

Notes from Ohio Federal Military Jobs Commission Meeting

14 Nov 14 at AVETEC

0800 – Senator Widener opened the session by meeting with the Commissioners and explaining the genesis of the Commission as well as the goal of delivering a written strategy to the State by 13 March 15. He mentioned the importance of the Commission being a sustainable part of the Ohio fabric. He said that the Commission's work (the state strategy) needs to be ingrained across the State and needs to define how all are working towards common goals.

0845 – Senator Widener opened the meeting with all team members by explaining the genesis of the Commission.

0900 – Cassie Barlow walked the team through the agenda, the legislation and the Chapters to be written by the Commission team.

0915 – Mgen (ret) Wayt and his team from CBD walked everyone through their Phase I and Phase II Federal Retention Study that highlights the strengths and weakness of all of Ohio's Federal Installations. The study also built a Federal Asset Fact Book for the State and the different regions across the State. A Community Guide to Federal Asset Partnerships was also delivered and briefed to every JobsOhio region.

1100 – Chapter Teams met and Brainstormed ideas for their Chapters.

Chapter 1 – Research and Technology Transition Innovation Initiative

FMJC Commissioners in Attendance: Don Campbell (former NASA Glenn and AFRL Director)

Gary O'Connell (former NASIC Chief Scientist)

R&D Working Group Leaders: Marty Kress, VP Research OSU

Dennis Andersh, Director WSU/WSRI

Commissioner O'Connell opened session with request that group brainstorm about a process, proposed structure, possible focus areas, etc. for developing recommendations for the research and tech transition strategy for the FMJC strategic plan. He also requested members to think of others in Ohio that should be involved who are not currently engaged on the working group.

Marty Kress and Dennis Andersh facilitated the working groups' brainstorming session and discussion. There was good participation and valuable feedback from the attendees. Rather than try to discuss how the list of university technical assets included in the meeting materials were linked to future R&D activities, participants were asked to table ideas about reference missions that represented emerging opportunities for the government labs, universities and firms in the State of Ohio, opportunities that would serve as platforms for the integration of the State's technology and research assets.

A summary of this session is below:

Go Forward Strategy: The Working Group discussed and generally agreed on a process and focus for the work ahead with the following components:

- Goal is to build on Ohio's research strengths by focusing on collaboration with the state's two major federal research facilities, Wright- Patterson Air Force Base and NASA Glenn Research Center, the University System of Ohio and industry who have a commitment to grow and transition technology in both the defense and commercial markets in Ohio. It was also noted that future collaborations will require the external parties to bring resources, labs, and facilities to the table. A guiding principle will be for the FMJC to identify mission priorities/requirements at Wright-Patterson AFB, NASA Glenn and other key federal agencies in the defense and aerospace domains that can capitalize on the State R&T assets. These requirements, i.e. programs of record and technology focus areas, are driving DOD and Service investments and will have long term relevance for future research funding. By looking first at market demand and then at opportunities, Ohio can align and organize our existing and future R&D assets to more effectively compete as a State to attract additional research funding, talent and associated high tech jobs.
- Aside from the federal research installations themselves, Ohio can better leverage and utilize its higher education institutions by aligning their inherent strengths and core competencies around future requirements and priority research and funding opportunities.
- The group agreed it should consider structuring this initiative around collaborative business models that encourage innovation, teamwork and focused outcomes that create a significant ROI for the federal installations and State of Ohio. Several models were mentioned for further analysis including InQTel, NASA Ames Workforce/Technology Initiative, John Doerr/Stanford Model, AHEAD at WPAFB, Responsive Systems Solutions Center, and ORNL Joint Venture/Business Development Corporation Model and others.

Team noted that industry in the State could best help the FMJC ID requirements for the Services, NASA and other key government organizations. The Team also noted that the capabilities needed to address emerging requirements will necessitate the inclusion of emerging entrepreneurial firms, IT firms, networking groups, data visualization, etc to be able to provide end-to-end systems solutions. There is a list of 300 aerospace and defense firms for Ohio that could serve as a starting point – but more firms need to be included to address emerging requirements.

Dennis Andersh noted that WSU and OSU will collaborate to set up a share point site for the Research and Tech Transition Working Group where significant reports and documents can be

reviewed such as the Air Force Tech Horizons, NASA Research Priorities, DARPA Tech Challenges, etc.

There was an ensuing open discussion around potential focus areas/mission requirements for future consideration as potential priorities based on a new and innovative business model and priority development process. Those topical areas are noted below:

- Navigation/time stamping- Alternatives to current GPS systems that can function in an anti-access area denied airspace environment and are less vulnerable to cyber attacks
- Cyber/Big data- Security
- Data analytics and data visualization – reference to ISR missions and other emerging applications
- Next gen communications technology to optimize new band widths and to provide secure systems
- Energy Storage
- Counter Space/Space Resilience - A2AD focused
- Human Performance and Training- utilizing technology to improve human effectiveness and reducing costs
- Autonomous Systems/Man-Machine Teaming
- Systems Integration- System of Systems approach to complex system engineering challenges
- Health Sciences and Medicine for focused medical applications
- Tech Transition and Advanced Materials and Manufacturing
- Advanced Air Traffic Control Systems

- UAS/Remotely Piloted Vehicles- Manned/Unmanned Flight

Based on the group's interaction, it was clear that the FMJC Team should involve and collaborate with other organizations in Ohio as well as in two key adjoining states – Kentucky and Indiana. The FMJC Team needs to inventory other organizations and initiatives in Ohio who can be aligned with FMJC R&D strategy with the focus on building on and coordinating state resources. It was also noted that the Team needs to closely interact with the Ohio Aerospace Council that is framing the Ohio Space Plan, the newly initiated Defense Manufacturing Assistance Program, and Jobs Ohio that is framing a set of investment priorities. Other Ohio organizations mentioned that need to be integrated into the process include:

- VA
- Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT)
- Ohio Innovation Fund (health care focused)

- Ohio's Entrepreneurial Signature Program
- ICORE Lean Launchpad
- Jobs Ohio and its Regional ED organizations
- Loraine Community College
- Other private Ohio higher Ed institutions with relevant research and technology assets
- Battelle – R&T and emerging national priorities
- Ohio SBIR company award winners and subcontractors
- Engage business early and often and focus on those who have investment/growth interest in R&D and new product development as opposed to technical services contractors
- In addition to tabling broad array of emerging mission requirements, the Team also devoted some time to exploring another issue in its charter -- technology commercialization. For years, this issue has been addressed in reports funded by the federal government, key State organizations including the State's leading research organizations. Everybody would like to increase the transition of R&T into new firms, products and processes – but that has been a challenge. What the Team discussed as options to improve performance ranged from an integrated WPAFB/NASA GRC SBIR call for proposal linked to a key strategic focus/emerging need, the integration of already funded SBIRs from across multiple agencies to address government requirements, access at the marginal cost to key test assets, labs and instruments at federal and university labs for emerging entrepreneurs and businesses, revised treatment of IP to facilitate collaborations and tech commercialization, and the role of key venture capitalists in Ohio and CA in being a source of new and innovative ideas.
- The Team did not have time to table any firm initiatives for this topic. But one action was for the team to take a look at the NASA Ames model that has facilitated to co-location of university and government researchers to be more active in new business and product launches, technology development and commercialization. This is achieved by giving the university researcher a government slot to better understand government requirements and market needs.

Closing comments- Marty Kress and Dennis thanked participants, encouraged them to continue to provide inputs and ideas about subject areas and involving others in the planning process.

It was stressed that key to the success of this activity would be (1) its ability to clearly ID funded requirements and emerging requirements —to clearly ID customer requirements will require active industry support, (2) its ability to integrate the State's portfolio of R&T assets to address those requirements – the will require an independent, technology integrator that can work across government, industry, university communities, (3) its ability to secure external funding

to facilitate collaboration and for the universities to make strategic R&T investments – this will require interactions with some key thought leaders, and (4) its ability to have Ohio based organizations taking the lead in framing the solutions sets for key government requirements – this could require a new institutional model.

Each participant at the meeting was asked to send in additional ideas and inputs. All invited participants will be given the same opportunity in the email that will go out to them summarizing the meeting.

This was a good first step, but it was clear that building a consensus and a viable action plan will require an expanded set of activities, meetings and interactions – a lot of staff work.

A list of emerging requirements and candidate technology focus areas will be developed from the feedback received and from ongoing research into federal budgets, programs of record, etc. Once this list has been compiled – it will be shared with the participating research organizations – university, industry and government labs. As noted above, broader and deeper industry support will be needed.

The team will also work to frame an inventory of key Ohio assets and best practices. This is an area where a good data base could be a most valuable asset. There will be an effort to reconvene the Research and Tech Transition Working Group in December. The Team is still expected to release a first draft report in January 2015 and the final report and recommendations by March, 2015. These are ambitious metrics and to achieve them the Team might need to limit its focus or table recommendations that will require further development by the staff of then established FMJC.

Chapter 2 – Small Business Federal Contracting

John Glazer (Glazerj@ohio.edu)

Mike Wiche (Michael.wiche@wright.edu)

Jason Kester (jkester@sohpa.org)

Martha Smith (martini_on_deck@yahoo.com)

Jim Laipply (James.Laipply@development.ohio.gov)

Les McFawn (LESMCFAWN@aol.com)

Karen Conrad (Karen.Conrad@development.ohio.gov)

Chris Ford (Ford@daytonregion.org)

Glenn Richardson (Richardson@jobs-ohio.com)

Loren Reno (loren.reno@yahoo.com)

The team conducted a general brainstorming session to capture thoughts regarding the development of a strategy to increase the opportunities for small business expansion within the

Federal sector. The team's initial thoughts are not to restrict this to only the Federal sector, but to also address the State level, as well.

The team organized the thoughts into several categories as listed below:

- Create an organizational conduit for small business. As an example, create a “fusion center” to provide information linkages for small businesses to potential employers. The purpose of the center would be to publicize existing opportunities. The information would be pushed to small business, as well as small business capability published for consumers within the Federal sector, OEMs, and others. This would take an ongoing effort, not a one-time publication, possibly using professional organizations to assist.
- Inventories would need to be developed, to include inventories of small businesses, inventories of current projects, and resources/tools.
- A gap analysis needs to be performed to determine the current need and the team discussed the potential to forecast the need.
- We need to identify the impediments to expansion of small business opportunities. We discussed the need to create focus groups for small businesses state-wide, potentially a university project or SBA.
- Educational outreach for both small businesses and the procurement community was discussed as an action item.
- The team needs to identify procurement sources, such as micro-purchase and public bid.
- The team needs to identify other members that can be of use.

In addition to the team discussion, General Reno provided the following thoughts:

Grow Small Business sector

- Stimulate entrepreneurship
 - Incentives
 - Academic: secondary, trade tech schools, community colleges, colleges and university
 - Discover, model successful incubator programs: reasons for success
- Publicize exiting opportunities
 - DoD directives
 - Other Federal departments
 - OEMs seeking sub-contractors (OH, US, Intl)
- Make SB environment friendlier
 - Score-keep and publicize awards vs criteria
 - Lobby Congress, Administration for improvements
- Publicize existing SB capabilities
 - “Push” SB availability to Federal sector
 - “Push” SB availability to OEMs
- Remove local-to-state hindrances
 - Zoning restrictions (e.g., family garage business)
 - HOA limitations
 - ID issues, then work locally to remove

Grow large business sector

- Enable SB transition to large business
- Attract companies that are transitioning
 - Eliminate reasons they don't come to OH
 - Eliminate reasons they leave OH
 - Court movers actively
 - Determine attractions: survey, publicize, develop
- Engage political sector (organize)
 - US: Senators, Congressmen
 - State: Governor, senators, representatives
 - County: commissioners
 - Local: councils, mayors
 - Retired elected officials
- Organize outreach
 - Who to do what
 - Who is in-charge
 - Timing and Timeline
- Optimize chambers of commerce, development coalitions
 - Share reasons for success
 - Share capacities, facilities, manpower

- Other thoughts
 - Most focus on growing but not at exclusion of attracting
 - Grow small to larger
 - Grow start-ups
 - Commission plan should include provision for perpetual suggestion-implementation-evaluation feedback loops
 - Mitigate reasons for military brain drain
 - Determine reasons for retiring military leaving state
 - Determine reasons for retiring OH resident military not coming back
 - Collect, advertise opportunities associated with existing programs, e.g., boots-to-classroom for military
 - Develop other programs
 - ID other programs, advertise them
 - Many active duty military will be separating, retiring as Services downsize. Establish, maintain "presence" in key unofficial Service periodicals, e.g., Air Force Magazine; AF, Army, and Navy Times
 - Important constituencies to consult in policy development:
 - Venture capitalists
 - SB owners, operators
 - Academic sector
 - Diversity
 - WPAFB SB office
 - Other business sectors: retail, grocer, medical, service, manufacture, distribution, transportation, IT, R&D
 - Chambers of Commerce, Development Coalitions

- Retired military
- Bottom lines
 - Grow what we already have: small and large sectors
 - Exploit present opportunity
 - Remove impediments
 - Plan next and after-next steps
 - Reverse exit of businesses and individuals
 - Share successes, collaborate where possible

Chapter 3 – Workforce Placement Center for Federal/Military Jobs

Team consisted of Toni Overholser from Clark State, Michelle Fields from WIA, Bob Gruhl from Montgomery County Job Center, Colleen Ryan from Vectren, Eli Faes from the Board of Regents and Gayle Agahi from Cleveland Clinic. The team talked about how we help federal employers find the employees that they need. They discussed the need for a good listing of what currently exists across the state to help with Federal employment needs. The team agreed that there is no need to recreate the wheel, and that we need to understand what is currently being accomplished and how the State can leverage what is currently being done. The team also discussed the importance of a one-stop shop idea to help people find Federal employment across the State. The team also discussed the importance of a comprehensive marketing strategy that would be able to new graduates across the country, displaced Federal workers as well as Veterans around the world. The team discussed the importance of connecting with educational institutions across the state to make sure they are addressing the workforce gaps. The team discussed the data that is currently being collected by the Aerospace Professional Development Center in regards to Defense workforce needs across the states. These data will be very helpful to the team in identifying gaps and working towards filling gaps. The team mentioned the importance of continuing to work on a state strategy to translate military skills sets to licenses, degrees and certificates across the State. The team also discussed the importance of getting to children at a very young age to show them the potential for Defense work in Ohio.

Chapter 4 – Federal Facility Retention and Expansion Plan

Chapter 5 – Develop OFMJC Organizational Structure and Plan

Obviously the specific details of the other Chapter's work products – goals, strategies, tactics, objectives, and activities – are going to heavily influence the final version of this Chapter. As without knowing what specifically we are trying to achieve it will be difficult to build a cohesive plan for how it is fiscally initiated and sustained.

Priorities:

* Would be useful to see funding strategies of other states to better understand how they:

○ Defined their funding strategy for operations,

- o Defined their funding strategy for capital (if needed),
- o How these strategies evolved as the state's moved from the initiation of this activity to the maintenance of the strategy,
- o How their strategy aligned with their objectives: i.e were they trying to maintain what they had, or proactively add to what they had
- * We need to have input from across the state on what funds are currently available, and the appetite of various offices (Governor, OBM, legislature, DSA, JobsOhio) to support with existing sources, or to pursue/create new funding streams.
- * We should understand the federal landscape to ensure buy-in of the funding/business plan strategy by those representative bodies.
- * We need to investigate and determine leverage points related to private industry's interest in and potential derived benefits from such a strategy and evaluate for potential investment partnerships.
- * We need to offer a structure for both fiscal administration and operations that leverages existing capabilities, is transparent to all involved, and ensures that the right talent and fiscal resources can be deployed, or redirected with a minimum of administrative burden/machinations.