

**FLC Northeast Region
Spring 2007 Meeting Minutes
Page 1**

Attendees

Mary Archuleta, Air Force Research Laboratory – Phillips Site
Dr. Theresa Baus, FLC Northeast Regional Coordinator, NUWC Division Newport
Robert Braun, US Army ARDEC
Dr. Richard Brenner, USDA ARS Office of Technology Transfer
Thomas Brown, FLC Northeast Regional Support Office
Michele Chambers, FLC Northeast Regional Support Office
Dr. John Scott Deiter, NSWC Indian Head Division
jennelle Derrickson, FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center
Jeffrey DiTullio, Natick Soldier RDEC
John Emond, FLC Mid-Atlantic Regional Coordinator, NASA Headquarters
Michael Furey, Brookhaven National Laboratory
Deborah Germak, FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center
Gary Jones, FLC Washington, DC Representative
Hans Kohler, L-3 Services Group
William Leach, NAWC Aircraft Division
Edward Linsenmeyer, FLC Chair, NSWC Panama City
Margaret McNamara, FLC Alumni Association, University of Buffalo
Lewis Meixler, FLC Northeast Region Deputy Coordinator, PPPL
Lynn Murray, Volpe Center
Gary Pasternak, US Army Engineer R&D Center
Michael Pomykacz, FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center
Patrick Rodriguez, FLC Mid-Continent Regional Coordinator, AFRL Phillips Site
Tim Ryan, US Army RDEC
Dr. Stanley Smith, FLC Alumni Association, S.H. Smith Associates
Andrea Snyder, FLC Management Support Office
J. Susan Sprake, FLC Vice Chair, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Gregory Taaffe, Benet Laboratories
Albert Zalcmann, FLC Management Support Office

Welcome – Dr. Theresa Baus, FLC Northeast Regional Coordinator

Northeast Regional Coordinator, Dr. Theresa Baus, welcomed the attendees and thanked them for coming to the meeting. In the interest of time, Dr. Baus immediately gave the floor to FLC Chair Ed Linsenmeyer for a national FLC update.

National Update – Edward Linsenmeyer, FLC Chair

FLC Chair Linsenmeyer began the update by mentioning that it was a good idea to connect regional meetings with FLC Executive Board meetings for two reasons: to increase the attendance of the regional meetings, and give Executive Board members the opportunity to get exposure to the activities of each FLC Region.

Performance evaluations for all six FLC regions were completed and their respective support contracts were renewed for option year #1.

The FLC was involved in a number of outreach activities, including:

- Attending the annual meeting of the Assistive Technology Industry Association (ATIA)
- Attending the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) national meeting
- Signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the International Society for Optical Engineering (SPIE)
- FLC Vice Chair Susan Sprake visited Botswana to attend conference. Among the topics covered included how to promote patents and protect indigenous intellectual property.

FLC Chair Linsenmeyer ended his presentation by reminding attendees of the upcoming elections for national officers (FLC Chair and Vice Chair), regional officers (Mid-Continent Region and Northeast Region), and Members-at-Large.

Overview of New York State Office of Science, Technology and Academic Research (NYSTAR) – Michael Relyea, Esq.

Mr. Relyea began his presentation by admitting that NYSTAR has had little contact with the FLC but would like to change that in the future. The FLC should be able to avail itself to state funding in regard to technology transfer and NYSTAR is interested in assisting the FLC. The new administration in place at NYSTAR is interested in emphasizing education and research and development (R&D). NYSTAR shares a similar mission as the FLC and both parties would benefit from working together.

Washington, DC Update – Gary Jones, FLC Washington, DC Representative

Congress has set an agenda with a number of initiatives. “Rising Above the Gathering Storm” addresses the issue of making the US more competitive in the areas of science and math, and offers suggestions on meeting this objective:

- “10,000 Teachers, 10 Million Minds” – program to improve science and math education from grades K-12.
- “Sowing Seeds” – sustain commitment to long-term basic research.
- “Best and Brightest” – make US more attractive in attracting students and researchers

The FY 2007 budget is slated to double investment in physical science and engineering, and modernize the research and development (R&D) tax credit. The priorities in the R&D portion of the budget include physical science, defense weapons development, space vehicle development, and homeland security.

External outreach efforts include visits to congressional staffers, a monthly column in *FLC NewsLink*, and obtaining congratulatory letters for FLC Award winners from their federal and state legislators.

The Specifics of Handling Royalty Income

Tim Ryan, US Army ARDEC – Picatinny Arsenal

Patents are important in that they provide seed revenue for laboratories, for instance ARDEC has made over \$2 million in royalties from the sales of ammunition, with 20 percent of royalties shared among the inventors, and the rest going back into the laboratory.

Michael Furey, Brookhaven National Laboratory

Some of the user facilities at Brookhaven are contracted to outside companies. Brookhaven has many work-for-others agreements, cooperative research and development agreements (CRADAs), and patents. In particular, Brookhaven has 160 patents in portfolio, with 87 licensed and 53 commercialized. Inventors can receive as much as 50 percent in the first \$100,000 from a patent. Remaining proceeds go to research and development, as well as the laboratory itself. Among the results of this reinvestment at Brookhaven include the purchase of computers, and upgraded MRI facility, and laboratory instrument upgrades in the Biology Department.

Deborah Germak, FAA William J. Hughes Technical Center

The Department of Transportation has not been as active in securing patents as other agencies but is trying to rectify the situation. The FAA has some licensing agreements but royalties are slow to come in. The Transportation Security Laboratory, formerly affiliated with FAA, is now part of the Department of Homeland Security and expects to become more active in pursuing technology transfer.

Technology Transfer Office Issues – “What is the Role and lab Support for ORTAs?”

What is the role of the Office of Research and Technology Applications (ORTA) Representative? Ideally the ORTA should be part of a laboratory’s senior management, but in reality that is often not the case with ORTAs assigned to departments such as Contracts, R&D, Office of the Laboratory Director, etc. The placement of the ORTA often depends on the priority of a particular agency. Management at many federal laboratories do not understand what technology transfer means. This will not change until technology transfer is made a significant part of the lab director’s budget.

A handful of agencies do take the role of the ORTA seriously:

- Air Force – integrates technology transfer into its lab investment strategy, which raises the profile of the ORTA. CRADA is seen as an important vehicle to advance mission and is used as leverage.
- USDA – has made technology transfer part of its mission, with ORTAs having the full support of the Secretary.
- Navy – has had great success in licensing, with full support of management.

Public Affairs Offices (PAOs) should be used more often to enhance technology transfer at laboratories. This can include publicizing CRADAs, preparing technology transfer information packets for distribution at PA conferences, and spotlight industry partners.

How US Export Controls Affect Technology Transfer – Ilona Shtrom, Office of National Security and Technology Transfer Controls

The Export Administration Regulations (EAR) applies to dual-use items for civil as well as military use. Exports fall into nine categories, with electronics the most exported category.

Deemed exports include the release of a technology or source code that is subject to the EAR to a foreign national in the US. This addresses two concerns: the role of foreign nationals in US industry; and, other countries seeking to illegally acquire controlled US technologies that could be diverted to weapons programs. Not subject to EAR is information that is publicly available, educational material, and patent information.

Technology Transfer Office Issues – Technology Transfer Office: Relevance in the Lab’s Structure

What types of metrics have to be offered to demonstrate the success of a laboratory’s technology transfer office? There is a correlation between success and recognition by the laboratory at large. Recognition, such as the FLC Awards, can result in a morale boost and even cash incentives depending on the laboratory.

Doing technology transfer with academia is problematic, as Bayh-Dole precludes university involvement in CRADAs.

Technology Transfer Office Issues – Dealing with Open Source Software

An issue to consider is what rights do government laboratories have is non-government entities take their (govt. lab) software for it’s own product and goes on to commercialize it? At present laboratories cannot control their software source codes.

Statutory Problem Working with State Entities

How can federal laboratories work with state entities? Work-for-others agreement is limiting, and many federal labs are wary of risking a CRADA. It is problematic to obtain state funding for these types of agreements.

The FLC Awards Regional & National Process: Relevance to Lab Management – Lewis Meixler, Northeast Region Deputy Coordinator

The current evaluation and process for the FLC National Awards is flawed. Using raw scores to determine the winner of an award is not a reliable barometer because some evaluators score on a much lower curve than other, throwing off the average score for a submission. The normalized scoring method should be used to determine the winners, as the scoring is based on the ranking of a nomination which tends to be more consistent.

In addition, evaluators should be selected from outside the FLC and pay them for the service, if necessary. This eliminates potential bias against laboratories and agencies.

Submissions should be screened more carefully to make sure they meet criteria. This was a problem in the 2007 awards.

Closing Remarks/Adjourn – Dr. Theresa Baus, Northeast Regional Coordinator

Dr. Baus thanked the attendees for taking part in the meeting and complimented them for their insightful opinions. The meeting was then adjourned.