

1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 CITIZENS COINAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

10

11 Washington, D.C.

12 Tuesday, November 16, 2004

13 1:00 p.m.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S .

2 MR. NOE: Good afternoon, everybody. Ken,  
3 can you hear me okay?

4 MR. THOMASMA: You bet I can hear you.

5 MR. NOE: Great. Fantastic. First of  
6 all, welcome to our November meeting of the Citizen  
7 Coinage Advisory Committee. I'm Tom Noe, for anyone  
8 on the phone, which is only Ken, the recently  
9 appointed chairman.

10 I think the first thing we'll do for the  
11 record is instead of doing a roll call, we'll just  
12 have everybody go around the room and I'll first of  
13 all announce our newest member, Ken Thomasma, who is  
14 on the phone. I don't even know where we're calling  
15 you at now. Where are you, Ken?

16 MR. THOMASMA: Sacramento, California.

17 MR. NOE: Well, great. Welcome to you.  
18 It's your first official meeting. We'll start with  
19 Leon and work our way around the room.

20 MR. BILLINGS: Leon Billings, appointee of  
21 the Senate Minority Leader.

22 MS. WARTENBERG: Ute Wartenberg, chief of  
23 the American Numismatic Society.

24 MS. HARRIMAN: Connie Harriman, former  
25 CCAC chairman and I represent the general public.

1               MR. SANDERS: Mitch Sanders. I also  
2 represent the general public.

3               MR. FIVAZ: Bill Fivaz representing coin  
4 collectors.

5               MS. LAWS: Rita Laws, representing the  
6 general public.

7               MR. NOE: Great. Thank you very much. We  
8 do have a quorum based on that. My understanding is  
9 we need seven and we've got seven plus one. So just  
10 a couple of quick opening remarks.

11              First of all, I thank everybody for being  
12 here and a special thanks to all the Mint staff for  
13 all the hard work in putting these meetings together.  
14 I would like to welcome Madelyn Simmons who has been  
15 appointed officially, I think as of yesterday, as our  
16 official liaison to our committee. We're all looking  
17 forward to working with you, Madelyn, and doing the  
18 people's work, which is what we're put here to do, I  
19 think.

20              One sad note which I felt we needed to  
21 discuss is one of our original members that came out  
22 with us, Dick Bratton, who was one of our most  
23 colorful members and one of our most entertaining  
24 members, passed away recently. And our condolences  
25 to his family and to all of his friends which we all

1     were. He's sorely missed. His humor and his  
2     knowledge was unequalled and we will miss him dearly.  
3     And I think about him as probably attending more  
4     meetings by phone from more far away places than any  
5     person ever in the history of any organization.

6                 I remember when he was in Scotland and  
7     what we went through to get him on because we needed  
8     him for a quorum and him hanging in there for an  
9     extra 20 minutes the one day because we had one more  
10    action item that we had to get done and we had to  
11    have a quorum to do it.

12                So we're going to miss Dick immensely so I  
13    wanted to at least give him a note of excellence for  
14    all of the great work he's done for us.

15                The first order of business today that I  
16    want to do is appoint the executive committee to move  
17    forward. According to our bylaws, the chairman has  
18    the ability to appoint an executive committee to work  
19    with the chairman to carry out the business.

20                I've asked Mitch Sanders to be the vice  
21    chairman and in turn handle any meetings where I'm  
22    not able to attend. We've asked Ute Wartenberg to  
23    continue as secretary. And as I have previously  
24    stated, she didn't return my phone call quick enough  
25    so she automatically became secretary for another

1 year. And then our immediate past chair, Connie  
2 Harrison, I've asked her to stay on because of her  
3 historical wisdom and institutional memory.

4 So that will be the executive committee as  
5 we run forward and if we need committees, et cetera,  
6 we will appoint people as needed. I don't think that  
7 needs to be voted on, does it, Greg? I don't think  
8 so.

9 MR. WEINMAN: No.

10 MR. NOE: The other thing I would like to  
11 propose to the membership is a proposed calendar for  
12 meetings for 2005. All of these would be subject to  
13 cancellation but I think it's important we get them  
14 on everybody's calendar for now and I think these  
15 will fit well within the Mint's calendar as far as  
16 any new products and designs that we'll be needing to  
17 look at.

18 Our first meeting for 2005 will be on  
19 January 25th. Our second meeting will be on March  
20 15th. Our third meeting will be on May 24th. Our  
21 fourth meeting will be in conjunction with the  
22 American Numismatic Association meeting in San Jose,  
23 California on July 28th. And it was suggested that  
24 we possibly look at doing a side trip to the San  
25 Francisco Mint because we're only an hour, hour and a

1 half away from there. And I know that a lot of  
2 people found the Philadelphia trip very enlightening  
3 and very educational and I think it would make a lot  
4 of sense to try to work on something like that for  
5 that meeting.

6 Then we'll have a meeting on September  
7 27th and then once again the final meeting, if  
8 needed, will be on November 15th. That's our  
9 calendar for 2005. Anyone here have any objections  
10 to that, to those dates right now? If not, do we  
11 need a motion on that? I don't think we do.

12 MR. WEINMAN: No.

13 MR. NOE: So those will be our meetings as  
14 of right now. If there are any changes to that, we  
15 will give plenty of notice to that. But as of now,  
16 those will be our six meetings as of now and  
17 obviously we can have any additional meetings if  
18 needed on an emergency basis.

19 The next item I put on the agenda which I  
20 think needed some more discussion is there had been  
21 some discussions on the annual report about a couple  
22 of our commemorative coin recommendations, and I felt  
23 it was important to bring it back up to the committee  
24 again to get some clarification to it.

25 In general, it was recommendations of the

1 anniversary of the founding of the NAACP as well as  
2 the Boy Scouts and there were some questions raised  
3 by staff and legal counsel as to whether we could  
4 honor an organization like the Boy Scouts as an event  
5 or the same thing with NAACP, or if in fact we needed  
6 to honor individual people who may have been involved  
7 in the founding of the Boy Scouts or the NAACP.

8 I'm going to open it up for discussions  
9 but I would like to put this to bed because I think  
10 we need to get this annual report done and I think  
11 it's the last piece of what I would call the puzzle  
12 before we get this done. Any thoughts on this?

13 MS. HARRIMAN: I would like to know what  
14 the rationale is for there being a concern about  
15 this.

16 MR. WEINMAN: This is Greg Weinman, legal  
17 counsel at the Mint. The reason this came up is in  
18 the public law that establishes the committee and  
19 specifically under the duties of the advisory  
20 committee, the committee is to advise the Secretary  
21 of the Treasury with regard to the events, persons or  
22 places that the committee recommends to be  
23 commemorated by the issuance of commemorative coins.  
24 Organizations, therefore, are not specifically  
25 identified under that paragraph.

1           The concern that at least we bring to the  
2 committee's attention is that these two organizations  
3 are in fact not governmental organizations, not  
4 government chartered organizations, but rather are  
5 private organizations. The United States Mint, if we  
6 were to take action on our own authority, is  
7 generally prohibited from endorsing a private  
8 organization.

9           I acknowledge fully that Congress, on its  
10 own authority, can most certainly pass a  
11 commemorative coin bill that would honor a private  
12 organization. The Mint, as an organization, and then  
13 the Department is more cautious about that.

14           I also note that from a historical  
15 standpoint, there has not been a commemorative coin  
16 that has specifically honored, if you will, or  
17 commemorated a private organization. Rather, they  
18 have commemorated individuals who are directly tied  
19 to private organizations or theoretically have  
20 honored an event of national significance that may be  
21 directly tied to the organization.

22           So with that in mind, upon looking at the  
23 minutes of the last meeting, that was the concern, if  
24 you will, that was brought to the chairman's  
25 attention for your consideration and further



1 discussion.

2 MR. NOE: Is there any legal basis why we  
3 can't include it? Is it something that -- I guess  
4 it's always the Treasury's prerogative and the  
5 legislators' prerogative to reject anything that we  
6 put before them.

7 MR. WEINMAN: That's correct. In the  
8 event, the committee is under the oversight of the  
9 Secretary. The Secretary -- I can't speak for the  
10 Secretary. What could theoretically and what has  
11 happened with your predecessor committee -- could  
12 step in and say that's not what I want to be putting  
13 forward to Congress, theoretically.

14 I'm not saying they would or there would  
15 be an intention to do so. If there was something  
16 much more egregious coming out of the committee that  
17 seemed inappropriate, but -- and I have absolutely no  
18 information at this point that anybody in the  
19 Department at that level with the Secretary would in  
20 fact object to this recommendation.

21 However, I would like to point out that  
22 this is a little different than other recommendations  
23 that have been made before. And if you want to  
24 consider that, there was always the possibility of  
25 possibly recognizing instead the individuals that are

10

1 involved with these organizations or, rather, an  
2 historic event associated with these private  
3 organizations as opposed to the organizations  
4 themselves.

5 But legally, no, I can't tell you that  
6 there is any particular legal reason why you could  
7 not go forward with your recommendation and move that  
8 to the next logical step which would be to go to the  
9 Secretary.

10 MR. NOE: Any other committee members have  
11 opinions, if they would like to keep these included,  
12 not included, added in, not added in?

13 MS. WARTENBERG: I would suggest, as it's  
14 largely academic, whether we call it the event of the  
15 founding or whatever suggestions you can come up  
16 with, I personally wouldn't favor using the founders,  
17 as this is a rather different concept in particular  
18 in the case of the Boy Scouts.

19 But as we're looking at 2009 and 2010 and  
20 we have no reason to have to recommend something and  
21 really just stick to the one recommendation per year  
22 and then review it next year because we need to speed  
23 up the process.

24 MR. BILLINGS: Are you moving to drop the  
25 NAACP and the Boy Scouts from this year's report,

11

1 leaving just one recommendation each of those two  
2 years?

3 MS. WARTENBERG: Effectively.

4 MR. BILLINGS: I'll second that motion.

5 MR. NOE: So we have a second to it. How  
6 about any discussion about that?

7 MR. SANDERS: I think this makes sense.  
8 The question is should we put some specific language  
9 in place, some sort of placeholder that you're  
10 considering in your programs?

11 MR. NOE: I don't think we need to do  
12 anything. I don't think we're mandated to do that.  
13 Well, traditionally, there has never been more than  
14 two. I think that's why we've always put two. I  
15 don't think there is anything that says we have to  
16 have two.

17 MR. WEINMAN: No, there is no specific  
18 number.

19 MR. NOE: Any further discussion on this?  
20 If not, all in favor, signify aye.

21 (Round of ayes.)

22 MR. NOE: Oppose, same.

23 (No response.)

24 MR. NOE: So unanimously, we'll take those  
25 two out for the purpose of that.

12

1           MR. BILLINGS: Tom, does that mean the  
2 report is now ready to go?

3           MR. NOE: It seems to me there is -- Greg,  
4 is there anything else we need to do to get this  
5 finished up?

6           MR. WEINMAN: No.

7           MS. GRIMM: The other things have been  
8 done.

9           MR. BILLINGS: And no further actions on  
10 our part to get it out the door?

11          MR. WEINMAN: No.

12          MR. NOE: So be it. That's great. The  
13 next discussion point I want to discuss are the  
14 minutes of the September 21st meeting, to get  
15 approval of those. And I know some people may have  
16 had some discussion where they want to make some  
17 either changes, amendments or suggestions to the  
18 minutes. Bill?

19          MR. FIVAZ: Yes. Regarding the question  
20 that Dr. Remini brought up about us being informed of  
21 all design changes and things --

22          MR. NOE: Where are you?

23          MR. FIVAZ: I'm on the first page, the  
24 first large paragraph. The last sentence, the staff  
25 of the U.S. Mint agree to inform the chairperson of

1 the CCAC prior to such announcements. I thought that  
2 all of us were going to be informed.

3 MR. NOE: I think that's actually what we  
4 did agree, that they would at least get an e-mail out  
5 to all of us. So one amendment would be staff of the  
6 U.S. Mint agree to inform the members of the CCAC  
7 prior to such announcements? Is that fair? Madelyn,  
8 is that all right? Okay. Anything else? Rita, did  
9 you have something you want to talk about?

10 MS. LAWS: I have one. I think Bill has a  
11 couple more.

12 MR. FIVAZ: I have one more. Would it be  
13 possible, when we're discussing the designs that we  
14 reviewed, design 1 got 11 points to 10 points, et  
15 cetera, to put in the margin a representation of the  
16 design that we approved?

17 MR. NOE: For description, you mean?

18 MR. FIVAZ: Description or --

19 MR. NOE: That makes sense.

20 MS. WARTENBERG: My understanding is the  
21 sense that all the submitted documentation will be  
22 included as part of the minutes. So what you see  
23 here is just the text but in the back would be all --  
24 not just what we selected but everything. Is that  
25 correct, Melody?

1 MS. GRIMM: I'm not understanding your  
2 question. You're asking if I attach the designs to  
3 the minutes?

4 MS. WARTENBERG: Yes.

5 MS. GRIMM: No, not when I sent them to  
6 the Secretary. I can do that, though. It's very  
7 easy.

8 MR. NOE: That's an awful lot of paper.  
9 What we may want to do is -- Bill's suggestion is a  
10 good one, design one and we can have one thing. This  
11 is reverse of Mt. Rushmore or whatever design 1 was.

12 MR. FIVAZ: I think the quarter size  
13 illustration of that in the margin would be great.

14 MS. WARTENBERG: I think putting it in the  
15 margin requires -- you know, this turns into full  
16 mounting, but I think it isn't an awful lot of paper.  
17 It's easy to reduce what we were given as the large  
18 form ones. You can have an image of one page. But  
19 for the minutes, for the records, we keep these,  
20 don't we?

21 MS. GRIMM: Absolutely.

22 MR. FIVAZ: Pick up this, for example.

23 MR. NOE: So maybe we could get them all  
24 on one page.

25 MS. GRIMM: I can reduce what you actually

15

1 select.

2 MR. NOE: And that could be Exhibit A.

3 MR. FIVAZ: That saves us from going back  
4 and seeing what design 1 was.

5 MR. NOE: Good point. That's fair.

6 Anyone have objections to that? One other  
7 correction, then. What we probably need to do on  
8 these minutes is to take -- is to also delete the Boy  
9 Scouts and the NAACP from the minutes also, as an  
10 amendment, because it's in this because that was our  
11 original recommendation which went into it.

12 MS. WARTENBERG: But the minutes have in  
13 it -- you don't amend the minutes because that's what  
14 we did in the meeting.

15 MR. NOE: So we leave it in there?

16 MS. WARTENBERG: We amend the letter.

17 MR. NOE: Gotcha. That's fair enough.

18 MR. FIVAZ: I had one other question.  
19 Have we received any feedback on our recommendations  
20 about the circulating issues of Franklin and Hamilton  
21 or is it too early?

22 MR. NOE: The board hasn't gone out on  
23 that so it's a little early. The cart is definitely  
24 before the horse. How about that? Rita?

25 MS. LAWS: Real small suggestion. The

1 fifth paragraph, page 1, the paragraph beginning,  
2 "Ms. Anderson," third sentence down, beginning, "The  
3 committee members," I think it would be more accurate  
4 to insert the words "some of" as in some of the  
5 committee members expressed.

6 MR. NOE: Is it some of or the majority  
7 of?

8 MS. LAWS: We didn't take a vote so we  
9 don't know whether it was a majority or not but we do  
10 know that some people felt that way and some did not.  
11 The way it is now, it implies --

12 MR. NOE: So we just put -- so if you took  
13 the word "the" out and put "some"? Just some? Is  
14 that fair for an amendment for everyone?

15 MS. LAWS: It would also have to be  
16 changed on the draft.

17 MR. NOE: The letter itself? Okay. Any  
18 other additions or corrections? If not, a motion for  
19 approval to the amendments.

20 MS. HARRIMAN: So moved.

21 MR. BILLINGS: Seconded.

22 MR. NOE: Any other discussion? If not,  
23 all in favor, say aye.

24 (Round of ayes.)

25 MR. NOE: Oppose, same sign.



17

1 (No response.)

2 MR. NOE: Unanimous carries. Thanks.

3 Thank you, everybody.

4 Greg, do you have some operating  
5 procedures?

6 MR. WEINMAN: No. Nothing has changed  
7 since last meeting.

8 MR. BILLINGS: What about the letter to  
9 the Secretary?

10 MR. NOE: There isn't really a letter. Is  
11 this more -- it's more of a letter that goes with  
12 the --

13 MS. HARRIMAN: It's the cover letter.

14 MR. NOE: It's the cover letter.

15 MR. FIVAZ: There is a letter to the  
16 Secretary.

17 MR. BILLINGS: Yes, the October 2000  
18 letter draft.

19 MR. NOE: There it is. Okay. I'm back  
20 now. I'm with you. Do we want to talk about that?  
21 We did talk about the third paragraph of that.  
22 Anything else in this letter draft that we need to  
23 discuss?

24 MS. WARTENBERG: I think we should wait  
25 until -- we have other issues coming up and then we

1 incorporate all the changes from the minutes.

2 MR. NOE: Do you want to do both at once  
3 or separate? What's your preference?

4 MS. SIMMONS: I'm not sure. I don't have  
5 a copy.

6 MS. WARTENBERG: It is a shortened version  
7 of the minutes. So as this hasn't been sent, the  
8 question is now should we combine the two meetings  
9 into one letter.

10 MR. NOE: I guess I would prefer to see us  
11 send each letter for each meeting. I think that's  
12 the preference. They keep a record that way and then  
13 the only thing we're going to want to do is add  
14 something -- is this where you all would like to add  
15 something about the NAACP and the Boy Scouts or do  
16 you want to wait until the next week? Because  
17 effectively it's what we did at the meeting.

18 MS. SIMMONS: Right. So the same as the  
19 minutes, you're not going to remove that from -- that  
20 was discussed in this meeting so you'll leave it in.

21 MR. NOE: I guess my point is I don't want  
22 to wait another two weeks to send a letter to the  
23 Secretary, so I guess I would like to get this one  
24 done, ironed out and in the mail.

25 MR. BILLINGS: So Mr. Chairman, I

1 understand the only change that we're proposing to  
2 make in this letter would be to change "the" to  
3 "some" in paragraph 3 to comport with the minutes?

4 MR. NOE: That's correct. Anything else  
5 anyone else saw?

6 MR. BILLINGS: In that case, I move to --

7 MS. WARTENBERG: Can I, as a discussion  
8 point, raise --

9 MR. NOE: Let's get a second first.

10 MR. FIVAZ: I'll second it.

11 MR. NOE: Now go ahead.

12 MS. WARTENBERG: Sending in the letter as  
13 of now, I don't know how the timing of all this is.  
14 If you then spend another two or three weeks on the  
15 other letter that effectively corrects some of this  
16 material, if I were sitting there as a recipient, I  
17 would find that very confusing. But if you know what  
18 we're already sending in this letter is not correct  
19 --

20 MR. FIVAZ: But this letter just has to do  
21 with that meeting.

22 MR. NOE: I think accurately that's what  
23 we discussed at that meeting. I think we would  
24 correct it in the next line, but I think we almost  
25 have to leave it on there.

1 MS. WARTENBERG: Then I don't understand  
2 why that letter must be sent. We specifically didn't  
3 send the letter in order to correct it, isn't that  
4 right? So it should have been sent four weeks ago.  
5 If we're now going back on this, I don't get here the  
6 rationale of not sending it.

7 MR. FIVAZ: But we're correcting it here  
8 at this meeting.

9 MS. WARTENBERG: We were just told we are  
10 not correcting it.

11 MR. WEINMAN: Just a point of information.  
12 What's the purpose of the letter?

13 MR. NOE: I thought we had to send it.

14 MS. GRIMM: They send the letter.

15 MR. WEINMAN: As opposed to the minutes?

16 MS. GRIMM: Right.

17 MR. NOE: I guess the one question I've  
18 already had that I've never understood is, is there a  
19 reason why we don't have a cover letter that encloses  
20 our minutes? Is there a certain form it has to take?

21 MS. HARRIMAN: As opposed to having a  
22 cover letter that essentially summarizes the attached  
23 minutes.

24 MS. WARTENBERG: And it's almost as long  
25 as the minutes.

1 MS. HARRIMAN: I thought it was sort of  
2 Mint practice to have a summary of the minutes.

3 MS. WARTENBERG: I think initially we  
4 didn't send any minutes at all because there were no  
5 minutes, so then we just sent a letter summarizing  
6 them and then when we had minutes, we attached the  
7 minutes which turned out to be almost identical in  
8 wording. So now we're looking at the concept --

9 MR. NOE: Here is the timing. The timing  
10 of this and the reason we've sent letters in the past  
11 was we're trying to get feedback back to the Treasury  
12 so they can get the feedback back to states on our  
13 recommendations.

14 If we wait two months to approve the  
15 minutes before we send it on to the Secretary, our  
16 input is almost moot as far as what's going to happen  
17 in these states. And I think that's why we  
18 originally had the letters.

19 Now, timing-wise, we probably need to do  
20 it quicker. And first of all, if it's under my  
21 penmanship, it's my responsibility, if there are  
22 inaccuracies anyway, whereas the minutes are  
23 something the whole committee needs to approve.  
24 That's my thought. Greg?

25 MR. WEINMAN: Let me ask a question. I

1 think the -- and I apologize for trying to remember  
2 the history here with this letter. It may be based  
3 on the letter that the United States Mint generally  
4 receives from the Commission of Fine Arts after its  
5 meeting. The purpose of that is the quick hit on  
6 comments on that particular --

7 MR. NOE: That's exactly what I was  
8 saying.

9 MR. WEINMAN: That can be put in the  
10 package to the Secretary. Is this letter carrying  
11 that water? If not, then maybe --

12 MR. NOE: Yes, I think it is.

13 MR. WEINMAN: -- you should design  
14 something that's more for that purpose.

15 MR. NOE: A, I think it could be shortened  
16 but B, it should be more timely. I guess my point is  
17 from this point forward, I would like to see the  
18 next --

19 MR. WEINMAN: 48 hours.

20 MR. NOE: But I'm saying if within one  
21 week, we've got some sort of overview so we don't  
22 miss anything and within that seven-day period, we  
23 can get a letter out within 14 days, under my  
24 signature, if a letter goes out to the Secretary, I  
25 think it's important to do that.

1                   MR. WEINMAN: That would be very  
2   beneficial to the Mint.

3                   MS. HARRIMAN: Can I just comment on the  
4   history which is always, I think, helpful? I think  
5   initially we all were in favor of having a letter go  
6   out as soon as possible with an overview. And then  
7   there was an idea on the part of an actual member  
8   that the detailed minutes needed to be presented to  
9   the Secretary as well.

10                  Then that brought up the issue of, well,  
11   we have our overview letter but we don't approve the  
12   minutes until the following meeting so you have a  
13   real time lag of possibly almost one to two months.  
14   So that's what started creating this current problem  
15   that we now have.

16                  So I'm just reminding everybody that this  
17   really happened because of the idea about you have to  
18   have those detailed minutes.

19                  MR. NOE: I guess my druthers would be  
20   that in an extremely timely manner, meaning seven to  
21   10-day period, the letter go out underneath my  
22   signature to the Secretary with a brief summary of  
23   what happens at this meeting, especially in regards  
24   to any coins we look at or coin designs we look at.

25                  I do think minutes aren't a bad idea to

1 have for our own file. I don't think it's that  
2 important that the Secretary see the minutes of every  
3 one of our meetings. But that's up to you all as  
4 members of this group.

5 MS. HARRIMAN: I think the original  
6 concern was if the Secretary or his designee were  
7 interested in the details of discussion.

8 MS. LAWS: Exactly.

9 MS. HARRIMAN: That that would be  
10 available to them and there were other concerns about  
11 the proper representation of the meeting.

12 MR. NOE: How about this as maybe a little  
13 compromise on what we do. For instance, when we do  
14 the summary letter for this meeting, also included, I  
15 can say, are the approved minutes or the amended  
16 minutes or whatever from our September 21st meeting  
17 for your files.

18 That way we'll serve the purpose -- we'll  
19 be getting it to them a month or two later but  
20 they'll still be in the file as well as a summary of  
21 this meeting.

22 MR. WEINMAN: That would be very  
23 beneficial to the organization, yes.

24 MR. NOE: That way we're covering both  
25 sides but doing it in a timely manner. I guess I'm



1 concerned we're not being timely.

2 MS. WARTENBERG: Is that an amended motion  
3 from -- I'm just trying to keep this --

4 MR. BILLINGS: That requires a motion. I  
5 move the chairman be authorized to send a timely  
6 letter to the Secretary reporting of this meeting and  
7 any subsequent meeting and that that letter have  
8 appended to it minutes from the previous meeting as  
9 well.

10 MR. NOE: Second to that?

11 MS. HARRIMAN: Seconded.

12 MR. NOE: Any more discussion? All in  
13 favor, say aye.

14 (Round of ayes.)

15 MR. NOE: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. NOE: Great. I think that clears that  
18 up. We have our marching orders moving forward. I  
19 think that's going to be a better way to do it and  
20 make everybody happy.

21 MS. HARRIMAN: I think so, yes.

22 MR. NOE: Anything else for the good of  
23 the order before we go into old business? I think  
24 we've kind of covered old business, actually. Rita,  
25 was there anything else you wanted to talk about or

1 anyone else wanted to talk about on the South Dakota  
2 quarter?

3 MS. WARTENBERG: It seems to be that in  
4 the press was some indication about the view that  
5 Rita had expressed. And I just want to mention that,  
6 open that up for discussion, that maybe it wasn't a  
7 unanimous feeling of the Native-American population  
8 which was certainly something I added to my  
9 consideration of Mt. Rushmore as a design.

10 I personally like it enormously and I  
11 think it is a very good coin design, but I was very  
12 taken by what was being said. But in the light of  
13 what I have subsequently read, it's really a question  
14 whether we went a little bit extreme on how we  
15 phrased that as a committee.

16 MR. NOE: Any other comments on that? One  
17 suggestion that I had that I think we may want to  
18 think about is if we get into a scenario where there  
19 is a question about the design because of information  
20 that any of us would bring to the table, that we can  
21 go ahead and vote on it at that point, we can ask the  
22 Mint how timely it is, whether it needs to be decided  
23 that particular day because sometimes we're under  
24 very quick deadlines like we were on some nickel  
25 designs a year and a half ago, or maybe we would have

1 had enough time to come to this meeting and ferret  
2 out all the information to find out the accuracy of  
3 it and how deep-seated the concerns are.

4           And I think my suggestion in the future as  
5 we move forward is if we have a scenario where that  
6 happens again, we give it all the hearing time it  
7 needs so that we can make a good, informed decision  
8 so that there is no misunderstanding. Does that make  
9 sense? It's not something we need a motion but I  
10 just think it's a procedural thing as we go forward  
11 that I think we need to make sure everybody is  
12 comfortable with.

13           But it's also important that we do have  
14 committee members that have information, make sure  
15 they bring it. So don't be afraid to share  
16 information that you hear because it's important to  
17 hear that.

18           I give the example of the Ohio quarter a  
19 lot because I think it's an important one to share,  
20 that there was some controversy on the astronaut on  
21 the Ohio quarter and we argued that it looked like  
22 Buzz Aldrin, who was a living person and was not a  
23 generic astronaut like John Glenn or Neil Armstrong  
24 or any deceased astronauts. And we couldn't get  
25 anywhere in this discussion and finally a Toledo

1 Blade reporter decided to find a picture of Buzz  
2 Aldrin and it was an exact replica of Buzz Aldrin  
3 when he was on the moon and the design got changed.

4 So the point is we have to remember that  
5 these coins are around forever and what we don't want  
6 to do is put something out or make a recommendation  
7 that gets out that, A, is against a lot of the  
8 nation's wishes or people's wishes or, secondly, that  
9 historically or something would be inaccurate.

10 So if something comes to our attention, I  
11 think it's important we're diligent about it but I  
12 also think it's important we stay timely on our  
13 recommendations. So I just leave it at that.

14 MR. FIVAZ: The Nolan Ryan dollar is a  
15 perfect example. That's exactly the same issue.

16 MR. NOE: Anything else on that before we  
17 move forward on it? And I'll add one point too just  
18 for the public. We talked about it previously. If  
19 there are questions for the committee, then my  
20 recommendation is we try to funnel them to the  
21 chairman or in the absence of the chairman, the vice  
22 chairman, and then we can make the decision.

23 If someone is better versed in an area  
24 than some of the others, then the chairman or vice  
25 chairman can make the decision on where to send that

1 person to get comments so that we're all on the same  
2 page, too. The one thing I want to try to do is see  
3 that our committee looks like it's running on the  
4 same page as much as possible. I don't expect us all  
5 to agree all the time but I would like to make it  
6 look like it.

7 MS. LAWS: I certainly didn't mean to  
8 imply that the American Indians are in agreement with  
9 what I said. I was merely pointing out that many  
10 feel that. That's all.

11 MR. NOE: And don't take this as a  
12 personal affront on you. I think it's more  
13 procedurally in the future. It's not meant to be  
14 that. But I think it's better to air it out and get  
15 it out now. Let me just give an overview too.

16 Being in the numismatic field, like Bill  
17 is, Mitch and Ute, when something comes out that any  
18 of us were to write, sometimes it looks like you're  
19 talking on behalf of everyone, whether it's me or Ute  
20 or whoever. If we do an op ed piece, which we've all  
21 done, and it says in there, there are this and this  
22 members of the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee --  
23 everyone says, oh, that must be the committee's  
24 position.

25 MS. LAWS: I agree. It's very important

1 to say I'm writing for myself.

2 MR. NOE: And the views expressed are  
3 simply mine and not those of the committee. All of  
4 us cannot do enough to make sure that we say that as  
5 many times as possible when we do this. So I think  
6 it's just a good thing to put out on the table so  
7 everybody is on the same page.

8 Anything else for that? If not, we'll  
9 turn it over to Stacy, who is going to talk about  
10 some 2006 nickel designs. We're early so Stacy is  
11 not ready.

12 MR. THOMASMA: I'm due to go to a meeting  
13 and I want to say this has been really educational  
14 and I can't wait to come to the meeting and I can  
15 meet everyone in person.

16 MR. NOE: Well, we'll be looking forward  
17 to it. Welcome to the committee and we're looking  
18 forward to seeing you in January. Thank you, Ken.

19 MR. THOMASMA: All right. Have a good  
20 afternoon.

21 MR. NOE: Anyone want to do a song or  
22 anything?

23 MS. LAWS: Coin trivia?

24 MR. FIVAZ: Bill, you got a little coin  
25 trivia for us?

31

1 MR. FIVAZ: I've exhausted my knowledge.

2 MR. NOE: You've done it all?

3 I did note that it looks like our Marine  
4 design and our Justice Marshall design were both the  
5 ones that we were -- is that right?

6 MR. SANDERS: The one we chose for the  
7 Marines was similar to, but not the same. The  
8 Thurgood Marshall --

9 MR. NOE: Did they have the right  
10 lettering, though?

11 MR. SANDERS: I believe it says the  
12 Supreme Court 1801 to 1835.

13 MR. BILLINGS: I didn't think that was  
14 good.

15 MR. NOE: Well, we tried. We're running  
16 an efficient meeting. We're running ahead of  
17 schedule.

18 MR. BILLINGS: So according to your last  
19 pronouncement, Mr. Chairman, if we don't know what  
20 we're talking about, we should say speaking not for  
21 myself?

22 MR. NOE: That's perfect. That's well  
23 put. That's well said. Or if we don't know what  
24 we're talking about, we'll say, speaking on behalf of  
25 someone else and you can implicate that person while

1     you're at it.

2                 MR. BILLINGS: That's sort of a family  
3     reunion rule. Never miss a family reunion because  
4     you'll be the one talked about.

5                 MR. NOE: Or don't go out of town for a  
6     day or you'll end up secretary of the committee.

7                 MR. FIVAZ: There is an old trivia  
8     question on the Delaware quarter. The quarter horse.

9                 MS. LAWS: He jumped into that.

10                MR. NOE: Oh, man. I can't believe I took  
11     the bit, so to speak.

12                MR. SANDERS: I want to make sure I'm  
13     understanding this properly. We're considering  
14     Jefferson and simultaneous with the design that we're  
15     seeing -- we're considering the 2005 and 1938 --

16                MR. NOE: I think she's going to tell us.  
17     I think we're going to wait for Stacy to sell us what  
18     we're considering.

19                MS. HARRIMAN: There is a 2005 in here.

20                MR. NOE: What they're saying is we can  
21     consider that as one of the designs.

22                MR. SANDERS: An old design.

23                MS. HARRIMAN: This is the reversion back  
24     to Mr. Canter.

25                MR. NOE: I just remind everybody to grab



1     their packets out of the design because my  
2     understanding is the slides are going to follow.  
3     While Stacy is getting up here, I'm going to pass  
4     around the narratives from the South Dakota quarter  
5     because we did say that we all wanted to take a look  
6     at that. Stacy, do you have one in your packet?

7             MS. ANDERSON: Thank you.

8             MR. NOE: I'm here to take care of you.

9             MS. ANDERSON: Thanks. Stacy, why don't  
10    we start -- we had a question this morning about the  
11    narratives originally in the South Dakota quarters.  
12    Whose question was that? Refresh my memory.

13            MS. SIMMONS: Leon.

14            MR. BILLINGS: Because the issue of Mount  
15    Rushmore had been raised, I wanted to see what the  
16    narratives have said.

17            MS. ANDERSON: Narrative 1 is the one that  
18    calls for just Mount Rushmore alone and then  
19    narratives 4 and 5 are the combination of Mount  
20    Rushmore and the buffalo and Mount Rushmore and the  
21    pheasant.

22            MR. NOE: Stacy, who writes the narrative?  
23    Does it come from our staff here?

24            MS. ANDERSON: They come directly from the  
25    state. In the case of South Dakota, they have a

1 quarter commission and they have someone who is  
2 assigned to writing what their ideas were or  
3 concepts.

4 MS. LAWS: They have a Web site where you  
5 can look at the biographies.

6 MR. NOE: It's interesting because when  
7 you look at this, it is amazing that nothing was said  
8 in here about the American Indian or Native-American.

9 MS. LAWS: Yes, it is. And it was  
10 interesting when I read the bios of the South Dakota  
11 quarter commission on line, it included a mention  
12 of -- when I read the bios of the South Dakota  
13 quarter commission members on line, one of them  
14 mentioned -- there was no mention of it. So it was  
15 hard to know if the matter was even brought up.

16 MR. NOE: Any questions on the narratives?

17 MS. WARTENBERG: Can I just make one  
18 comment? It's pretty clear, though, if they're  
19 thinking it's close to a public vote, basically  
20 everything revolves around Mount Rushmore, as it's  
21 called, and the only thing anyone knows about South  
22 Dakota is that it has Mount Rushmore.

23 So I personally, having looked through the  
24 various Web sites -- you know, the question is really  
25 a matter of degree here, Rita. That's how I saw

1     this. Clearly members of -- this is like such a wide  
2     field. It's like saying the Americans. You know,  
3     who is that? The same ideas. Who are these Native  
4     Americans? These were people very clearly addressing  
5     the -- from my understanding of reading and listening  
6     to the press, the South Dakota state quarter  
7     committee really objected to this idea that this was  
8     offensive and in fact saying no, they really wanted  
9     this on. So this is really --

10           MS. LAWS: Ute, I can give you 10 Web  
11     sites where you can go and read the Native-American  
12     discussion of this. It is very real. It is very  
13     real.

14           MR. WARTENBERG: No, no. But it seems to  
15     be not as unanimous.

16           MS. LAWS: I never said it was unanimous.  
17     I never said all American Indians do that. You can't  
18     find a 100 percent consensus among any racial group  
19     on any issue. But I'm saying any American Indians  
20     and most Lakota feel the way that I expressed in the  
21     last meeting. And I have an article here from the  
22     Associated Press that discusses this. So it's very  
23     real.

24           MS. WARTENBERG: It's a question whether  
25     that --

1 MR. NOE: Mount Rushmore on the coin.

2 MS. LAWS: And that's fine if that  
3 happens. I was just bringing a viewpoint that I was  
4 familiar with for very many years to the committee,  
5 which is what I'm supposed to do.

6 MR. BILLINGS: The reason I raised the  
7 issue earlier with respect to the process,  
8 particularly with the state quarter, in theory if not  
9 in fact, there should be some political element to  
10 the decision by the state to select -- first to  
11 prioritize and then to select their preferred option.

12 I must tell you I'm very concerned about a  
13 poll that takes place on the Internet. It reminds me  
14 of 1936 when Gallup did his first poll and found out  
15 overwhelmingly that Alf Landon was going to be found  
16 president, not recognizing that most of the  
17 Republicans had telephones in those days.

18 And I think that made the situation in  
19 South Dakota where you're going to get an inadequate  
20 effect from Native-Americans on this issue under any  
21 circumstances. But I don't think that that is  
22 necessarily a matter for this committee to resolve  
23 and I think we basically have to defer on the issue  
24 of political correctness, if you would, to the state.

25 MR. FIVAZ: Stacy, do you have any input

1 or any facts on how involved the public was right  
2 from the get-go on the designs of this?

3 MS. ANDERSON: Well, with regard to the  
4 narratives, it was a commission, a committee put  
5 together, that decided what the concepts would be.  
6 So they didn't, as other states have, accept public  
7 input on ideas from the beginning. It was just,  
8 again, like I was saying, it's another way of coming  
9 up with their three to five concepts for us.

10 MR. FIVAZ: And my concern would be after  
11 the designs were formulated, did any information go  
12 out to the public to get feedback from them? Are you  
13 aware of that?

14 MS. ANDERSON: No. On the design? The  
15 narratives are very widely published. They are on  
16 their Web site, on the quarter Web site for the  
17 state, and there have been a lot of newspaper  
18 articles saying what they are. They've been out  
19 there.

20 MR. FIVAZ: So the public did have an  
21 opportunity to express their concern with --

22 MS. ANDERSON: Exactly. Not to us.

23 MR. FIVAZ: No, to the commission.

24 MS. ANDERSON: Correct.

25 MR. FIVAZ: To the state commission?

1 MS. ANDERSON: Correct. As far as it  
2 being out in the public. I'm not sure how they've  
3 taken that in and what they've done with it.

4 MS. HARRIMAN: Stacy, isn't it true that  
5 each state pretty much decides the specific process  
6 to be followed?

7 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

8 MS. HARRIMAN: In terms of public  
9 participation, input, et cetera?

10 MS. ANDERSON: Absolutely. Even if it's  
11 not having any at all, but really it's just up to  
12 them. Basically the governor's office is assigned  
13 with let's come up with them and then they take it  
14 from there.

15 MR. FIVAZ: Thank you.

16 MR. NOE: Do you want to get us through  
17 2006?

18 MS. HARRIMAN: Could you just refresh our  
19 recollections as far as what the legislation  
20 provides --

21 MR. NOE: What our job is?

22 MS. HARRIMAN: What I call the reversion.

23 MS. ANDERSON: Right. It's basically --  
24 really the parameters were so wide on this one. It  
25 was just that in 2006 and beyond, the nickel would

1     revert back to an image of Thomas Jefferson and his  
2     home in Monticello. So really as far as a narrative,  
3     that was it. That's what the artists were given.

4             MR. NOE: So any obverse with Jefferson on  
5     it and any reverse with Monticello?

6             MS. ANDERSON: Right.

7             MS. HARRIMAN: And Monticello on the  
8     obverse and Jefferson on the reverse. So they didn't  
9     differentiate with going back. It's just an image of  
10    Thomas Jefferson. Giving more leeway, I guess.

11            MR. NOE: You mean as a little kid?

12            MR. SANDERS: Decide to keep for 2005 in  
13    the future, any particular design we want?

14            MS. ANDERSON: Right. Both of those were  
15    presented in your packets because they are  
16    technically choices that the Secretary can make.

17            MR. FIVAZ: Do we have the option of  
18    recommending that they get away from the Jefferson  
19    after 2006?

20            MS. HARRIMAN: No.

21            MS. ANDERSON: That would be left to  
22    further legislation.

23            MR. NOE: You're big on getting us more  
24    power than what we've got. I like where we're at.

25            MS. HARRIMAN: You don't want to go there.

1                   MR. NOE: Yeah, you don't want to go  
2     there. So essentially -- let me see if I can  
3     simplify this just a little bit so it makes Mitch's  
4     life a little easier. If we take them in the order  
5     they're at right now, we have six obverses here.  
6     Number seven would be the 2005 and number eight would  
7     be the 1938 obverse. Does that work for everybody?

8                   MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

9                   MR. NOE: So that way, you go ahead and go  
10    on the obverses and let's walk through them a little  
11    bit.

12                  MS. ANDERSON: The first one, basically  
13    what we did was ask the artist to provide us with a  
14    little bit of background information, what inspired  
15    them, why they presented Jefferson or Monticello in  
16    the way they did.

17                  So the first image is -- we call it the  
18    first Rembrandt Peale life study created in 1800 and  
19    it depicts Jefferson as the vice president at 57  
20    years of age. And the portrait that this is based on  
21    had a significant role during Jefferson's lifetime.  
22    Many other images were created from it and thus, in  
23    some ways, it is how Jefferson was known by his  
24    contemporaries.

25                  MR. NOE: It's important to look at your



1 papers and not that because it's going to look a  
2 little weird up there compared to what you're looking  
3 at on your paper. Do you want to go to the next one?

4 MS. ANDERSON: The second one is entitled  
5 Advocate of Liberty and the artist depicts Jefferson  
6 as visionary, looking into the distance and holding a  
7 quill pen, which the artist mentions was Jefferson's  
8 major tool of persuasion, to represent both his  
9 unquenchable thirst for knowledge and the defining  
10 moment in his life, drafting the Declaration of  
11 Independence.

12 MR. NOE: Any questions on that one?

13 MR. BILLINGS: I disagree with the  
14 historical interpretation.

15 MR. NOE: The quill pen or what?

16 MS. WARTENBERG: Are they all by different  
17 artists or is there any artist that designed more  
18 than one of these?

19 MS. ANDERSON: A couple of obverses were  
20 created by the same artist. They were presented to  
21 the National Endowment for the Arts panel, of course,  
22 unnamed, just as they are to y'all, but there did  
23 indeed turn out to be some that were by the same  
24 artist.

25 MR. FIVAZ: Are any of these from the Mint

1 engravers?

2 MS. ANDERSON: Yes, they are.

3 MS. LAWS: Are they trying to indicate  
4 that he's smiling or something?

5 MS. ANDERSON: That I don't know. It's  
6 just the artistic rendering.

7 MS. LAWS: I would like it a lot better if  
8 the lines weren't so deep.

9 MR. NOE: We'll discuss all that later.  
10 Let's just get through the narratives. Next, please.

11 MS. ANDERSON: This one is after Gutzon  
12 Borglum's Mount Rushmore of Jefferson. Borglum's  
13 Jefferson is seen as a widely familiar image of  
14 Jefferson. The artist chose this image to create a  
15 dynamic yet unorthodox portrait for the design,  
16 stating that the design could be sculpted with a  
17 rocky design making it easily recognizable as  
18 Borglum's Mount Rushmore.

19 MS. WARTENBERG: May I ask a question  
20 here? In terms of coinability, how possible is that?

21 MS. ANDERSON: These have been reviewed  
22 for coinability and although the comment was made  
23 that the relief is considerably lower than, for  
24 instance, on the Reagan Medal, another kind of  
25 sculpted design, these have been reviewed for

1     coinability.

2                   MS. WARTENBERG:   So they can make them  
3     look rough like that?

4                   MS. ANDERSON:   That's the idea.

5                   This design is after the second Rembrandt  
6     Peale life study.  This portrait was displayed on the  
7     eve of Jefferson's second inauguration.  The clothing  
8     in the design is actually a composite.  The artist  
9     says that he substituted a colonial coat for the  
10    fur-trimmed coat that is in the original portrait in  
11    order to portray Jefferson in a look that is more of  
12    the people.

13                  The sixth one, this one is after the Felix  
14    Schlag Jefferson nickel in 1938.  Representing the  
15    familiar icon that has become synonymous with  
16    President Jefferson, the artist enlarged the Schlag  
17    portrait, composed it in a Yin/Yang style for both a  
18    closer look at Jefferson and a more contemporary  
19    feel.

20                  MS. WARTENBERG:   Yin/Yang?

21                  MS. ANDERSON:    Balanced.

22                  MR. BILLINGS:    I bet that's something you  
23    didn't know the difference between, your Yin and your  
24    Yang.

25                  MS. ANDERSON:    This one is after Gilbert

1 Stuart in 1805. The artist notes that Jefferson was  
2 pleased with this medallion portrait by Stuart saying  
3 it was the best portrait which has been taken of me,  
4 to which Jefferson's family agreed. The portrait was  
5 originally done in the medallion style and the two  
6 stars represent Jefferson's two terms as president.

7 Do you have the images of the '05?

8 MR. NOE: Yes.

9 MS. ANDERSON: Would y'all like to see  
10 those?

11 MR. NOE: We don't need them. We've got  
12 them both.

13 MS. ANDERSON: With regard to the '05  
14 design, it was created by Artistic Infusion Program  
15 artist Joe Fitzgerald. It was approved by the  
16 Secretary for the '05 nickel. It's based on the  
17 Houdon bust but was made age-appropriate to  
18 Jefferson's presidency by using later paintings by  
19 Gilbert Stuart and Rembrandt Peale. The liberty  
20 inscription is based upon Jefferson's own  
21 handwriting.

22 And then of course the Schlag portrait.

23 MR. NOE: Number 8?

24 MS. ANDERSON: Is number 8. And  
25 Mr. Schlag won a nationwide art competition in 1938

1 to create this design.

2 MR. NOE: Mitch, you got some paper for  
3 us? Do you mind if we just do the obverse and then  
4 go back and do reverses? You don't have to be  
5 somewhere in the next 10 minutes or so, do you?

6 MS. ANDERSON: No.

7 MR. NOE: Okay. Good. We're in good  
8 shape. I would like to do them all while it's all  
9 fresh in our brains. Let me ask you this. Do we  
10 want to vote on all of them or do we want to narrow  
11 it down to four or five of them to discuss? What's  
12 the committee's pleasure?

13 MR. SANDERS: Do a straw vote?

14 MS. LAWS: Will we be doing justice to the  
15 effort put in by the artists if we vote on them?

16 MR. NOE: We can give them a zero. I just  
17 find with eight things, I would love to get it down  
18 to five.

19 MS. HARRIMAN: If we knock it down, I  
20 think it means we're giving it a zero.

21 MR. NOE: Let's put it this way. Is there  
22 a consensus we would like to leave 1 in to talk  
23 about?

24 MR. FIVAZ: Yes.

25 MR. NOE: Is there a consensus we would

1 like to leave 2 in to talk about?

2 MS. WARTENBERG: No.

3 MR. NOE: So we have one that would like  
4 to leave 2 in. How about 3?

5 MR. FIVAZ: Iffy.

6 MR. NOE: How about 4?

7 MR. FIVAZ: Yes.

8 MR. NOE: How about 5?

9 MR. FIVAZ: No.

10 MS. HARRIMAN: No.

11 MR. NOE: Anybody like 5? How about 6?

12 MR. BILLINGS: No.

13 MS. HARRIMAN: Six is a double no.

14 MR. NOE: So let's do this. Let's leave 1  
15 in, let's leave 4 in. Do you want to narrow it down  
16 to four or five? Because I think we can get it down  
17 to four if y'all want to.

18 MR. FIVAZ: We can get it down to less  
19 than that.

20 MR. NOE: I think you have to leave the  
21 '05 and the '38 in, is what I'm saying. I think we  
22 need the feedback.

23 MS. HARRIMAN: Number 1, number 4.

24 MR. NOE: So we're going to go 1, 4, 7, 8.  
25 Does anybody have an objection that we go forward

1 with those?

2 MS. HARRIMAN: Perfect.

3 MR. NOE: I'm all for democracy as long as  
4 it goes the way I want. That's a joke, everybody.

5 MS. LAWS: I'm in favor of that. Could I  
6 ask, Leon, just for my own edification, what about  
7 number 2 is not historically accurate? You're the  
8 expert. You said something about 2 is not  
9 historically accurate.

10 MR. NOE: He was saying the narrative.

11 MR. BILLINGS: I don't think that the most  
12 important thing that -- if you asked Jefferson what  
13 the most important thing he did, it was not writing  
14 the Declaration of Independence. It was founding the  
15 University of Virginia. And if you go to his  
16 tombstone, his tombstone doesn't say anything about  
17 being president or author. It says founder of the  
18 University of Virginia.

19 MS. LAWS: Okay. Thank you. That's  
20 interesting. I did not know that.

21 MS. HARRIMAN: Absolutely.

22 MR. NOE: Thank you for being on the  
23 committee.

24 MS. HARRIMAN: You know what, it's too bad  
25 that Dr. Remini didn't hear that.

1           MR. NOE: Yes, because he might have  
2 argued with you. I have a great letter that's a  
3 quick aside, but I bought a letter years ago out of  
4 an auction and it's a letter from Jefferson in his  
5 own writing to his contractor telling him all the  
6 changes he wanted to make to Monticello that were  
7 ultimately made.

8           MS. HARRIMAN: Do you still have it?

9           MR. NOE: Yes. It's a pretty cool letter.  
10 So Mitch, we're going to go 1, 4, 7 and 8. Is  
11 everybody okay with that?

12          MR. FIVAZ: Yes.

13          MR. NOE: One last time? Okay. Do you  
14 want to get your little papers out?

15          MR. SANDERS: Let's talk.

16          MR. NOE: Let's talk. Could we talk?  
17 Let's talk about 1. Likes, dislikes. We've got  
18 plenty of time.

19          MR. FIVAZ: I like it. I think it's well  
20 balanced and depicts him as I would expect to see  
21 him. And I like the full figure instead of the  
22 partial figure.

23          MS. LAWS: Is it just me or is there a  
24 difference in the expression on his face between 1  
25 and 4? On 4, does he look more assured and certain



1 and on 5, does he look uncertain or is that just me?

2 MR. FIVAZ: I think it's you.

3 MS. LAWS: Thanks, Bill.

4 MR. NOE: It could be the Xerox. I hate  
5 to say it.

6 MS. WARTENBERG: I see what you mean.

7 MR. NOE: I see what you're saying.

8 MS. WARTENBERG: It's more of the three  
9 quarter view. Artistically, if you look at the  
10 number 4, it has more a full frontal view of which  
11 you see effectively what is the left side of his  
12 face, so this side. What you see on your right is  
13 more visible of that. I think it's all in  
14 perspective.

15 I comment on what Daniel would say if he  
16 were here. But I think it's based exactly on the  
17 same portrait. If you look at the Peale portrait, I  
18 think 1 is a better representation.

19 MS. HARRIMAN: I was going to say, Rita,  
20 one of the things that I -- his lips are tight,  
21 they're tense, in number 1. That's the difference I  
22 see.

23 MS. LAWS: The eyebrow over the eye  
24 changes his expression a little bit. I don't know if  
25 it's better or worse but it gives a little different

1 expression.

2 MS. HARRIMAN: Just to me, because of his  
3 lips, he looks tense.

4 MR. NOE: And I want to remind everybody  
5 as you do these, especially the new members, continue  
6 to look at the smaller image. It's very important  
7 you do that because don't be disappointed when a  
8 smaller image doesn't look like a larger image.

9 MS. LAWS: Exactly. Very, very true.

10 MR. BILLINGS: In the instance, the  
11 smaller image on number 4 expresses itself, I think,  
12 better than number 1. Part of that is number 1 looks  
13 like he's looking through you and number 4 looks like  
14 he's looking at you.

15 MR. NOE: I don't disagree with you. Any  
16 other comments on 1 and 4? Okay. Let's talk about  
17 7, which is the 2005 design.

18 MS. WARTENBERG: I hate that design. I  
19 can't imagine how that was ever chosen.

20 MR. NOE: It's very popular, believe it or  
21 not. It's probably one of the more popular ones  
22 because it's a little fresher looking and more  
23 modern.

24 MS. WARTENBERG: The way that the haircut  
25 is off and the sharp outline, there is something

1 quite aggressive about this. It clearly comes down  
2 to certain people --

3 MR. NOE: I do like the liberty in the  
4 script the way it is. I think it's good. It's  
5 different than what we've had before and I think it's  
6 kind of neat. That's supposedly in his penmanship.

7 MS. LAWS: I agree.

8 MR. NOE: Other comments on 7?

9 MS. HARRIMAN: Bill, have you heard  
10 comments from collectors about this image?

11 MR. FIVAZ: Not too many. My personal  
12 opinion, I don't particularly care for the part of  
13 his head being cut off.

14 MS. WARTENBERG: The same artist submitted  
15 a full head, didn't he, which I liked much better.  
16 There were a few letters to -- I can't remember if it  
17 was Coin World, some people just saying, wow, but  
18 people writing in don't necessarily reflect the --

19 MR. FIVAZ: Right.

20 MR. NOE: Any other comments on 7? We'll  
21 vote on it.

22 MS. LAWS: This is where he's wearing the  
23 more formal coat.

24 MR. NOE: I think we probably could have  
25 gotten everybody to ding out, but I think it's

1     important to give the Secretary our like or dislike  
2     of the design. That's the reason I left it in there.

3                 MS. LAWS: He's wearing more formal  
4     attire.

5                 MR. NOE: Any other -- anything else for  
6     the good of the order before we let Mitch do his  
7     magic? Okay. Let's get some papers around.

8                 MR. SANDERS: So if we're voting on 1, 4,  
9     7 and 8, do it under design 1, 4, 7 and 8. We have  
10    blanks in there but --

11                MR. NOE: That's fine. And write at the  
12    top Jefferson obverse. Put Jeff obverse on the front  
13    of it. Just a reminder, three is the highest, zero  
14    is the lowest.

15                MR. BILLINGS: We're going to just do two  
16    of these or three?

17                MR. NOE: I'm sorry?

18                MR. BILLINGS: We're just going to vote on  
19    two different sets, right?

20                MR. NOE: Four designs.

21                MR. BILLINGS: No, no. We're going to  
22    have a vote on the obverse and --

23                MR. NOE: Then we'll do a reverse. Good  
24    point. That would have been way too easy. Now  
25    you're going to make me take another one. I feel

1 really stupid but thank you. I appreciate that.

2 MR. BILLINGS: You're the chairman.

3 MR. FIVAZ: 1, 4, 7 --

4 MR. NOE: 1, 4, 7 and 8.

5 MR. FIVAZ: It seems to be pretty  
6 polarized.

7 MR. NOE: Anybody got results? We need  
8 two more yet. If everything goes right, we should  
9 have seven. Go ahead. You got any trivia for us?

10 MR. SANDERS: Whoever filled out this  
11 ballot, can you help me with what this first number  
12 is?

13 MS. HARRIMAN: I think it's mine. No,  
14 it's not.

15 MS. WARTENBERG: No, that wasn't mine.

16 MR. NOE: Leon, is that you?

17 MR. BILLINGS: No.

18 MR. FIVAZ: Not me.

19 MR. NOE: Who used a pencil?

20 MS. WARTENBERG: I used a pencil but I  
21 didn't --

22 MR. BILLINGS: It's got to be yours.

23 MS. WARTENBERG: Yes, that is mine.

24 MR. NOE: The accuracy of our minutes are  
25 in jeopardy, ladies and gentlemen. We narrowed it

1 down to pencil.

2 MR. SANDERS: Top choice is design 4 with  
3 16 points. Design 1 had 12, design 7 had 11, design  
4 8 had five.

5 MR. NOE: Now, does anyone feel the need  
6 on any of these to make any -- do we want to put any  
7 comments on any of those?

8 MR. BILLINGS: I would like to suggest, if  
9 there is consensus on it, that the Jeffersonian  
10 spelling of liberty should be considered on whichever  
11 coin.

12 MR. NOE: That's a great idea. Is there  
13 consensus on that? His handwriting is on whatever --  
14 okay. So our first choice is number 1; and second  
15 choice, number 2; 7, number three. And whatever we  
16 do, the liberty would be done in Jefferson's  
17 handwriting?

18 MR. BILLINGS: Our first choice is number  
19 4.

20 MR. NOE: 4, 1, 7, 8.

21 MR. BILLINGS: 4 is number one.

22 MR. NOE: We can make that work.

23 MR. SANDERS: One thing that struck me  
24 about 6 is it had his name on it which is something  
25 we don't typically do on our coins but is advisable.

1 These things stick around forever. How many people  
2 today know it's Jefferson? How many people forever  
3 know it's Jefferson?

4 MR. NOE: If we teach history the proper  
5 way, everyone should know it's Jefferson.

6 MR. BILLINGS: When did we start doing  
7 that?

8 MR. SANDERS: That's occurred to me  
9 before.

10 MR. NOE: So we've got the order of what  
11 our preference is with the caveat it's unanimous by  
12 everybody that liberty is written like it is on the  
13 2005 coin.

14 MR. BILLINGS: Of course being a  
15 Francophile, Jefferson would probably have had it  
16 today.

17 MR. NOE: We're going to move to the  
18 reverses, if that's okay with everybody. And  
19 assuming everything is in order, it looks to me like  
20 we have 6 and the old 1938 reverse will be number 7.

21 MS. ANDERSON: Correct.

22 MR. NOE: Everybody with me on that?  
23 Okay. Stacy, it's all yours.

24 MS. ANDERSON: The first design is called  
25 West Front of Monticello and Oval Flowerbeds. This

1 design is the artist's tribute to Jefferson's  
2 exceptional architectural ability and his knowledge  
3 of botany and interest in American native plants. It  
4 shows the west front of Monticello with oval  
5 flowerbeds in the foreground that Jefferson designed  
6 and began planting in 1807. The beds were planted  
7 with old European varieties and newly recognized  
8 American varieties, some collected by the Lewis and  
9 Clark Expedition.

10 MR. NOE: Any questions on that one before  
11 we move forward? Go ahead.

12 MS. ANDERSON: Number 2. This one is  
13 entitled floor plan. By presenting Monticello's  
14 floor plan, the artist wanted to commemorate  
15 Jefferson's architectural vision for Monticello in  
16 its purest form, as drawn by Jefferson. Jefferson  
17 himself had a self-taught love of architecture and  
18 art and a passion for the efficient use of form,  
19 light and space. The artist notes that standing in  
20 the atrium of Monticello, one can observe the  
21 symmetrical and radiating flow of the floor plan.

22 MS. LAWS: Why are the three rooms in the  
23 blackout lined darker?

24 MS. ANDERSON: I don't know.

25 MR. NOE: It could be the original, before



1     it was added on. Who knows. It's where he kept all  
2     his gold.

3             MS. HARRIMAN: His wine.

4             MR. NOE: Number 3.

5             MS. ANDERSON: Number 3 is called  
6     Monticello Garden View. This design deliberately  
7     recognizes the strength of Felix Schlag's 1938  
8     Monticello while providing a fresh portrayal of  
9     Jefferson's home. By restricting all legends to the  
10    bottom portion of the coin, the artist created space  
11    for an enlarged, more detailed house device that  
12    highlights the building's construction and introduces  
13    more delicate architectural elements.

14            MR. BILLINGS: Is this an east front view?

15            MS. ANDERSON: No. It's west front.

16            MR. BILLINGS: Are they all west front?

17            MS. ANDERSON: Not all of them.

18            MR. BILLINGS: I think this is an east  
19    front because there are six columns on the west front  
20    and four columns on the east front.

21            MS. ANDERSON: Well, I know that the Felix  
22    Schlag version has always been referred to as  
23    representing the west portico.

24            MR. NOE: If you look at it close, there  
25    are two more columns in behind there, Leon. Do you

1 know what I'm saying?

2 MR. FIVAZ: Are there four columns in the  
3 front or six columns in the front? I think there are  
4 four columns in front.

5 MR. BILLINGS: On the east. There are  
6 four columns in front on both sides. I was trying to  
7 get a perspective.

8 MR. FIVAZ: Those two would be hidden by  
9 the frontal view but they do appear on a couple of  
10 the others.

11 MR. NOE: You've got another different  
12 angle in 4, right?

13 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. Number 4 is  
14 Monticello 3/4 view. The artist notes that  
15 Monticello is the embodiment of Thomas Jefferson's  
16 many lifelong disputes, architecture, philosophy,  
17 history, politics, science and spirituality. The  
18 gold contour shape, interrelated angles and intimate  
19 details of this design are intended to pay homage to  
20 Jefferson's diverse endeavors, using varying surface  
21 textures inspired by some of the great coins of  
22 America's past. The artist wanted to create an  
23 overall composition that would maintain a resonance  
24 with the previous Monticello design.

25 MR. NOE: Any questions on 4? If not,

1 let's move to 5.

2 MS. ANDERSON: 5 is Monticello water view.

3 The artist notes that Jefferson was an avid  
4 naturalist and avid architect who recognized great  
5 beauty in fine details. Jefferson situated the fish  
6 pond at Monticello so that it would capture a view of  
7 his home's splendor. The artist emphasizes that the  
8 pathways that wind across the design serve as an  
9 invitation to a place that ensures Jefferson's legacy  
10 remains as dynamic as Jefferson himself.

11 MR. NOE: Then we've got 6.

12 MS. ANDERSON: This is close-up of the  
13 west portico. The artist uses a close-up 3/4 view of  
14 Monticello's west portico, focusing on the exterior  
15 columns and rotunda in a way that personifies the  
16 structure as optimistic and forward-looking, with a  
17 door open to all who seek liberty and opportunity.  
18 The type is designed to echo the dominant shapes in  
19 the architecture, emphasizing the essential idea of E  
20 Pluribus Unum as the binding hub of our pluralistic  
21 society.

22 MS. HARRIMAN: I have one question. If  
23 you look at the small rendering, on the right edge,  
24 is there a problem looming here?

25 MS. ANDERSON: Again, they've been

1 reviewed for coinability and the discussion was it  
2 could feather off right at the edge of the coin. If  
3 it were the dome that were closest to the edge, that  
4 could cause problems with showing the whole design,  
5 but the way that our manufacturing group looked at  
6 it, they've said that because it's all building, that  
7 it could feather off the way that the profile view of  
8 Jefferson does on the new nickel.

9 And I'm trying to think of another  
10 example. Maybe the way that the Old Man in the  
11 Mountain on the New Hampshire, since it's all  
12 building, it could kind of feather off without  
13 obstructing. But it did pass the coinability test.

14 MR. NOE: And then obviously 7 is old  
15 standby, right?

16 MS. ANDERSON: Correct.

17 MR. NOE: Can we whittle seven down to  
18 four or five, everybody? Everybody want to talk  
19 about 1 some more? Consider it?

20 MR. FIVAZ: Yes.

21 MR. NOE: 2?

22 MR. FIVAZ: No.

23 MR. NOE: Can I get rid of 2? Does  
24 anybody mind if we get rid of 2? Okay. 2 is out.  
25 3?

61

1           MS. LAWS: Before you get rid of 3, I  
2 recommend to give it a fair shot. Try looking  
3 between 3 and old standby on the last page because he  
4 was trying to update the original and it's really  
5 interesting when you flip back and forth and look at  
6 the smaller versions, it's stunning how different and  
7 the same --

8           MS. HARRIMAN: The reason is there is a  
9 lot more detail because if you look at the windows  
10 and all the little extra vertical and horizontal  
11 lines.

12           MR. FIVAZ: And I'm sure he put the  
13 labyrinth in there as he did to avoid -- so he could  
14 look more like the original.

15           MR. NOE: That's not to say we can't make  
16 comments on the lettering. Can we throw 5 out?

17           MS. HARRIMAN: Yes.

18           MS. ANDERSON: One point about the design  
19 is that y'all talked about the detail. There is an  
20 issue that we may not be able to capture every detail  
21 in the drawing but just consider the translation.

22           MS. LAWS: Don't throw out 5.

23           MR. NOE: We'll let you get your vote in  
24 there.

25           MS. LAWS: Thank you.

1 MR. FIVAZ: What did we say about 4?

2 MR. NOE: Well, 3, 4 and 5 are all  
3 similar. I just was trying to see if you could  
4 eliminate one of them.

5 MS. LAWS: I'm not voting to leave 3 in  
6 the discussion. Before you made a decision about  
7 what you wanted to do --

8 MR. NOE: I have no problem leaving 3 in.

9 MS. HARRIMAN: I want 3 in.

10 MR. BILLINGS: Leave 3 in but drop out 7.

11 MR. NOE: We've got to talk about 7. I  
12 think we need to give the Secretary of the Treasury  
13 an opinion about 7.

14 MS. HARRIMAN: What about 4, 5 and 6?

15 MR. BILLINGS: What number is this?

16 MR. NOE: That is 6.

17 MR. FIVAZ: 4 is a 3/4 view but look at  
18 those steps. That's not artistically correct.

19 MR. BILLINGS: What's not artistically  
20 correct?

21 MR. FIVAZ: The steps extend way out past  
22 the building.

23 MR. BILLINGS: Let me make one observation  
24 and I agree that the steps are inappropriate, but  
25 when I was talking to you guys before, the importance

1 of Monticello from a Jeffersonian perspective is that  
2 when you look at 4, you're looking at -- and this is  
3 the west front. I thought it was the east front but  
4 it's the west front.

5           Then his personal quarters are there on  
6 the right. His bedroom and private quarters are  
7 those three windows sitting on the right. And on the  
8 opposite side of that is the area where -- was his  
9 study where he had his fabulous copy machine and so  
10 on.

11           So the essential Jefferson lived in this  
12 part of the house. The entertaining Jefferson lived  
13 on the other side of the house, just for historical  
14 perspective.

15           MS. LAWS: That's important, yes.

16           MR. BILLINGS: And I think you get that  
17 from 3 and if you can't correct the steps on 4, it  
18 ought to go out.

19           MR. NOE: Well, let me ask you this.  
20 We've gotten rid of 2. Would anyone like to get rid  
21 of 4 or 5? I'll give you two options.

22           MS. LAWS: Why don't we just go with what  
23 we have?

24           MR. NOE: Let's go. We can do with what  
25 we have. Let's talk about 1, then. 2 is the only

1     one we're getting rid of right now, folks.

2                 MR. FIVAZ: One comment I would like to  
3     make on number 1. This is as close to the original  
4     Schlag representation that was rejected by the Mint  
5     except it was turned so that you're seeing the left  
6     side of the building rather than the right side.

7                 MR. NOE: Are the steps on this too far  
8     out, too?

9                 MS. WARTENBERG: Yes, there is something  
10    really wrong with this.

11                MR. NOE: It seems like they're way out  
12    there.

13                MS. HARRIMAN: Plus, for some strange  
14    reason, maybe because I'm from California, the right  
15    side of the building looks like a facade in the kind  
16    of little towns that Hollywood builds for movies.

17                MR. NOE: Is there an asymmetrical use of  
18    the way United States appears, being across the top,  
19    down at the left?

20                MR. NOE: I think that once you reduce it  
21    down into a nickel, it will be crazy.

22                MR. FIVAZ: Number 1?

23                MR. NOE: Yes. Talk about trying to get  
24    detail into a small nickel, it's going to be tough on  
25    that one.



1 MS. LAWS: Too busy.

2 MR. NOE: 2 is gone. Let's go to 3. And  
3 this is the attempt to take 1938 and update it, is  
4 what it boils down to.

5 MR. SANDERS: This is awfully similar to  
6 what's currently there. The lettering is rearranged  
7 but it's in the same place.

8 MR. NOE: 4. Let's talk about 4.

9 MS. LAWS: Well, Leon and Bill are right  
10 in how it depicts the steps.

11 MR. NOE: Well, obviously they moved the  
12 steps out so they could balance the part of the  
13 right. It's too bad they didn't just cut them both  
14 off and figure out a way to make it work.

15 MS. WARTENBERG: There is also an  
16 imbalance in the description. One thing I find  
17 really odd is there are two things here that one  
18 should definitely know what it is, Monticello. In  
19 fact, I found that even on the old design, it's so  
20 small, no one really knows what that building is.

21 And here, E Pluribus Unum, which arguably  
22 is the least important element, is the biggest. It  
23 almost looks, size-wise, larger than United States of  
24 America. So I don't like how they are arranged. The  
25 five cent is quite small. I don't know.

1                   MR. NOE: And I think if we like a design,  
2 don't be afraid to do what we did on the last one.  
3 Let's talk about the design and maybe you want to see  
4 the lettering different. I don't think that's  
5 outside of our purview to make that type of a  
6 recommendation.

7                   MS. LAWS: To save space, you can even put  
8 the symbol instead of words in, can't you?

9                   MR. FIVAZ: The view on this would be to  
10 move the building down, take out E Pluribus Unum and  
11 move it over to the top.

12                  MS. HARRIMAN: Which makes it even more  
13 like the original.

14                  MR. NOE: You're talking about on number  
15 4?

16                  MR. FIVAZ: Yes.

17                  MR. NOE: Any other comments on 4?

18                  MR. FIVAZ: The only comment I want to  
19 make is harking back to the obverse design. This 3/4  
20 reverse would fit in nicely with that. I think it  
21 would balance it out.

22                  MR. NOE: Again, if you want to, when we  
23 get into 4, if you like 4, we can say fix the steps  
24 on the left, the little thing on the right and  
25 balance it out. Those again are comments that would

1 be easy for us to chat about.

2 MS. WARTENBERG: If you look at how the  
3 other set of steps goes up there, from a perspective  
4 point of view, there is so much wrong with this.

5 MR. NOE: Right.

6 MR. FIVAZ: It's out of perspective.

7 MS. WARTENBERG: It's just wrong. If you  
8 take how you do a drawing of a building like this,  
9 something is wrong here and I think fixing this is  
10 just not -- it's just not well done. Within the  
11 building.

12 MR. NOE: I know what you're saying.

13 MS. WARTENBERG: Look at the top how the  
14 corners go. The roof is not right. And then this  
15 kind of half open shutters there. I think it's an  
16 incredibly messy design.

17 MR. NOE: All right, Rita. I'll let you  
18 comment on 5 first because you're the one who wanted  
19 that puppy in there.

20 MS. LAWS: Thank you, Tom. Well, my  
21 comment is that I think the symbolism behind the  
22 reflection in water is amazingly beautiful and  
23 different and unique. And if there is some way to  
24 lighten up this horrible gray band in the center that  
25 seems to distract from the otherwise beautiful

1 design, I think this design is definitely worth  
2 tweaking and looking at, because Monticello is a  
3 reflection of who Jefferson was and so this is a  
4 literal and a symbolic reflection.

5 My last comment, 5 and 6 together, the  
6 reason I like these two the most by far is because  
7 when you talk to very many people, both collectors  
8 and noncollectors, who would like to see the nickel  
9 be a whole new totally different design instead of  
10 remaining the view of Monticello, these are the ones  
11 that are most different.

12 Then if the idea is to do something new  
13 and different, then I think 5 and 6 are clearly the  
14 best candidates.

15 MR. NOE: I think on 5, though, if you've  
16 got a problem with 4 because of the steps and the  
17 balance, you've got the same problem with it for the  
18 reflection. That's the only thing we've got to make  
19 sure we talk about.

20 MS. WARTENBERG: The steps are even  
21 smaller and, therefore, hardly visible.

22 MR. NOE: If you shrink it down, it's  
23 going to be one different look, I think. All right,  
24 number 6.

25 MR. FIVAZ: This would have been a great

1 reverse of the 2005.

2 MS. HARRIMAN: Right. They go together.

3 MR. FIVAZ: Perfectly.

4 MR. NOE: You're saying you don't like it?

5 MR. FIVAZ: Not as well as some of the  
6 others.

7 MR. NOE: I think it's nice. I think it's  
8 great.

9 MR. FIVAZ: If they regained the 2005  
10 obverse, I would love to see this reverse.

11 MS. HARRIMAN: The number 7 Jefferson that  
12 we were looking at.

13 MS. WARTENBERG: I think this is a very  
14 good point we raise here about the version of that  
15 portrait I don't like, but basically it should go on  
16 the other design in the reverse because you're going  
17 to end up with a really odd mixture of totally  
18 different styles.

19 So if this goes with the portrait, this  
20 works really well. I think it's graphically quite  
21 good but I think there shouldn't be a mismatch.

22 MS. HARRIMAN: Maybe we should say that.

23 MR. NOE: I don't think there's anything  
24 wrong with saying that. I think everybody has a  
25 pretty clear consensus that if they go with the 2005

1 design, this matches very well.

2 MS. LAWS: Yes.

3 MR. FIVAZ: Yes.

4 MS. LAWS: Number 6 also looks like you're  
5 looking through a telescope, which is interesting.  
6 Telescopic view.

7 MS. HARRIMAN: It's a small rendering so  
8 it works.

9 MR. NOE: Let's talk about number 7, which  
10 is old faithful.

11 MR. FIVAZ: Can I ask a question?

12 MR. NOE: You can ask all you want.

13 MR. FIVAZ: Number 6 with the telescope  
14 view, is there any objection to using the cent  
15 abbreviation instead of cents, the word cent?

16 MS. ANDERSON: No. In fact, that was  
17 something that was brought up in this process and  
18 there is no prohibition against spelling out the word  
19 cents. It's just that not many submitted designs  
20 with it.

21 MS. HARRIMAN: Look at this in conjunction  
22 with the number 4 Jefferson.

23 MR. NOE: The number 4 Jefferson?

24 MS. HARRIMAN: The number 4 that we voted  
25 on as the top choice for the reverse.

1 MR. NOE: Do they look good together?

2 MS. LAWS: I think they go together.

3 MR. NOE: I don't think it looks that bad.

4 MS. LAWS: One is to the left, one is to  
5 the right. Balanced. With so many letters on this  
6 small size, anything you can do to minimize the  
7 number of letters would be helpful.

8 MR. NOE: Anything else on number 6?

9 MS. HARRIMAN: Maybe we should move it  
10 down to the first steps.

11 MR. NOE: How about old faithful, 7. Any  
12 comments?

13 MR. BILLINGS: Yes, I want to comment.  
14 The attractiveness of number 7, the only  
15 attractiveness, is this side of the coin is intended  
16 to focus on Monticello and this coin does that  
17 because the printing is around it and Monticello is  
18 in the center of it.

19 So with respect to these others, whichever  
20 one, with the possible exception of the telescope, if  
21 there are preferences, it seems to me that we ought  
22 to suggest that the printing should more balance the  
23 building rather than having the printing be the  
24 center of the focus.

25 MR. NOE: Which is why it's ironic because

1 the more I sit here, the more number 6 keeps jumping  
2 out at me because it's the boldest -- if you really  
3 want to look at a bold Monticello, even though it's  
4 telescopic, it's got that look to it that's so  
5 different.

6 MS. LAWS: And you can see all six  
7 columns.

8 MR. BILLINGS: It doesn't say Monticello,  
9 you understand.

10 MR. NOE: Correct. I think it's funny.  
11 How many times do we have to say what it is for  
12 someone to figure out what it is. There comes a time  
13 in history you want someone to learn something from a  
14 coin instead of having it handed on a platter.

15 MR. BILLINGS: My suspicion is anyone who  
16 has to ask what that is would want to know what the  
17 name of the guy is on the other side.

18 MR. NOE: Exactly. My thought is why  
19 don't we do a vote on this and then see if we want to  
20 add some comments because we've had some good  
21 comments in here. Let's see how the results come out  
22 and then let's give some comments, short comments we  
23 can put in the notes.

24 MR. FIVAZ: 2 is not in there.

25 MR. NOE: 2 no longer exists so cross out



1 your 2, folks.

2 MS. LAWS: It was an interesting and  
3 creative event.

4 MR. NOE: So everybody cross off design  
5 number 2 so you don't confuse it. Put Jeff reverse.

6 MR. WEINMAN: Could we have a five-minute  
7 recess while he is tabulating?

8 MR. NOE: Yes. We're doing a five-minute  
9 recess. My legal counsel says we're taking a  
10 five-minute recess while he tallies the votes.

11 (Recess.)

12 MR. SANDERS: Our winner was design 6 with  
13 17 points. Design 1 received five points; design 3,  
14 seven points; design 4, seven points; design 5, six  
15 points; design 6, as I said, 17 points; and design 7,  
16 five points.

17 MR. FIVAZ: What were the top three?

18 MR. NOE: It looks like it was 6, 6 and 6.  
19 That was the top three. 3 and 4 had seven apiece.  
20 Now, let me ask you this. Now that we've said that,  
21 do we want to make any comments about 6 to make sure  
22 that --

23 MS. LAWS: Yes. We like the minimization  
24 of the lettering, leaving off the word Monticello and  
25 the c-e-n-t-s helps.

1           MR. NOE: We like the simple design or  
2 simple wording, lettering.

3           MR. FIVAZ: I think we ought to recommend  
4 that if this one is chosen, if 6 is chosen, it should  
5 be paired with the current 2005 obverse.

6           MR. NOE: If you put it next to 4, it  
7 actually is not bad.

8           MR. BILLINGS: With liberty spelled out.

9           MR. FIVAZ: Either number 4 or number 7.

10          MR. NOE: 4 or 7. Well, 1 is the same as  
11 4, color-wise.

12          MS. LAWS: You might also want to add the  
13 comment that the steps need to be as strongly defined  
14 as possible for the sake of collectors.

15          MR. FIVAZ: Did you say, Stacy, that  
16 number 6 would be feathered out at the bottom?

17          MS. ANDERSON: Yes. It does work for  
18 coinability and that's how our manufacturing group  
19 addressed it. They said because the bulk of the  
20 design is up against the edge, that it would still  
21 have the same edge as our current nickel, that it  
22 would just -- the design itself would sort of feather  
23 out as it went to the edge.

24          MR. NOE: Anything else on the 2000 nickel  
25 design? Stacy, great job. Thank you. As usual,

1 very good.

2 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you very much.

3 MR. NOE: Who does the narratives? Do the  
4 artists do it or do you guys in-house do it?

5 MS. ANDERSON: In this case, we asked the  
6 artists to give us a vision statement and then we  
7 just sort of edited them down. Some of them went  
8 really far so we edited it down.

9 MR. NOE: Great. Anything else  
10 design-wise we need to know about or is that it?

11 MS. ANDERSON: That's it.

12 MR. NOE: Have we worn you out today?

13 MS. ANDERSON: Just that the quarters are  
14 coming up in January with respect to the rest of  
15 those quarters.

16 MR. NOE: Do you think we'll have the  
17 other four states to look at in January?

18 MS. ANDERSON: That's the road that we're  
19 on right now.

20 MR. NOE: Or at least three of them or two  
21 of them.

22 MR. FIVAZ: January will be busy.

23 MR. NOE: Thank you very much. Madelyn,  
24 do you want to give your legislative update?

25 MS. SIMMONS: Sure. This is the time line

1 for each year, what's outstanding or what's currently  
2 pending for each year. There is one in 2013, but I  
3 decided not to go that far out.

4 MR. NOE: 2013?

5 MS. SIMMONS: Yes. There is a bill that's  
6 currently pending for 2013, but I just didn't go that  
7 far. The last thing that I gave you, we'll go over  
8 that first. The large packet, the legislative  
9 update, you can go over it in leisure and call me if  
10 you have any questions.

11 What we've included again, as usual, is  
12 we've split it up into commemorative coins, first  
13 House and Senate and then we've taken out anything in  
14 the major listing that has been passed. So these are  
15 pending bills and we go to Congressional medals,  
16 House and Senate, bouillon bills.

17 I can tell you one little caveat about the  
18 bouillon. There was an amendment to treat bouillon  
19 like stocks. That has failed. It was in a bill  
20 originally about jobs and it was stripped out in the  
21 final version so they're going to probably revisit it  
22 next time.

23 MR. NOE: Say that again?

24 MS. SIMMONS: An amendment by Reid in  
25 Nevada to have bouillon coins and bars treated like

1 stocks.

2 MR. NOE: For tax reasons or for capital  
3 gains reasons?

4 MS. SIMMONS: Tax reasons. And that has  
5 failed. They've brought it up every --

6 MR. NOE: I was going to say, they've had  
7 it for a while.

8 MS. SIMMONS: Then we go into circulating  
9 coinage related bills, then we have public laws, what  
10 has been enacted, and then a breakout of those bills  
11 that have reached their minimum cosponsorship.

12 Earlier I mentioned the committees will  
13 have a rule that the specific bills have two-thirds  
14 cosponsorship so that gives you an idea. And the  
15 actual text in this packet is the actual bill number,  
16 the title, sponsor, how many cosponsors it has,  
17 description and the status. So again, you can just  
18 look that up at your leisure.

19 The bills that are in the newly introduced  
20 packet, that's this one, since our last meeting, we  
21 have HR 5046. It's the Pentagon 9/11 Commemorative  
22 Coin Act and it authorizes three different coins,  
23 some \$50 gold coins and that is to be an amount  
24 equivalent to 10,000 plus whatever amount is  
25 determined by the individuals that perished at the

1     Pentagon on 9/11.

2                   And the purpose of that is to make sure  
3     that each one of those, their family members or  
4     survivors receive a free gold coin. And then there  
5     is a silver coin and half dollar.

6                   This one is the one I referred to earlier.  
7     There is a bill that wants to waive the mintage level  
8     caps and this is a bill that does that so that  
9     500,000 silver does not apply. So they certainly are  
10    telling the Secretary he can strike as many as he  
11    likes in the silver form.

12                  Everything else is pretty boilerplate on  
13    this except for it is to be issued as soon as the  
14    bill is passed. And the year 2001 will be on the  
15    coin as opposed to the year in which it's issued. So  
16    we haven't reviewed it internally to see how that all  
17    goes.

18                  And then surcharges paid to the Pentagon  
19    Memorial Fund for the purposes of constructing a  
20    memorial at the Pentagon in Arlington. This bill is  
21    currently pending in the House Financial Services  
22    Subcommittee and there is not a Senate bill.

23                  The next bill, HR 5220, is the Washington  
24    National Opera Commemorative Coin Act and it calls  
25    for no more than 300,000 coins in proof and

1     uncirculated quality. It would be issued in 2010.

2             MS. HARRIMAN: Who introduced this?

3             MS. SIMMONS: I knew you would ask that  
4     question. Let's see. King.

5             MR. NOE: Looks like King.

6             MS. SIMMONS: Yes, King, from New York.

7             MR. BILLINGS: He's a tenor.

8             MS. HARRIMAN: That seems odd to me.

9             MR. NOE: He's the only one.

10            MS. HARRIMAN: I think somebody from the  
11     board of directors of the Washington National Opera,  
12     because it says the chair is supposed to consult with  
13     the board of the Washington National Opera.

14            MS. SIMMONS: Anyway, there is no  
15     language. What's interesting about this bill is that  
16     the Secretary shall consult on a regular and frequent  
17     basis with the board of the opera in order to  
18     establish a role for the board in the promotion,  
19     advertising and marketing on the coins. So  
20     henceforth, we have always -- our sales and marketing  
21     group has handled the marketing.

22            MR. FIVAZ: Where it says 300,000 coins  
23     approved, is that total?

24            MS. SIMMONS: That's their mintage cap.  
25     So they went underneath what is actually in the

1 statute. The statute says no more than 500,000 for  
2 silver coins and they've gone below that.

3 MR. FIVAZ: But my question is, is that  
4 300,000 for proof and uncirculated?

5 MS. SIMMONS: That's total combined.  
6 Again, this bill is pending in House Financial  
7 Services Subcommittee and there is no Senate bill.

8 The next two bills are the Ponce de Leon  
9 Discovery of Florida Quincentennial Commission Act.  
10 There is both a House and a Senate bill and it's  
11 similar -- we've had other bills like this related to  
12 commissions and they are required to look at an  
13 upcoming event that they'll be hosting an anniversary  
14 and looking at the issuance of the commemorative  
15 coins.

16 That's the only way that a commemorative  
17 coin relates to this bill. It's not calling for a  
18 commemorative coin but it has the commission looking  
19 at all the fund-raising commissions.

20 MR. NOE: Including coin. Graham got that  
21 passed by acclimation?

22 MS. SIMMONS: Yes. There is a House bill  
23 pending and the Senate bill passed. On to  
24 Congressional gold medal bills, we've got HR 5115,  
25 Constantino Brumidi Congressional Gold Medal Act. If



1 any of you know anything about the Senate, the very  
2 elaborately painted corridors in the Capitol are  
3 painted by Brumidi and they're actually undergoing  
4 renovation, I know from personal experience going  
5 back about 10 years ago.

6 MR. BILLINGS: Actually, the inside of the  
7 dome was done by Brumidi in fresco on a scaffold from  
8 which he fell. When I was a kid right out of  
9 college, I was a Capitol guide and I could give you  
10 still the entire tour of the Capitol.

11 MR. NOE: I love it.

12 MR. BILLINGS: I used to do it for beer.

13 MR. FIVAZ: Now you do it for martinis.

14 MS. SIMMONS: There is no Senate companion  
15 bill for that but it is pending in the House  
16 Financial Services Subcommittee.

17 2850, it's the Fred McFeely Rogers  
18 Congressional Gold Medal Act. Mr. Rogers awarded a  
19 gold medal. And then S 2900, the Elizabeth Wanamaker  
20 Peratrovich and Roy Peratrovich Congressional Gold  
21 Medal Act. These were natives of Alaska and before a  
22 lot of the civil rights movement took hold in the  
23 areas like Washington and New York, these folks were  
24 pioneers in Alaska. So they are -- there may be an  
25 Alaskan holiday for them.

1           And circulating coinage bills, we have two  
2   dedicated to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial  
3   One-Cent Coin Redesign Act, both bills in the House  
4   and Senate and they are companion bills. It  
5   authorizes four redesigns of the reverse of the  
6   Lincoln one cent coin in 2009. The obverse will  
7   remain the same but then every quarter, you would  
8   have a new design for the reverse.

9           Those designs shall bear -- they shall  
10   represent different aspects of his life, his work and  
11   early childhood, formative years in Indiana,  
12   professional life and presidency in Washington, D.C.

13           Let's see. Then on the reverse, after  
14   2009, it shall bear an image emblematic of President  
15   Lincoln's preservation of the United States of  
16   America as a single and united country. In addition,  
17   this bill calls for numismatic products and they're  
18   calling for the Secretary of the Treasury to issue  
19   one cent coins in 2009 with the exact metallic  
20   content as the one-cent coin contained in 1909 in  
21   such number as he determines appropriate. That would  
22   be 95 percent and 5 percent.

23           MS. WARTENBERG: How expensive would that  
24   be per cent?

25           MS. SIMMONS: Probably more than a cent.

1 MS. WARTENBERG: Is that realistic, this  
2 bill?

3 MR. FIVAZ: It's called a loss leader.

4 MR. NOE: It's more than a cent. You're  
5 talking -- what are we paying right now, three cents  
6 apiece? Three and a half cents apiece.

7 MS. SIMMONS: But for numismatic purposes,  
8 as far as selling them, the profit --

9 MR. NOE: You've got a good point. So it  
10 wouldn't matter then.

11 MS. SIMMONS: As far as committee actions,  
12 on October 11, reported the American Veterans  
13 Disabled for Life Coin Act which is over in the House  
14 and the House Management Service Committee has not  
15 acted recently.

16 And as you recall, they have decided to  
17 assert their jurisdiction over all rendering bills  
18 including commemorative coin bills. So any  
19 commemorative coin that goes through the House, House  
20 Ways and Means will have a look at it.

21 MR. NOE: Whose committee is that?

22 MS. SIMMONS: Bill Thomas.

23 MR. NOE: Payback time.

24 MS. SIMMONS: The one-pager Enacted and  
25 Potential Commemorative Coin Programs, again, this is

1 just a time line. Knock off 2004 because we've got  
2 those programs. 2005, they're both enacted.  
3 Remember, there are only two programs a year unless  
4 Congress decides to waive the rules and enact another  
5 one.

6 MR. NOE: What's your bet on '6? What's  
7 your bet on 2006 if you were a betting person?

8 MS. SIMMONS: Right now, the way the  
9 activity has been, of course these ought to be  
10 introduced, unless American Veterans Disabled for  
11 Life passes the House this week, they have to all be  
12 reintroduced. Thus far, Theodore Roosevelt and Ben  
13 Franklin. Ben Franklin has cosponsors in the House  
14 and they're working on it in the Senate so that has a  
15 good shot.

16 And the San Francisco Mint, it's been  
17 reintroduced for 2007 as well. I mean, introduced.  
18 It's another -- it's currently pending under two  
19 years, 2006 and 2007, but neither bill is moving. I  
20 would guess that Ben Franklin will probably move but  
21 again, in the Senate, speaking to the sponsors, they  
22 really haven't reached their 67 threshold and I don't  
23 see they're going to.

24 2007, we've got one bill enacted. It was  
25 by again the San Francisco Old Mint and National Park

1 Anniversaries.

2 MR. NOE: Is that getting any light at  
3 all?

4 MS. SIMMONS: No. And then going on down  
5 in 2008, Celia Cruz, Congressional Medal of Honor  
6 Memorial Coin Act which establishes a memorial for  
7 all those who have received the Congressional Medal  
8 of Honor, American Bald Eagle Recovery and then the  
9 NASA bill.

10 And then finally, 2009, Dr. Martin Luther  
11 King Commemorative Coin Act, Hudson-Fulton-Champlain  
12 Commission. Again, that is -- probably shouldn't be  
13 on there. That is again to review the possibility of  
14 the coin. And then finally the national opera coin.

15 Just so you know what we've been  
16 discussing most recently in the medal area is we've  
17 had our first meeting with some Martin Luther King --  
18 Mrs. Coretta Scott King and the sponsors of the bill  
19 in the House and Senate for that gold medal. So  
20 we're starting the process of getting source material  
21 and designs.

22 MS. LAWS: Can I ask a question? If a  
23 congresswoman wanted to write a bill, a coin bill,  
24 would it be horrible for them to consult with the CFA  
25 or the CCAC in the planning stages to kind of

1 brainstorm with us or is that totally outside our  
2 authority?

3 MR. WEINMAN: They could.

4 MS. LAWS: Do they know that?

5 MR. NOE: That's what they tried to do  
6 with the national park.

7 MS. LAWS: I would have loved -- this  
8 Lincoln thing is such a neat idea. I would have  
9 loved to have had a chance to listen to it and  
10 comment. Do you know what I mean?

11 MR. NOE: I think we're going to have  
12 plenty of time. I think it's going to come back. I  
13 don't think this one is going away. In some form,  
14 you're going to see something in 2009.

15 MS. SIMMONS: And many times what you'll  
16 see is bills get introduced and reintroduced before  
17 they're ever passed. And they can be modified over  
18 and over but still it's very rare when one bill goes  
19 through on the first try. It just all depends again  
20 on the sponsor and how active they are in getting the  
21 bill passed.

22 MR. NOE: Any questions on any of these  
23 for the good of the order? This is good. This is  
24 helpful because we get calls a lot with people asking  
25 us and it's a nice cheat sheet to say this is how

1 many sponsors it has.

2 MS. SIMMONS: Good. I'm glad it was  
3 useful. Before we get into agenda items for January,  
4 anything else we need to discuss for the good of the  
5 order? Again, I appreciate everybody's patience.  
6 Today it's been a long day but I think we got a lot  
7 accomplished today.

8 MR. FIVAZ: Is there any update on the  
9 final member?

10 MS. SIMMONS: The vacant slot?

11 MR. NOE: Yes.

12 MS. SIMMONS: Ms. Pelosi is looking at  
13 additional names. The Secretary's office has  
14 indicated that they would like more than just one  
15 name to be able to select from so they are currently  
16 thinking over what other nominees there could be.

17 MR. FIVAZ: Is there any time frame  
18 involved with that?

19 MS. SIMMONS: No, there isn't. I think  
20 they're very interested to know the committee as it  
21 is now can still do business and they think with the  
22 election and everything, it's kind of slowed things  
23 down. But it's all a matter of me calling the  
24 counsel's office and making sure that they provide  
25 some additional names.

1 MS. LAWS: What are the chances a person  
2 would be selected for the January meeting?

3 MS. SIMMONS: Highly unlikely with the  
4 holidays.

5 MR. NOE: Obviously agenda items for  
6 January will be -- we've got anywhere from one to  
7 four quarter designs, hopefully four but maybe three,  
8 maybe two. Does that sound right?

9 MR. BILLINGS: But if there are no quarter  
10 designs, we'll postpone that meeting until February?

11 MR. NOE: Oh, I think we'll have some.

12 MR. BILLINGS: But we're not going to meet  
13 for some.

14 MR. NOE: That's correct.

15 MR. BILLINGS: The point being we won't  
16 have anything to do.

17 MR. NOE: We're going to have some quarter  
18 designs, though. January is going to be a pretty  
19 definite meeting. I think the ones after that will  
20 be the ones whether we need them or not. My  
21 suggestion is if we end up with all four quarter  
22 designs of January, let's try to put off until March,  
23 if we can, any other stuff and not rush. That would  
24 be my suggestion.

25 MS. SIMMONS: And Greg just mentioned what



1     came out of our meeting yesterday is the Martin  
2     Luther King Commission would like to have something  
3     in by April so that would mean the March meeting.  
4     But it all is depending on whether they can get  
5     source material and legal releases can be obtained.  
6     That's one of the bigger chunks of time.

7                 MR. FIVAZ:  Was that at Mrs. King's  
8     request?

9                 MS. SIMMONS:  Not necessarily.  It's kind  
10    of the general feeling.

11                MR. NOE:  Anything else?  We'll get  
12    updated rosters to everyone.  Thank you all for all  
13    your time and the staff, thank you everybody.  We're  
14    adjourned.

15                (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

