territories that will be defining innovation in their own terms. We could have philosophical or religious innovation, cultural, artistic, linguistic, social, creative, lots of different kinds of innovation in America, not just the invention of tangible products or scientific achievement even. So that is something to keep in mind.

In terms of the reverse designs that we have been given, again I have to protest the wording "American Innovators." The name of the program is American Innovation. But looking at these simply as, you know, the portfolio that we have to review, if I had to decide on one, it would be either 7A or 7B. These are the only ones that really made any sort of creative use of the title of the program, American Innovators in this case, and that this first coin is the only coin that will have that wording. So I would like to see it in a more creative typographical view that we see in 7A or 7B. Of the two, I am assuming that 7A is a -- these are different forms of relief.

One is incused, and the other one is raised. I assume
7A is raised. That would be my preference.

I guess that concludes my comments.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Dennis.

Donald, would you like to have a word?

MR. SCARINCI: Well, there are two good things
I could say.

CHAIR LANNIN: Stop the presses.

MR. SCARINCI: Well, first, you didn't drag me
to D.C. to look at this crap. So I am happy about
that. Okay?

(Laughter.)

MR. SCARINCI: I would have been miserable if
I had come all of this way --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh, too.

MR. SCARINCI: -- just to do this, right?

The second good thing, you know, to be
positive, is that there is no dead president portrait.
So the only dead thing we have, you know -- and as much
as it is a great piece of heart that Don Everhart did.
Been there, done that. It is a retread. It is a great
design. It was a great design when he did it the first

time. But we don't really need to do it again, and we certainly don't need to make it the common obverse on a series that is going to last God knows how long.

So, you know, all I can really say here is, you know, it is time for Americans to boycott U.S. Mint products. This is the time. I would not buy this series. I would not want the Mint to package these designs, these coins with any other product that I do want to buy. This is something where America has to vote with its pockets and vote no. And until America votes no, this stuff that we get, you know, and that we get blamed for, you know, this is the kind of thing, this is the kind of thing, that has to stop.

And it is unfortunate that, you know, the vision of a great, new Mint director that we finally have that is here to change things, do things better, do things differently and he is going to be saddled by something that, even though he had nothing to do with because he didn't vote for it -- he is not in Congress -- we are all stuck with it. Right?

And all I could say to you at the Mint is, you know, I understand, you know, the timeframe of this,

but we have done short timeframes before. And you can't tell me that it is impossible because you did a Congressional Gold Medal in 30 days. No private mint in the country could do that. You did it. So when you want to do it, you could do it. And we didn't have to be stuck with a common obverse that is a retread design. Brilliant retread design, by the way but a retread design.

So I have to say, you know, this is -- you know, being stuck with, you know, the George Washington signature, which could have been done more creatively, by the way -- you could have done something -- you know, you could have used the signature. There was wiggle room in the statute here to do something with the signature. It just said we needed the signature, right? It didn't say the signature had to be the only thing on the coin.

Who is going to buy this? I mean, you absolutely have to be out of your mind to buy this. So I am not voting for any of these designs, and I am not going to dignify any of these designs with comments. They don't deserve comments. The series if this is the

way it is going to start is only going downhill. So maybe if nobody buys it, maybe it will just end and just die unceremoniously and be relegated to a half a page in Dennis' red book. And it would be a sad half a page, which maybe should be done in black as if it is a -- you know, to mourn how bad designs could be that come from the United States Mint.

I thought we saw bad designs. This is horrible. This is beyond horrible.

So I am glad I didn't come. I am glad I didn't take the trip. And I am glad this is on the phone because these are the only saving graces to this program.

I am not voting for any of this. I agree with Mike. You know, Dennis, you shouldn't have even discussed. I mean, how could you? How could we? What is there to say, you know, that these last two bad designs are better than the other bad designs? They are all bad designs. And what we are really being stuck with here is the obverse, which is going to be the design for the whole program.

CHAIR LANNIN: No.

MR. SCARINCI: So this reminds me of what happened in 2004 when we sat there looking at the "Hurry up. Hurry up. We have got to vote for this" presidential dollar program. And we at the CCAC, you know, wouldn't consider it. We wouldn't consider redoing the old, traditional portraits, which, of course, we are now going to redo in silver as medals, and we are going to pretend they are medals, which is silver bullion. So we are still going to do what we want to do, but this is a disservice to -- it is really not just even a disservice to collectors. It is a disservice. It is a disservice to the greatest country in the world, who is stuck with designs like this.

What is the message we are sending out? We can't do art, that we are bad at art, that we are so bad? I mean, it is a terrible message. This is a terrible coin. I don't want my name associated with it. I am not voting for it. And all I can do is urge Americans to boycott the program.

I am done.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Donald.

MR. SCARINCI: Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Heidi? A voice from the West Coast. What would you like to say? Heidi? Heidi, are you there?

MS. WASTWEET: Oh. Sorry. I have trouble with my MUTE button. Can you hear me?

CHAIR LANNIN: Yes, now we can hear you.

MS. WASTWEET: Okay. Well, that is a hard act to follow. First of all, the obverse design, this redoing of the Statue of Liberty, it was a reverse before and now we are designating it as an obverse? Am I understanding that correctly?

CHAIR LANNIN: I believe that is correct.

MS. WASTWEET: We have had conversations on this Committee before about making distinctive choices about obverses being easily separated from reverses. And this just confuses that issue even more by taking an obverse design and now making it -- or taking a reverse design and making an obverse design.

And I agree with what everyone else has said about we should just have a fresh, new design anyway, even though this is a nice design. But beyond that, the confusion of obverse/reverse I think is a really

bad idea.

As far as the other designs here, you know, this series is supposed to be about innovation. These are the least innovative designs I have seen in my eight years on this Committee. And nothing in there says anything about innovation. The symbolism of a quill pen, which has been used for thousands of years or a roll of parchment that speaks more about ancient Greece than about America, none of this says innovation.

And I would like to point out in the legislation, this is an optional coin. We don't have to release this. And, looking at these designs, that is my opinion that we are better off not putting out anything, rather than putting out something so dull and so non-innovative. It really puts a bad mark on the face of the Mint to even have this out there. I would rather just we do nothing instead. If the timeline is an issue, if you can't come up with better designs than this, than I say we just don't do anything at all.

That is all I have.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thanks, Heidi.

Jeanne?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Thank you, Mary.

When I first opened this package, I was kind of overwhelmed with disappointment truly. You know, I agree with all of my colleagues. The only thing that I would like to ask is the obverse design. Is this a way of saving the Liberty program? And do I understand it correctly that this is a one-time first coin to use this particular Liberty image and that in the future, we would be choosing other Liberties for the obverse? Can someone from the Mint answer that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The legislation does require that this introductory coin obverse would be the common obverse for the rest of the series.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: For the rest of the series?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is right.

CHAIR LANNIN: There is no wiggle room in that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. They both point to the same subparagraph, 2A, introductory coin and then the subsequent.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: So the subsequent years issued would be this same image?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Now, for the reverse designs, you know, I have to agree with what everyone has said. These are very weak designs. There is just no power behind them. There is no guts behind them. And we have to always think about this is the art in your pocket. If this is a dollar coin, this is what you are going to be exchanging with the public for 15 years. And to do, I don't think that this is a very wonderful piece of art to do that.

Now, I have heard from collectors. You know, Mike has insisted that this is not good. And as an artist, as a designer, I can't see where this has any merit at all. And I am sorry to say this for the Mint artists that probably worked very hard on this, but, then again, they didn't have a whole lot of time. So I am probably also not going to support these designs.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Jeanne.

Herman, are you on the phone?

MR. VIOLA: Oh, I am here, and it is a very interesting conversation. I would have to say I agree with everyone here. When I looked at these designs, I thought, is this the best we can do for innovation, creativity in this country? I mean, I share the feeling that we should put better art out there for people to watch, to look in their pocket.

Now, you know, with Dennis, if we are forced to take these designs, I would say 7A is the one that was the least objectionable, but if there is a way we can just say no to this whole effort, I am with that idea.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Herman.

Okay. I would like to clarify something. Some of us seem to feel that 2018 American Innovation \$1 coin is optional. I do not believe that it is.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is.

MS. BIRDSONG: It is.

CHAIR LANNIN: It is optional?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is. It is definitely within the secretary's discretion to do the 2018 --

MR. MORAN: Mary, I read the exact wording from the act out for you.

CHAIR LANNIN: So I don't know where I read something where he had decided that yes, we were going to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I am not aware that he has made that decision.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. So this still does remain optional?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. That is good to know. All right.

MR. SCARINCI: Mary, can you tell us when it is appropriate to make a motion to reject all designs?

CHAIR LANNIN: Can I --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hey, Don, tell them right.

MR. MORAN: Can I do it first?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Whoever wants to do it.

CHAIR LANNIN: First of all --

MR. URAM: Tom here. I will do it.

CHAIR LANNIN: Excuse me. Excuse me. We need to have Tom Uram give his thoughts, and then I as chair would like to give my thoughts. Thank you.

Tom, would you like to go next?

MR. URAM: Just real quick. And for the record, I got on just before Erik spoke, about 10 after. I was late from an appointment.

But, anyhow, I think we finally have a series that will be worse than the Susan B. Anthony dollar. You know? So Mike and I and a few others have talked about this. And we have all gotten some correspondence. But I would be in favor of what everyone has said. And I am ready for Don's or Mike's motion at any time.

That is pretty much it.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Thank you, Tom. All right. Now I would like to say something.

Perhaps I was misunderstanding the fact that I thought we had to do the 2018. And so I was trying to look at these designs. I, too, am not happy with what

we were presented in a very short period of time. I thank the artists at the Mint for working under the time constraints to try to put something together.

I had a thought about something for the reverse design number 1 that could possibly be considered because we are required to use Washington's signature. If the background could be textured somewhat to resemble parchment, that might provide just a little something.

And then I was thinking of taking Washington's signature and going from the bottom sort of left, let's say, at the 8:00 o'clock position up to the 2:00 o'clock position, and have it go toward a vanishing point so that the G would be slightly larger and then the Washington would extend onto infinity as just sort of symbolic of just the beginning of innovation. That was about the only comment that I could make on these.

I listened to what Dennis said on 7 and 7A. They are way far down on the list as far as I am concerned. The sun reminds me -- I didn't know why I am thinking Sunkist raisins or something. I look at the sun, and that just struck me.

But those are my thoughts. If we were required, if we had to come up with something, I was trying to alter design number 1 with both texture and a vanishing point for George Washington's signature.

MR. JANSEN: Mary, this is Erik. Can I say something?

CHAIR LANNIN: Sure.

MR. SCARINCI: Is it a motion, Erik?

MR. JANSEN: For you, Donald, yes.

I don't think anyone on the Committee here is really complaining about the existence of the program. So I think it would be inappropriate for anyone to interpret what appears so far to be pretty much unanimous of those present that we have a program here. We respect that. But we don't have the creativity yet. We haven't had the time to do that. Mary, you're your comments were what would be more appropriate in your brainstorming process with this and not reengineering an artist's work.

I hear the Committee complaining about the art, about the timeline, about the urgency, and not the program, per se. And I think it is important that the

Committee respects what Congress has passed. I don't think any of us are questioning that. We are questioning the implementation of the program, trying to preserve the reputation of the Mint and, quite frankly, the integrity of what is a decade-plus-long series.

Thank you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Erik.

Would anybody else like to say anything?

MR. MORAN: Well, Mary, this is Mike.

CHAIR LANNIN: Yes, Mike?

MR. MORAN: I really think that the best course of action for the Mint is to can the entire 2018 effort and go with a 2019 and do it right. As far --

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Make a motion.

MR. MORAN: And that is just an observation.

CHAIR LANNIN: Make a motion.

MR. MORAN: I am going to make another motion.

CHAIR LANNIN: All right.

MR. MORAN: I have one of two ways to go on this. We can either reject all of the designs or we can decline to review. To get things started, I will

make a motion that the Committee declines to review this body of art.

CHAIR LANNIN: All in favor of Mike's motion?

MR. WEINMAN: Discuss. Discuss.

MR. MORAN: We need a second.

MR. WEINMAN: We need a second at this point.

MR. URAM: And I think perhaps some discussion first.

CHAIR LANNIN: Yes. Who said, "Second"? I couldn't hear.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tom.

MR. MORAN: It sounded like everybody.

MR. WEINMAN: We need an actual second.

CHAIR LANNIN: I need a name.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tom? Tom, you are on.

CHAIR LANNIN: So Mike made the motion, and Tom seconded it. And your motion is to decline --

MR. WEINMAN: To review.

CHAIR LANNIN: -- the review of the eight designs that the CCAC has been presented with for the 2018 American Innovation \$1 Coin Program. Is that correct?

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Any discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it would be probably less than effective to have such a vanilla motion. By that, I mean, I would add some reasons so that someone who has not been privy or had the opportunity to review what has been said on this Committee can understand it quickly and simply as to why we are doing this.

CHAIR LANNIN: Well, I believe we need to vote on Mike's motion first.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think we are having discussion, with all due respect, here.

CHAIR LANNIN: All right.

MS. WASTWEET: This is Heidi. I would like to make a comment.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay.

MS. WASTWEET: Instead of a motion to refuse to review, I suggest maybe we can say we consider recommending that the coin not be made at all, but before we make that decision, I would like to hear comments from the Mint staff on what they feel they

have on the comments they have heard from us so far.

MR. WEINMAN: What do you mean?

MS. WASTWEET: Would the Mint --

MR. SCARINCI: Well, the comments were universally bad. I mean, look, I think what we don't want to do -- I think it was you, Mike, who said this or maybe you, Erik. You know, obviously we respect and will do whatever we are directed to do by Congress. All right? And it is the implementation of this program with bad designs that we are all objecting to.

MS. WASTWEET: Right.

MR. SCARINCI: So I think refusing to review I think Mike's motion accomplishes that in a very polite way. I don't know that the CFA is going to be more polite than that. But I think what we don't want to suggest and what none of us are suggesting, you know, is that the program approved by our elected officials is not worthy of implementation. It is. It is this set of designs that is the problem.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you for clarifying.

MR. HOGE: This is Robert. I would actually

--

(Simultaneous conversation.)

MR. WEINMAN: Excuse me.

MR. HOGE: I think this was a very --

MR. WEINMAN: Excuse me.

MR. HOGE: -- poorly thought out and
implemented program.

MR. WEINMAN: Excuse me, Robert. Please,
reminder that this is being transcribed. Please speak
one at a time, and please identify yourself for the
record.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay.

MR. HOGE: Okay. This is Robert. Hello?

MS. WASTWEET: Robert, I wasn't quite
finished.

MR. HOGE: Hello?

MR. WEINMAN: Wait until the chair recognizes
you.

CHAIR LANNIN: Robert, please speak.

MR. HOGE: Hello? I would like to take
exception to that. I don't think this was a properly
thought-out program to be presented in Congress. I
don't think they gave it enough thought as to the

wording or the idea of what the coins would end up looking like. I think it is a bad idea to have the date and the Mint mark and the inscription around the edge.

Some of you may have seen the commentary in the most recent issue of Coin World about how this is not something that the public wants. And it is being forced to do something that collectors could buy simply to provide some revenue.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Thank you.

Heidi, I believe you wanted to speak next?

MS. WASTWEET: Yes. The question I was trying to ask the Mint is would they want the second chance to redesign or would they want to take the option of not producing this first coin in the series, as allowed in legislation?

MR. WEINMAN: I don't think the Mint is going to have an opinion at this point without discussing this.

MS. STAFFORD: Could you repeat that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, it is a classic.

CHAIR LANNIN: Could you repeat that, please,

Heidi?

MS. WASTWEET: Is the deadline an issue? Is that why we are scrambling to get these done? Is that a problem?

CHAIR LANNIN: This is a very tight deadline if that is what you are asking, yes.

MS. WASTWEET: Okay. So if they don't have time to redo these deadlines properly, then maybe the Mint would prefer to take the option to not produce the coin at all?

MR. WEINMAN: I don't think -- I am not sure the Mint is going to speak to a course of action at this point. This is the CCAC's opportunity to review and provide feedback. And the Mint, as always, will take that under advisement.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay.

MS. WASTWEET: Okay.

CHAIR LANNIN: Any further discussion before we vote on the motion, which is still open I think?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: I have a question. This is Jeanne. If we refuse to review the design, I think that wording is a little strange because we have

already reviewed these designs.

MR. MORAN: Jeanne, this is Mike.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes?

MR. MORAN: I think until we have had opinions on these designs --

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay.

MR. MORAN: -- but until we actually vote, we don't review.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mike.

MR. MORAN: Okay.

CHAIR LANNIN: So, Mike, would you like to state your motion again?

MR. MORAN: We, the Committee, decline to review these designs.

CHAIR LANNIN: And it was seconded by Tom?

MR. URAM: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Is there any further discussion before we vote on this motion?

MR. JANSEN: This is Erik. I would merely say I think to an outsider, this is not very informative.

CHAIR LANNIN: That it is not very what?

MR. JANSEN: Informative. Our rationale is not clear. Are we obstinate or do we have a reason?

MR. MORAN: This is --

MR. JANSEN: I would ask that the motion originator might truly consider adding some rationale to the refusal.

MR. MORAN: Erik, I am a bit at a loss as to what to add to it. For one thing, I think all of us feel like better designs could be submitted if the Mint would do that. We recognize that there is a tight timeline getting even tighter.

I think all of us also question the need for the issue of a 2018 coin. We have not gotten an answer on that one either as to whether it could be killed.

I think all of us have, at least indirectly, alluded to the fact that this is going to be a commercial failure, this coin.

There are so many reasons. We could just go on down the list. I think keep it plain and simple. We either decline to review and let the press dissect it -- Lord knows they have gotten an earful today. There are plenty --

MS. WASTWEET: Mike?

MR. JANSEN: Mike, with all due respect --

MS. WASTWEET: Mike, you could say --

CHAIR LANNIN: One at a time, please. I believe Jeanne started first, Erik.

MR. JANSEN: Okay. Okay.

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: Yes?

CHAIR LANNIN: I thought, did you say something?

MS. STEVENS-SOLLMAN: It was Heidi. It was Heidi.

CHAIR LANNIN: I am sorry, Heidi. Why don't you go first? And then Erik can go.

MS. WASTWEET: Mike, you could simply add the wording "refuse to review due to quality."

MR. MORAN: I am open to amendments. If you want to make that amendment, I will support it, Heidi. It is good.

CHAIR LANNIN: Erik?

MR. JANSEN: I would also potentially like to see an amendment, Mike, stating the poor quality under an unreasonable deadline and inappropriately so.

CHAIR LANNIN: And inappropriate?

MR. JANSEN: And inappropriately so.

MR. HOGE: Madam Chair?

CHAIR LANNIN: Yes?

MR. JANSEN: If I were being harsh, I would merely say, "We refuse to rubber-stamp a poor, poor quality done under an unreasonable deadline."

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay.

MR. HOGE: Madam Chair?

MR. MORAN: How about if we just say, "Due to quality and the pressure of a deadline"?

MR. JANSEN: I am for that. I would like that better. Oh, excuse me.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. So, Mike, your motion is the Committee refuses to review the designs due to quality and --

MR. MORAN: Due to quality of the designs and the pressures from a tight deadline.

CHAIR LANNIN: And pressures from deadline.

MR. MORAN: Yes.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. I think we had better before we keep adding to this -- all in favor of Mike's

motion?

MR. MORAN: As amended by me.

(Chorus of "Ayes.")

CHAIR LANNIN: Are there any nays?

(No response.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How did you vote, Mary?

CHAIR LANNIN: I am asking if there are any nays because nobody said what their names were before they said, "Aye." So I am just trying to get a count.

MR. URAM: Uram. Aye.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. And I vote for the motion as well. And so the motion passes 10:0. All right. Thank you.

MR. MORAN: Well, I want to apologize to the people at the Mint who are there. This was not the way I wanted to see this turn out.

MR. JANSEN: I would second that apology. Sorry that the deadline has been put upon us. And I would hope, quite frankly, that the Mint would, the Mint staff and this Committee would, take a big breath and truly assess the opportunity to take another 30 to 60 days to design some better art and then accelerate

the execution issues if they can be done.

CHAIR LANNIN: Thank you, Erik. And I would like to say that, under Mr. Ryder's tenure, I think we are going to have great designs coming out. And we can look forward to working cooperatively with the Mint in getting better designs and having agreeable meetings.

So thank you all for calling in today. If there is no business, other business, to come before the Committee, I would like to move to adjourn. Is there a second?

MR. HOGE: Second. This is Robert.

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. Robert seconds. All in favor of adjourning, say aye.

(Chorus of "Ayes.")

CHAIR LANNIN: Those opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIR LANNIN: Okay. The meeting is adjourned. It is 1:55. Thank you.

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, NATE RIVENESS, the officer before whom the foregoing proceeding was taken, do hereby certify that the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

NATE RIVENESS

Notary Public in and for the
District of Columbia

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, SARAH VEACH, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from audio to the best of my ability.

I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

August 3, 2018

DATE

SARAH VEACH