#### THE MANUFACTURING COUNCIL

DOC Building 14th & Constitution Avenue, N.W. Room 4830 Washington, DC

Tuesday, April 30, 2013

The meeting was convened, pursuant to notice, at 9:26 a.m., MR. JOSEPH B. ANDERSON, Chair, residing. APPEARANCES:

## MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

MR. MICHAEL LASZKIEWICZ Vice President and General Manager Automation Power Control Business Rockwell Automation, Inc.

MS. MARY ISBISTER President GenMet

MR. JOSEPH B. ANDERSON, JR. Chairman and CEO TAG Holdings, LLC

MS. CHRISTIE WONG BARRETT CEO Mac Arthur Corporation

MR. STEPHAN G. BRAIG President and CEO Trexel Incorporated

MR. J. JOSEPH BURGESS President and CEO Aegion Corporation

MR. MICHAEL J. CADIGAN
General Manager
Microelectronics Systems and Technology Group

MR. CARLOS M. CARDOSO Chairman President and CEO Kennametal Incorporated

MR. MARK CHANDLER Senior Vice President Cisco Systems Incorporated

MR. CODY FRIESEN
President and Chief Technical Officer
Fluidic Energy

MR. HIROYUKI FUJITA
President and CEO
Quality Electrodynamics

MR. ALBERT M. GREEN CEO Kent Displays Incorporated

MR. DAVID HASTINGS
President and CEO
Mount Vernon Mills Incorporated

MR. ERIC L. KELLY President and CEO Overland Storage

MR. JOEL LORENTZEN CEO Genesis Systems Group

MS. CLAUDINE MARTINEZ
President and General Counsel
MCT Industries

MR. SHIRISH PAREEK Founder and CEO

Hydraulex Global

MS. ANDRA RUSH CEO The Rush Group

MS. SUSAN SMYTH
Director - Manufacturing Systems Lab
General Motors Company

MR. ROY SWEATMAN
President
Southern Manufacturing Technologies
Incorporated

MR. JEFF WILCOX Vice President - Engineering Lockheed Martin Corporation

MS. CAROL WILLIAMS
Executive Vice President - Manufacturing &
Engineering, Supply Chain and Environmental,
Health & Safety Operations
The Dow Chemical Company

MR. BILL ZAHNER
President and CEO
A. Zahner Company

### ALSO PRESENT:

DR. REBECCA BLANK
Deputy Secretary of Commerce

MR. FRANCISCO SANCHEZ Under Secretary of Commerce

DR. MARK DOMS
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs

MS. NICOLE LAMB-HALE
Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing
& Services
U.S. Department of Commerce

MS. CHANDRA BROWN
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing

MR. NEAL ORRINGER
Senior Advisor to the Secretary
for Manufacturing

MR. MATT ERSKINE
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Economic Development

MR. PHIL SINGERMAN
Associate Director for Innovation
and Industry Services

MS. JENNIFER PILAT Director Office of Advisory Committees

MS. ELIZABETH EMANUEL
Deputy Director
Office of Advisory Committees

# **EX-OFFICIO OFFICES**

MR. DON GRAVES
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Small
Business, Community Development and
Housing Policy,
U.S. Department of Treasury

MS. JANE OATES
Assistant Secretary for Employment and
Training Administration,
U.S. Department of Labor

MS. LIBBY WAYMAN
Senior Advisor to the Assistant Secretary
for Manufacturing
U.S. Department of Energy

#### WHITE HOUSE

MR. JASON MILLER
Special Assistant to the President for
Manufacturing Policy

# I N D E X

	PAGE
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	7
NATIONAL EXPORT INITIATIVE	39
THE MANUFACTURING COUNCIL'S WORK Nicole Lamb-Hale, Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing & Services	48
THE MANUFACTURING COUNCIL EXPERIENCE Chandra Brown, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing	54
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  Neal Orringer, Senior Advisor to the Secretary for Manufacturing Services	58
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY Phil Singerman, Associate Director for Innovation and Industry Services	63
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION  Matt Erskine, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment & Testing	68
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR INTRODUCTION  Jane Oates, Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training	75
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY INTRODUCTION  Don Graves, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Small  Business, Community Development,  and Housing Policy	83
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY INTRODUCTION Libby Wayman, Senior Advisor to the Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing	90
WHITE HOUSE INTRODUCTION  Jason Miller, Special Assistant to the President for Manufacturing Policy	98
ECONOMIC BRIEFING Mark Doms, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs	105

PRIORITIES DISCUSSION	131
NEXT STEPS AND MEETING ADJOURNMENT Mike Laszkiewicz, Chair	158
Mary Isbister, Vice Chair	

# 

# PROCEEDINGS

# WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

1.3

2.4

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Good morning, and welcome. It's wonderful to see everyone here and so enthusiastically meeting and networking with one another. I'm going to ask that the Council members please take their seats. Your seats are pre-assigned. The Secretary will be joining us shortly and we'd like to be ready for her when she gets here.

We have a very full agenda this morning so we will work hard to stay on track and make sure that we can allow everyone the opportunity to participate fully. Thank you. We look forward to getting started.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: If we could come to order, please. Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the Manufacturing Council. My name is Mike Laszkiewicz. I am the Chairman of this term of the Manufacturing Council. Mary Isbister -- Mary is the Vice Chair. Mary and I met at this meeting about two years ago and learned that our facilities were only about a quarter of a mile apart from one another, so I'm careful of what might happen to you at this meeting. I've learned already from our event last night that many of our

participants already have relationships and have been teaming together with private partnerships to drive manufacturing forward.

Secretary Blank, thank you very much for joining us this morning. Nicole Lamb-Hale, who I'm very sad to see is leaving, but has been a great friend of the Manufacturing Council. We appreciate your partnership. Chandra, good morning. You've switched teams.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Last year you were sitting on this side of the table. We appreciate everyone's support. Jane, thank you for coming.

We're going to be going through a process today where we on-board this team, and in that process I'd like to introduce Secretary Rebecca Blank.

Secretary Blank has been extremely supportive of our manufacturing initiatives and has ensured that the Commerce Department has allocated resources and teamed up with business executives on this Council and throughout U.S. manufacturing, so we appreciate her work and we congratulate her as she finishes her term and hopefully sends us off in a good direction. So thank you and welcome to Wisconsin.

SECRETARY BLANK: Good. Well, thank you,

Mike, and thank you, Mary. I'm not quite in Wisconsin yet, but I'm getting there. I want to thank everyone for coming this morning. These committees are incredibly important to us and I know that they are a labor of love on your part. So I appreciate all of the advice and work that you are going to do in the next several years as a part of this new committee.

I want to start with brief introductions. I

1.3

2.4

know there are some faces here of people I've met and there are some new faces as well, if I can see you down there at the end. So let's just go around the table and tell us your name, your company, where you're located, and just a phrase or two on what it is that you actually make. We'll let the Commerce people introduce themselves as well like good government people.

So, Nicole, you want to start?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY LAMB-HALE: Nicole Lamb-Hale, Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing & Services.

MS. BROWN: Chandra Brown, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing.

SECRETARY BLANK: Who used to be...

MS. BROWN: Who used to build boats and bridge and space launch complexes, and streetcars.

MS. PILAT: Jenna Pilat, Director for the

1	Office of Advisory Committees.
2	MS. EMANUEL: Liz Emanuel, Deputy Director for
3	the Office of Advisory Committees.
4	MR. ORRINGER: I'm Neal Orringer. I'm
5	Secretary Blank's advisor on manufacturing.
6	MS. WAYMAN: Libby Wayman. I'm the Director
7	of the Clean Energy Manufacturing Initiative from
8	Department of Energy.
9	MR. PAREEK: Shirish Pareek, Hydraulics
10	Global, manufacture of hydraulic pumps and motors.
11	MR. HASTINGS: David Hastings, with Mt.
12	Vernon Mills, located in South Carolina. Most of our
13	facilities are in the Southeast and we manufacture
14	denim and apparel finished fabrics for work wear,
15	specialty flame-resistant type fabrics, and the
16	military.
17	MR. KELLY: Good morning. My name is Eric
18	Kelly, president and CEO of Overland Storage. We're a
19	technology company in California. We manufacture data
20	storage systems, network systems.
21	MR. SWEATMAN: Roy Sweatman, SMT, Tampa,
22	Florida. We are basically a machine shop. We make
23	for aircraft and aerospace defense.
24	MR. ZAHNER: Bill Zahner, June City, Missouri,
25	the A. Zahner Company. We manufacture original

architecture.

1.3

2.4

SECRETARY BLANK: I should say, I had the pleasure of visiting Bill's facility. I don't know when this was, sometime in the last year, and it is the most fascinating place to go through. You guys all know how much fun manufacturing tours are, but he gives you a great one. You need to get to Kansas City.

MS. BARRETT: Hi. I'm Christie Wong Barrett, the CEO of MacArthur Corporation. We're a small manufacturing company headquartered in Michigan and we make labels and die-cut components. So you might find our parts in almost every vehicle in the State and a number of electronics.

MR. LORENTZEN: Joe Lorentzen, CEO of Genesis Systems Group. We do a lot of -- serving customers worldwide, headquartered in Davenport, Iowa. We have offices in Mexico and Japan.

MR. WILCOX: Good morning. I'm Jeff Wilcox with Lockheed Martin. I'm the vice president for Engineering, which also includes production operations at Lockheed Martin. We make lots of things, although truth be told we're more of an innovator than a manufacturer. We typically develop systems that use parts for many of the companies in this room and other manufacturing companies.

MR. FRIESEN: Cody Friesen, president and CTO of Ludic Energy, which is based in Scottsdale, Arizona. We make large-scale, sustainable batteries that we export to Southeast Asia, Central America, et cetera, and essentially displace dirty lead/acid batteries and diesel generators and offset substantial amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> and mercury, et cetera. So I'm happy to be here.

1.3

2.4

MR. GREEN: Albert Green. I'm the CEO of Kent Displays. We're located in Kent, Ohio. We manufacture a line of products called the Boogie Board LCD Heat Writers.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Mary Isbister. I'm the president of GenMet in Wisconsin. We are a custom metal fabricator and part of the very large supply chain for companies that sit on the Council like this. I am happy to be the Vice Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Hi. Mike Laszkiewicz.

I'm from Rockwell Automation. We're located in

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a global business. We are
focused on manufacturing. We design and manufacture
information and control systems. As I learned last
night, we're in many of your facilities. I'm the Chair
of the Council. Again, thank you for coming.

MS. SMITH: My name is Susan Smith. I run Manufacturing R&D for General Motors. We make cars and

trucks.

1.3

2.4

(Laughter)

MR. CARDOSA: Good morning. I'm Carlos
Cardosa, chairman and CEO of Kennametal. We are
headquartered in Pittsburgh. We are in 60 different
countries. We are a tungsten carbide company. We
provide tooling for most of the companies here. We
like to think that we make America -- we're everything
from any -- you can think about, we're involved in it:
underground mining, oil and gas drilling, to making
airplanes and so forth.

MR. ANDERSON: I'm Joe Anderson, chairman and CEO of TAG Holdings. It's an entrepreneurial endeavor that I own and we own several manufacturing companies, do a lot of machining, a lot of modular assembly for the auto industry, historically, moving more into the machining of heavy equipment like Caterpillar, aerospace, and defense, located in the suburbs of Detroit.

MS. MARTINEZ: Good morning, everyone. I'm Claudine Martinez and I am the president and general counsel of MCT Industries. This was created 40 years ago by my parents, so my brother and I are now heading up the second generation in the family business. We focus on defense, all four branches.

We build maintenance platforms for the aircraft, as well as various transportation systems, and then as well on the energy side we build various transportation systems that range from nuclear and chemical platforms for an Air Force base, as well as the various labs.

MR. FUJITA: Good morning. My name is
Hiroyuki Fujita. I'm from QED, a medical equipment
manufacturer and exporter. We are located in
Cleveland, Ohio.

MR. BURGESS: I'm Joe Burgess, CEO of Aegion Corporation. We're based in St. Louis, Missouri. We manufacture coatings and linings products primarily used for tech line repair across water, waste water, and energy and mining applications.

MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Carol Williams and I'm the executive vice president for Operations, which includes manufacturing, for the Dow Chemical Company. Since many of you probably didn't like chemistry in high school, we manufacture everything from the coatings on this table to materials that go into the water bottle, to the seat cushion, to the paintings on the wall, to the agricultural chemicals that are used every day to make our products. So, globally around the world we participate in 120 countries but the U.S.

is our history and our largest facility.

1.3

2.4

MR. BRAIG: Good morning. I'm Steve Braig.

I'm CEO of Trexel, located outside of Boston,

Massachusetts. We manufacture capital equipment. We provide a processing solution to provide a microcellular material structure in plastic parts, so it's mostly used for automotive light-weight applications. Thank you.

MR. CADIGAN: Good morning. My name is Mike Cadigan for IBM. We run IBM's semiconductor business. As you can all imagine, it's a very challenging business in high technology development and innovation. Innovation, of course, is one of the key things we're going to talk about as a committee. You all recognize that we are a multi-national company, so Carol and Carlos, I catch your beat on country coverage. I think we're in about 158 countries at present today. I really feel good about being part of this team.

MS. RUSH: Hi. I'm Andra Rush, president of The Rush Group, and we service primarily the auto industry but I'm open to other industries.

(Laughter)

MS. RUSH: We build interior systems and components, primarily like your instrument panel overhead systems, everything that you see in a car.

We're happy to be here.

1.3

2.4

MR. CHANDLER: I'm Mark Chandler. I'm general counsel at Cisco Systems. We make internet infrastructure and systems built around that, such as video systems, telephone systems, physical security, and so forth.

MR. SINGERMAN: Good morning. My name is
Philip Singerman. I'm with the Commerce Department's
National Institute of Standards and Technology. I'm
the Associate Director for Innovation and Industry
Services.

MS. OATES: Good morning. I'm Jane Oates.

I'm the Assistant Secretary at Labor for Employment and
Training.

UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: Francisco Sanchez,
Under Secretary of Commerce for Trade.

SECRETARY BLANK: So thank you all again for being here. And Jane, thank you for coming over from Education, or Labor. Labor is always a great partner with us, as is Education.

So I was going to say a few words and them I'm to swear you all in. So anyone who is having second thoughts, this is your chance to dash from the room before we get to the swearing in part. I just thought I'd let you know that.

1.3

2.4

# (Laughter)

SECRETARY BLANK: So we are going to look to this group to really drive strategies, policies, programs that are going to build on the growth that we have seen in manufacturing as we've been coming out of this recession. And I should note, while this group officially sits inside the International Trade

Administration, I, and I think all of us around the Department, consider this a group to work with broadly across all of the different issues that we work on in this Department because ITA has only a piece of the manufacturing portfolio, NIST has a piece of it, the Patent & Trademark Office obviously has a piece of this, our Economic Development Administration does.

So over the time in your committee I think you're going to be meeting people from a number of our different bureaus and working on a number of different issues and I hope that your advice will span the range of issues that we care about.

Manufacturing, as you know, has been a top driver of economic growth through the last three years. Last year, manufactured goods were 11.5 percent of GDP, \$1.7 trillion. We have added more than half a million jobs in manufacturing over the past three years, which is quite a contrast to the previous decade

where we lost jobs.

1.3

2.4

I should say the job loss wasn't just in the recession, the job loss was actually steeper in the first part of the 2000s than in the second part. We had this longer term trend that we have turned around here in the last few years. Our goal is to keep that trend turned around, to keep manufacturing growing.

In its previous term this Council was active in a number of areas: it gave very strong support to the new trade agreements with Colombia, Korea, and Panama; it called for more support into research and development; it advocated for more STEM education and training; and it pushed for an even stronger U.S. energy environment and a whole set of other recommendations which I know a number of you are very familiar with.

We took those recommendations seriously and many of them are reflected in the administration's actions and plans for the future. I am quite confident that the recommendations that you make, building on the last Manufacturing Council, are going to help further drive our program ideas and help drive innovation and competitiveness in manufacturing on a broader scale.

The President's proposed budget for fiscal year 2014, which came out just a few weeks ago,

includes a strong national strategy for manufacturing and you're going to be hearing more about some of these programs in this meeting and in others, including support for an education workforce, 21st century infrastructure, strong basic R&D, and more.

1.3

2.4

So to jump-start the discussions today I want to share a few samples of some of the budget proposals that are in there and how they support some of the key programs inside the Department of Commerce to just sort of get us to a base of, what are we doing here at Commerce that relates to manufacturing?

So I should note the budget proposals are based on a belief that over the next 5 to 10 years the U.S. will have an increasingly attractive competitive advantage in bringing manufacturing investment into the United States, either U.S.-based manufacturers or foreign-based manufacturers locating here.

This is, of course, in part due to what is really a revolutionary change in our energy situation that I think you probably are quite familiar with but too many people in the United States don't quite realize how much the energy environment in the U.S. has changed and how much more change is coming quite quickly.

Our labor costs, our level of productivity in

the U.S., the productivity levels have risen steadily so we are now one of the most productive countries in the world. You compare that together with all the other advantages that the U.S. has of pretty strong intellectual property protections, stable rule of law, an environment with very strong research and innovation, partners in university and research settings, and there are just a lot of reasons to believe that anyone who is going to be looking to invest, and particularly people who want to put investments in the developed world, are going to be looking at the U.S. and we need to be competing hard for those investments and creating the opportunity to really expand, particularly advanced high-tech manufacturing in the United States, over the next 5 to 10 years. We need to take advantage of this moment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

That is why the budget supports a new

Commerce-led initiative called the Investing in

Manufacturing Communities Partnership. The IMC is what
this goes by, Investing in Manufacturing Communities.

I went out and announced this program publicly two weeks ago in Mesa, Arizona, and in West Valley
City, Utah, two communities that have really worked to create an environment to attract particular industry segments in manufacturing and have been very successful

at building a cluster of industries in those communities through smart strategic planning and targeted investments.

1.3

2.4

Through the IMC, the idea is that the Federal Government will help incentive more communities to follow the lead of these two communities, developing a strategic plan, figuring out what the assets are that they have in place, what are the industries that they are particularly well-suited to attract, both the larger manufacturers as well as supply chain industries, and asking what additional targeted investments do they need to make in order to be more attractive as a place to attract manufacturing investments.

Our idea is that we will provide seed money, with matching money coming from the community, to help them make some of those targeted investments. We are going to start this year with 25 planning grants, asking communities to start building those strategic plans and to start really thinking strategically, and it's particularly true for some of the depressed Midwestern cities who have spent the last three decades figuring out, how do we deal with shutting factories and loss of jobs? We want to incentivize them to start thinking in a very different way. How do we take

advantage of what is now a very different environment to actually attract manufacturing back and to build the strategic plan that is going to do that?

1.3

2.4

We then propose next year to ask for some new money, together with money that exists not just in the Department of Commerce but in a number of other agencies around government, to try to fund a couple of pilot projects, to put out six or eight competitive proposals for communities to match our dollars with their dollars to implement those strategic plans, to actually invest in either infrastructure in some sort of research-private sector linkage, workforce development, whatever it is that they most need to make their community even more attractive for investments in the industries that really fit into that particular community.

Now, I know that all of you represent U.S.based companies. One of the things I'm curious about
as we move forward is what you think best practices are
for communities here. What do communities need to do
to be attractive sorts of investments that you are
going to be making in the next five years? We're going
to come back and ask you that advice as we're
implementing this and trying to work on the community
front: how do we get communities to prepare for this

and look attractive to you? What is it that you want to see?

1.3

2.4

A second area of the budget supports is innovation in manufacturing and its supply chain. I know a number of you are familiar with the proposal that the President put out, now a year and a half ago, the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation—that acronym, of course, NNMI. We always have to have acronyms.

The President has, this year as last, called for up to \$1 billion to launch up to 15 of these National Network for Manufacturing Innovation Institutes. Each of these institutes will bring together businesses, universities, community colleges, local communities, governments, State and Federal, to focus on a particular technological area.

This is sort of a regionally based consortia that is going to focus on a specific technological problem that is of interest to the industries in that area, helping move that technological issue forward. So last year we launched a pilot project on 3-D printing that is located actually in eastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania and northern West Virginia.

I'm going to get these numbers wrong, but it brings in something like 8 major research universities,

36 private sector manufacturing companies, a number of community colleges on the workforce development side, a number of these tech transfer community-based institutes, and it's really designed to say, what are the next set of questions around 3-D printing that these industries need, and how do you get the research universities working on those problems?

1.3

2.4

How do you get a much better collaboration between the research and the private sector so there's a much shorter time period of both, you're working on the right problems and you're transferring that back into the industry as quickly as you can to move 3-D printing forward and keep the U.S. on the real front end of that. That's the sort of thing we want to be doing.

Finally, we need to help manufacturers build on the all-time record of \$2.2 trillion in U.S. exports last year. As you know, we care a lot about exports. That's what ITA is all about. This is a challenge right now because as you know a number of the countries that we export to have been slowing down in economic growth.

Europe has slowed down, China has been growing more slowly than some of the forecasts predicted. As a result, we came out of this recession with huge

increases in exports. It has slowed a little this year and we want to keep that momentum going.

1.3

2.4

So the new budget proposes a 14 percent increase over two years ago for the International Trade Administration, the organization that Francisco runs here in Commerce. The issue here is to particularly allow us to strengthen our support of U.S.-based exporters overseas.

One of the complaints I hear all the time when I go overseas is we do not have enough boots on the ground among our Foreign Commercial Service, particularly in some of the fast-growing overseas markets that particularly help small- and medium-sized businesses who want to get into these markets.

We want to expand our Foreign Commercial Service by about 50 or 60 new warm bodies with this money and target the resources to the fast-growing markets so that we can help more U.S. exporters do more in terms of trade missions, bringing people back and forth, helping companies understand how they get into some of these rapidly growing overseas markets.

We are, of course, going to move forward to realize the Council's recommendation from last term to complete negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

That sits a little bit more in the U.S. Trade

Representative's office, which is in the White House, than here but we are very close partners with USTR in putting the materials together that are part of those negotiations.

1.3

2.4

And as the President announced, we are launching this summer talks with the European Union to talk about a U.S.-EU free trade agreement. We've been working very closely again with USTR to put together some of the regulatory issues and specifically--NIST is very involved in this--to what is it that we want to talk about.

This is a really fundamentally different free trade agreement than we have ever done before. It is between the two most developed regions of the world in some ways, right? It's going to include some things that other free trade agreements do not include.

Quite honestly, the manufactured and tariff issues are some of the easier parts of this, and the harder parts I think are talking about services.

Agriculture is going to be hard; it always is, right?

But really we want to see, what do we want to put on the board as best practices around some coherence with regulations, particularly moving forward with new products so that we can try to do a better job in creating a global market, at least between us and the

EU, on some of the regulatory fronts.

1.3

2.4

If we in the EU do this, you know this is going to become best practice to much of the rest of the world. So that is one that you really will want to watch over the next few years, and I suspect if there are some places where we can get you involved in terms of some key issues where we want some advice we will do so.

It is clear that the administration believes, as everyone here does, that a vibrant and a dynamic manufacturing sector is absolutely crucial to creating good jobs here in the United States and strengthening our middle class. I am looking forward to hearing your thoughts on some of the things that I have mentioned, other questions, issues, ideas, comments that you want to take on.

But before we do that, let's do a bit of housekeeping. I have the pleasure of swearing you all in. So if I can ask everyone who is on the committee, or is about to be on the committee, if you will stand. Raise your right hand.

(Whereupon, the members of the Manufacturing Council for 2013 were duly sworn.)

SECRETARY BLANK: Congratulations. (Applause)

SECRETARY BLANK: Mike? I don't have my agenda in front of me.

1.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Madam Secretary, if you have a minute or two we wanted to know if you could take a question or two from the --

SECRETARY BLANK: I would be happy to take a question or two. I think I can do that. What is our agenda? I actually don't have it in front of me.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY LAMB-HALE: 10:05 is Francisco.

SECRETARY BLANK: Okay. I thought I had a little bit of time. Yes. I'd love to hear, in terms of either comments, things you want to put on the table, things you want me to hear. Go for it, Mike.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: What I'd like to do is open it up to the committee. I know that this is always a little intimidating first meeting, but this group has proven not to be shy.

SECRETARY BLANK: It never is.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: So I think any comment related to -- these are representative positions. As you think about manufacturing in your business, in your industry, in your geographies, this is the time to maybe put burning issues that you have on the table for us this morning. Any comments?

MS. WILLIAMS: If you look at last year's, I wasn't on the Council last year and I read through the wonderful piece they did. What do you think the main contributions were from that panel, and then how do you look to us for moving forward with some of your focus areas?

1.3

2.4

SECRETARY BLANK: Yes. I'm going to ask
Nicole to respond to that in part as well because she
worked very closely with that Council. So I thought
the last Council had a lot of very good things to say,
particularly on the workforce development front, as
well as on, how do we move forward with innovation and
creating an innovation-based society that is actually
helpful to the manufacturing community here, which is
not just about the research universities but how you
move that into the development of something like the
National Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

That came out of a lot of different recommendations but some of those were the conversations that went on here in this Council. It's not like we have solved those problems, if you will. I mean, I think the question of innovation and how we keep the U.S. on the front edge of that particular -- you know, whatever your industries are, if we're going to stay competitive the U.S. has to be on the front end

of it.

1.3

2.4

I have said a number of times that if you look out 10 to 20 years and say what is going to be important for the United States to remain competitive as really the global leader in the world economy, I think there are three issues there, right? One of them is being on the front edge of innovation, one of them is having the skilled workforce that we need, and the third is having the infrastructure that serves all of our industries, but particularly manufacturing.

That is, of course, not just traditional infrastructure of roads, airports, and railroads, but new infrastructure, a smart grid, and satellites, broadband systems, that sort of thing. At some level I suspect almost anything that the Council worked on the last time and will work on in the next several years fits into those three categories because those are the key categories.

Do you want to add to that, Nicole?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY LAMB-HALE: I would just add, generally speaking, the recommendations on energy, particularly as it relates to natural gas, are very helpful in the debate that we are engaged in on whether natural gas should be exported and the like. I mean, that kind of input helps in the policymaking process.

Again, as Dr. Blank mentioned, workforce development issues were very key. The trade agenda was key. The recommendations of the Export-Import Committee very much were put into the process as we have been developing the TTIP negotiation stance and TPP. Competitiveness, generally.

I think all of the issues around making the R&D tax credit permanent. I mean, the President still has that on the table and it's largely due to the fact that you and others have said this is important to us so that we can have longer range plans for our businesses.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Maybe just one more comment, please.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: And if I could just add something for new Council members. When you receive the phone call from Liz or Jenna asking your opinion on something, it really matters. I will never forget one of the first phone calls that I got, and here I am, the smallest business at the time on the Council, I think, and they wanted to know what I thought about the import/export and the trade agreement. They wanted to know from a small business perspective. So, it really does matter and I suggest you answer fully.

SECRETARY BLANK: And I can tell you, when

we're talking on the Hill they really don't want to hear what Nicole and I think. They're much more interested in hearing, what does our Manufacturing Advisory Committee, made up of people on the ground, think. Given you are a very diverse group, what is the range of opinions and where are people coming from?

1.3

2.4

MR. GREEN: I was a bit surprised to hear your comments on the support for medium and small businesses abroad and more boots on the ground. I think you were referring to sort of the Gold Key service.

UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: That's one of our services.

MR. GREEN: One of the services. We have had just a great experience with Gold Key. My only comment is, and I think I've said it before, it's one of the best kept secrets. I think you could do a whole lot by just publicizing it. The boots on the ground we found to be excellent, so I just wanted to pass that on.

More would be better, I assume, but I think it's really good to publicize it.

SECRETARY BLANK: Yes. And there are things that we would like to do and we're actually just constrained from doing because we cannot carry through with them. We just don't have the people to do it. We do try to serve everyone as excellently as possible,

but there are markets where we have to really pick and choose and prioritize.

1.3

2.4

MR. GREEN: Yes. It's harder in some markets, for sure.

SECRETARY BLANK: Yes. Yes. Thank you. Yes.

There was another question. I'll take one more
question. Eric? Yes.

MR. KELLY: Sure. Could you explain the linkage between the innovation strategy and the new patent offices that you've been opening up?

SECRETARY BLANK: Oh, sure. Yes. So some of you may know that the America Invents Act, which was this major reform at the Patent Office that passed a year and a half ago, included a requirement that the Patent Office, rather than just all being located in Washington, DC, establish regional offices around the country, at least three. We have opened one in Detroit, as some of you may know, and announced that we'll be opening one somewhere in Silicon Valley, around the San Jose area, one in Dallas, and one in the Denver area.

The issue here is to be able to attract a broader group of people working for the patient office because there is some industry expertise in those areas and not all of those people want to move to Washington

1 and work here, right, so that we can actually attract 2 people to work in some very key areas of intellectual 3 property for the Patent Office who then stay in place in those locations. 4 5 But it also means we then have a local place 6 that people can come to, can search our databases, can 7 from there go out and work as consultants and just work more effectively with the local communities. So this 8 9 is one piece of a larger innovation agenda, but only 10 one. Yes. Thank you. CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Could I have 30 11 12 seconds? 1.3 SECRETARY BLANK: Yes. Absolutely. 14 CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: First of all, Madam 15 Secretary, thank you again for participating. SECRETARY BLANK: Yes. 16 17 CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: And Francisco, I was 18 going to give you a brief introduction. Are you going 19 to make a comment on this point? Can you stay with us for a minute? 20 UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: I wanted to make a 21 22 comment on the person to my right. Actually, the two

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

personal privilege before I go into my remarks, Becky

So Mr. Chairman, if I could have a point of

23

2.4

25

people to my right.

is going to be leaving us soon. Our loss is
Wisconsin's gain because she'll be going to Wisconsin.
But you could have no stronger advocate, no more
committed public servant than Rebecca Blank. She has
made manufacturing one of her top priorities. The
Department of Commerce and the U.S. Government will
feel her loss. It has been a joy to work with her and
I wanted to personally recognize her. If you would join
me in a round of applause.

(Applause)

1.3

2.4

SECRETARY BLANK: I'm just working on manufacturing under a different name because what am I going to do? Go to an institution that basically does workforce development and innovation. So that's what it's about.

I'm going to take off because I unfortunately have a full day. I would much rather listen to this conversation but I can promise you that I get a full report on the conversation from the folks who are here on the ground. All of you, if there are things you want me to hear, you can get in touch with me. Just let Nicole know and I'm more than happy to talk. So thank you again for all that you're doing. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you.

(Applause)

UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: If I could have one more point of personal privilege before you formally introduce me. We also are losing another great talent that those of you who have been on this Council for a while have gotten to know, and that's Nicole Lamb-Hale. I take personal pride in having identified talent in bringing her into ITA. Before I came along she was just a lawyer.

(Laughter)

1.3

2.4

ASSISTANT SECRETARY LAMB-HALE: It's true. I can't deny it, it's true.

UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: Nicole was our

Deputy General Counsel for the Department of Commerce
and I was looking for an Assistant Secretary for

Manufacturing and Services. I had gotten to work with
her ever so briefly, but I knew immediately that there
was real talent there.

So I took her to lunch upstairs in our executive dining room and she thought we were just having a get-acquainted lunch, two colleagues, and I was doing a full-court press to get her to take the job that she ultimately took. I can tell you that she took this job and came in with guns a'blazing and gave it 150 percent.

One of her great prides, I believe, is working

with this Council and taking the recommendations that you have provided this Department and making them meaningful, into policy, into advocacy before Congress.

We're going to miss her, too. I'd ask you to give

Nicole Lamb-Hale a round of applause.

(Applause)

1.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: The introduction I'd like to make next is for Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade Francisco Sanchez. One of our objectives with this Council is to make sure, from the first meeting, we're all a bit more aware of the partners in the Commerce Department that we work with.

I actually took a few notes here because this is a busy guy. Secretary Sanchez really is a key leader in the President's Export Initiative, which we talked about and worked on extensively in the last Council.

He is also responsible for overseeing the development of trade policy so he's the guy, or his team is oftentimes calling us when there's a piece of trade legislation where there is a sincere interest and understanding from us as business leaders as to what we think is important in terms of content and focus on these trade agreements.

He is all about promoting U.S. companies and

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

the global economy, helping us focus on our competitiveness and hopefully working on policy and legislation that makes sure there's a level playing field, enabling new market access. He's also responsible for managing compliance issues, I think, both ways and he's responsible for the administration of trade law.

So when you think of a resource and if you are concerned about the changes, I believe the Commerce still has a strong leader in Under Secretary Sanchez, and we appreciate your participation today.

#### 

#### 

# 

## 

/

\_ \_

#### NATIONAL EXPORT INITIATIVE

# Francisco Sanchez, Under Secretary for International Trade

UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: Well, thank you, Michael. Thank you for that introduction. Thanks to you and Mary for your leadership of this Council.

Joe, I want to recognize you for your past leadership as Chair. Those of you that are returning members, thank you for your continued service. Those of you that are new members, we are delighted to welcome you to this very, very important Council that we rely on a lot.

I also want to take a moment to recognize—she's been recognized before—one of your very own,
Chandra, who we also, in recognizing talent, we plucked
her out. In just a short time she is already doing an
outstanding job for us. To her right, Jenna. Thanks
to you and your team for making this Council's work
meaningful to what we do.

I want to tell you that for me the manufacturing sector is more than just a job that I have some responsibility for, it's personal. My father ran a candy factory for 25 years and my uncle also was an innovator, a manufacturer.

\_ \_

How many of you have ever been to a Wal-Mart or a CVS and you're waiting for a prescription and you go and you sit down in this chair, put your arm in, hit a button and it checks your blood pressure? Show of hands? So, my uncle invented that machine and manufactured it, then ultimately sold it.

I'm very proud of both my dad and my uncle for the work that they have done. So it's something that I recognize not only from the work I do, but from my own family, the impact that manufacturing has on communities, on States, on our country.

I have the great privilege of helping manufacturers reach out to the 95 percent of the world's consumers that live outside our borders, the one, Carlos, that your company seems to be doing so well at. Mike, I think you topped him, right, with 160 countries? And if we do that right, if we help you reach out to those markets, you're going to be strengthening your businesses, you're going to be creating more jobs.

Ultimately, you are contributing to the competitive edge of the United States and so it's no surprise that Barack Obama, in 2010, recognized how important this was and he launched the National Export Initiative. He had two goals: to substantially

increase exports from the United States and to support an additional two million jobs through exports. We here at ITA have done a lot through the Gold Key program that you mentioned, but also through a whole lot of other programs.

1.3

2.4

If I can just pat ITA on the back, I want to tell you about some of the things we have done. We have helped 17,000 companies. About 95 percent of those are small- and medium-sized companies with about 54,000 export successes, and we've done that just in the last three and a half years. That's something I am very proud of.

It's very important work, what we do on the trade policy front, but it just gives me a real sense of accomplishment when a company actually makes a sale and we have some small role in helping make that happen.

You heard Secretary Blank talk about our record year. In 2011, we had a record year of \$2.1 trillion worth of exports, and last year we beat that: \$2.2 trillion. That has supported 1.3 million additional jobs since 2009, so we are about 60 percent of our way to the President's goal of having \$2 million additional jobs supported by exports.

So we are going to keep working away and we've

got about two years left--actually, about a year and a half--to meet the goals that the President set forth. He set these goals to be accomplished by December of 2014. We're going to do it in a number of ways. We're going to continue to do the export promotion that, Albert, your company has benefitted from. We're also going to support USTR on trade policy through the Trans-Pacific Partnership and through the talks that should begin in July with the EU.

1.3

2.4

Let me just focus on a little bit of what we're doing internally and then talk briefly about the TPP and the EU talks. Internally, and this is a little bit of inside Washington so I'm not going to go into great detail, but we're constantly seeking ways to deliver our services more effectively and more efficiently.

So we have put forward a consolidation plan with an ITA that brings our four business units to three. We are trying to align our services in a way that make it easier for you to have access to them and we are about, I hope, a day or two away from getting approval from our Senate appropriators to go forward with this consolidation. But I'm excited about it.

I just whet your appetite with it because until we actually get approval from Congress I don't

want to go into too much detail, but I am excited about the work we've done. Nicole has been instrumental in helping us develop this plan and the ultimate beneficiaries of this will be you.

1.3

2.4

The second thing I want to focus on is the work we are doing on trade policy. The TPP, as you know, is a 21st century Gold Standard agreement. The President has made clear a couple of things: 1) he wants it done quickly and he has directed his negotiation team to get this done in the October/November time frame.

When we accomplish that, we will have done this in three years. Now, to do a trade agreement bilaterally within two or three years is quite an accomplishment. To do one with, now, 12 nations is lightening speed.

To do one that not only tackles the traditional things that you see in a trade agreement, which are reducing tariffs, but also to tackle creating a level playing field as it relates to State-owned enterprises, putting language in there about corruption and language hopefully--we're still negotiating this piece--that will be enforceable so that if you can identify acts of corruption it isn't just a slap on the hand, but there will be consequences to this, focusing

on specific issues that make it harder for small- and medium-sized companies to compete in the Asia-Pacific region.

1.3

2.4

So this is going to be a comprehensive agreement that touches on a whole bunch of barriers that have to date made it hard to do business in these 12 countries. Beyond these 12 countries I think it is going to have implications as a precedent for future trade agreements with other countries. I'm very excited about that.

We appreciate the input you've given us. Keep giving it to us. We're going through, I believe, our 16th round that will take place in Lima, Peru, in about two and a half weeks. There will be subsequent rounds leading up to the October/November time frame.

Then the second one that I'm extremely excited about is the talks between the United States and the EU to have a trade agreement with the European Union.

This, too, is exciting not so much for the tariff side, because our tariffs with the EU are relatively low to begin with, but to work on standards.

I suspect this would be important in the automobile sector, whether it's cars or parts, but to be able to have cooperation on standards, to have regulatory cooperation, will be huge, and not only in

terms of reducing barriers between the EU and the United States, but again in terms of precedent and in terms of other markets that have been, shall we say, reluctant if you will to engage in meaningful trade barrier reduction to take notice that, my God, if the United States has a TPP and it has a U.S.-EU agreement, we're going to get left out in the cold. All of a sudden, you have other countries wanting to engage with us in reducing barriers.

1.3

2.4

A great example of this, is Secretary Blank went to Brazil about three weeks ago. Now Brazil, whenever anyone—whether it's us or business people—has talked about engaging in any kind of a trade agreement with them, whether it's bilateral, multilateral, they said, oh, absolutely but not now. Maybe in four years. I'm exaggerating a bit, but they have not been too thrilled with this.

Becky goes and she doesn't raise it. They tell her, you know, we should really talk about trade agreements that we could work on. Now, they weren't talking about a comprehensive one, but they put on the table this. I can assure you that that came as a result of the work we're doing in the Asia-Pacific region and what we're about to embark on with the Europeans.

So this is exciting stuff and it's going to have an impact in your sectors. I encourage you. I have a feeling I don't have to encourage this crowd, but I encourage you to engage with us as we go forward with the EU. It's going to be very, very important and have huge, positive implications to manufacturers. So I hope my enthusiasm comes through because I think it's going to have a great impact for our economy, and particularly for you.

1.3

2.4

With that, I thank you, Michael, for letting me have a few minutes here to share some of what we're doing internally, as well as externally. I very much look forward to working with this Council going forward. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Well, thank you very much for taking the time. We appreciate your work and we look forward to working with you.

UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: I know you're on a tight schedule and I know you'll be leaving us, but thank you again for your time.

UNDER SECRETARY SANCHEZ: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Our next introduction,

which I think you're all now familiar with Nicole, but

the Under Secretary of Commerce to the Assistant

Secretary for Manufacturing and Services, Nicole Lamb-Hale. She'll talk about her role, but on a personal note, Nicole has been one of the representatives from the Commerce Department who has always been at our meetings and she's very close to our work.

She's provided, at meetings and between meetings, advice and counsel to the Council about initiatives and activities. We've always appreciated that and we're very happy for you and your future. But thank you for attending today.

# 

#### 

#### 

1.3

# THE MANUFACTURING COUNCIL'S WORK

#### Nicole Lamb-Hale, Assistant Secretary

#### for Manufacturing and Services

ASSISTANT SECRETARY LAMB-HALE: Thank you so much, Mike. Thank you, Mary. Thank you, everyone, for your service. This has been one of our most active and I think in many ways innovative Councils. You guys roll up your sleeves and you really get into the issues and we so rely upon all the work that you do. It has been a joy for me to be a part of this. For those of you that don't know me, I am a recovered lawyer, I think, officially now.

(Laughter)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY LAMB-HALE: I will not be returning to the practice of law when I leave, so I've really done it. I've crossed the rubicon and I'm going to do something different. But I have to say that my 18 years of law practice before coming into the Department was in Detroit, representing manufacturers.

So this Council--and if there's media here, please don't print this--is my favorite Council because of that, because of the fact that I get it. I get what you do every day. I get the impact that it has on communities around this country. I have the personal

experience.

1.3

2.4

My dad was an executive at Chrysler in the 1970s when Chrysler had its first financial woes. I was afraid as a child because I didn't know what would happen with my family. So, I get it and that's what drives me every day to give the service that I give to these issues and to the country because that's just so important.

So I want to acknowledge Joe and Chandra—
Chandra is on the other side of the table here—for
their leadership on the last Council. You guys have
been great. Thank you. We decided that Chandra had to
come on the other side to continue the work. But
thanks for the leadership that you showed, and thanks
to the returning members for going another round with
us, and the new members who are here to contribute.

I also want to acknowledge Jenna Pilat, who has been just a fearless advocate for industry input into our policy process. Jenna, thank you so much for all of your work. Liz, thank you. Liz is relatively new to our team but she has jumped in with both feet.

We have all kinds of charts. We have our stop-light chart, which some of you have seen, and we work those charts. It's really because of Jenna's leadership that that gets done. Anyone in the inter-

agency can testify to that. The White House knows she's coming with her chart, and where are we on these things. So, thank you for that.

1.3

2.4

I also want to acknowledge some of the team for Manufacturing and Services that's in the room.

Todd Valentine, who is my special assistant, has been fabulous. He is going to be working very closely with Chandra as I depart.

But he's been very helpful in the interagency process, ensuring that again the recommendations that Councils like this give us get into good use in the policymaking process. We have Jeff Grant here, who runs our Health and Consumer Goods office. He is a tireless advocate as well. All of them are. I should say ditto for everyone: tireless advocate.

Praveen Dixit, who is our Assistant Secretary for Industry Analysis. Many of you have been involved in some of his trade briefings, trade data briefings, and his team is very involved in the process in terms of the TPP and the TTP--all these acronyms--the U.S.-EU agreement.

They are very much involved in making sure that, again, your input is in the process because USTR can't negotiate if they don't know what their talking points ought to be, right? So Praveen's office makes

sure that those issues get in there.

1.3

2.4

Maureen Smith, who is my fabulous principal
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing and
Services is here, and she is really, again, a tireless
advocate and has been in industry. This is her second
round in government. I think many of you have worked
with Maureen over the years and will certainly continue
to provide the continuity of leadership that we need in
these issues.

We have Scott Kennedy here who heads up our aerospace team, and Scott was very active in our auto team prior to that so he's well steeped in all issues manufacturing and will be a resource to you as well.

We have Fred Elliott who is here from our aerospace team as well. Fred is a tireless advocate. We sometimes get involved in some inter-agency squabbles to make sure that regulations don't get in the way of commerce. We work very hard. Is there anybody else in the room that I missed from Manufacturing and Services? I think I got everybody.

So I just wanted to give all of these folks recognition. You should know that they will continue to be here and to work hard on all of these issues. I have to say proudly that Chandra is here. I'm so glad that she arrived before I departed. Chandra is

consistent with the model that I established for the Deputy for Manufacturing, to have fingernails with some oil under them, you know, somebody who really understands manufacturing.

1.3

2.4

So Chandra, having been on the other side of the table, I think will be excellent in terms of making sure that there's the proper balance between what the government can do and what you can do in this public/private partnership. I just want to thank all the inter-agency colleagues who are here and who have continued to support us.

They'll introduce themselves, I know, but I really just think that the decision to bring in folks from Energy, Labor, Education, and to bring the Jobs Council perspective in as well has been really helpful to ensure that all of the issues are dealt with that affect manufacturing because it's not just a silo, as we know, it's really very much a comprehensive, holistic set of issues, so I am just happy to have had the support of the inter-agency in this process.

So I guess I've said my goodbyes, right? But I just wanted to thank you all for the work that you've been doing. As Becky and Francisco talked about, I mean, your input goes into the policy process. We can't always get everything done but I think that the

fact that we have that input, your credible input and
we can put it into the policy process, I think we get
more done than we would otherwise.

So, thank you for your help on that. I think that, again, your input will continue to be valued. Even though you'll see some leadership changes, the administration's focus on manufacturing continues. It is steadfast. We have got to do in the next three years, so we're counting on you to be partners in that regard.

So with that, I'm going to introduce Chandra Brown, whom you all know. Chandra left her private sector life in Oregon to join us. I think that one of the most fun kind of off-campus, so to speak,

Manufacturing Council meetings we had was when we visited her facility and got to see these new streetcars. Streetcars are back in the U.S., and so it's very exciting that under Chandra's leadership we have those streetcars being manufactured in the U.S.

So, it's fabulous. So I just want to turn it over to her.

1.3

# 

#### 

### 

#### 

# THE MANUFACTURING COUNCIL EXPERIENCE Chandra Brown, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing

\_

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BROWN: Well, welcome, everyone. I have to say—and I'll be brief—when I first came in I instinctively went to the other side of the table. I have now been with the Department of Commerce for basically one month and I am so, so very happy to be here because this is the first group I actually understand and know. I'm learning so much information here, it's fantastic.

I have to tell you, one of the reasons why I chose to leave the private sector and a job I adore, which has been manufacturing for the last 19 years, whether it's streetcars, boats, or bridges, I'm incredibly proud of the work we've done. But I came over because now is the time. This is what's really great, I think, about this Council in particular.

As we all know, this is a huge issue.

Manufacturing is talked about every day. It's

mentioned in all the speeches by the President. It's

something that we are absolutely pushing forward. So I

am here, and hopefully you are here, at a time when

good change can be effected.

There has been such incredible work done by the past Councils. I know we've sent around the previous recommendations. What we're really looking for is to take that forward to the next level and use these next few years to move forward.

1.3

2.4

2.5

I am very happy to be basically your liaison, your translator. I'm learning the government side as we go. It's fantastic. I think one thing I can't emphasize enough, and another reason why I came over, it really is the quality of support of the folks here in Commerce.

I had no idea the depth and breadth of the team. Obviously Nicole already talked about and mentioned it, but how much industry analysis and expertise is imbedded within this Commerce group. So we are here as your resources, we are here to help, we are here to advocate for anything that we can within our scope.

I'd just welcome anyone to come visit me at any time, to come see me here in Commerce. Again, even with the transitions, I will be here and I'm really looking forward to an active agenda that we can move forward in the next few years. So, I thank everyone for your time and service.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you, Chandra. We

really appreciate your participation. And let me just take a minute and I want to remind everyone of our objective here again today. Please make this as an onboarding process. I know we're not into the work, and also with the all the Type As we have in here everyone wants to charge forward.

1.3

2.4

But what Mary and I ask you to consider is it's important to understand the resources that are available to you. As we break out in the subcommittee work, the people that are here will be very valuable resources to you in your work. So I want to make sure that we all are banking this. It'll be the easiest meeting we have and hopefully we're using this for future success.

One off-script point I want to make is most of the members are new but it was mentioned earlier, and I wanted to acknowledge Joe Anderson who was the previous Chair. Chandra was the Vice Chair. So if you see me making some mistakes, I've asked Joe to call me out, or at least use his eloquence to coach me.

So if you have questions or you want to know how the previous Council worked or you have some thoughts or opinions that we need to consider going forward, I hope it's okay, Joe, that we can rely on you as another resource because you did a great job leading

the previous Council. So, thank you.

The next introduction—and I will admit, some of these people now I don't know, some I do. The one thing you'll learn working with government is there's a lot of movement. People go from one job to another maybe more than what we're familiar with in the private sector. But the Senior Advisor to the Secretary on Manufacturing Policy, Dean Orringer, I believe is here. Okay. Sorry, I couldn't read your card from here. Thank you. Good morning. You have the floor.

#### 

# OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

# Neal Orringer, Senior Advisor to the Secretary for Manufacturing Policy

1.3

2.4

MR. ORRINGER: All right. Well, thank you very much. I don't want to take up too much time here. You're going to be hearing from my counterpart from the White House, Stacy Miller, as well, soon. Hopefully they won't overlap.

This Council has a really unique opportunity.

A lot of similar groups have been assembled over the last couple of years. I've been in Washington, watching a lot of similar committees for about two decades. Those groups have ended their tenure writing reports full of generalities and platitudes. This group is different.

We'd like to challenge you. You're tasked with advising the Secretary of Commerce on manufacturing matters, so I'd like to lay down two basic thoughts: one, understand her responsibilities and priorities; and number two, provide specific recommendations based on your experience and expertise.

So really briefly, let's begin with the responsibilities. Many of you know the various bureaus she oversees. We walked you through a couple and

you'll be hearing from a lot of the bureau heads here today. We're going to be passing out a summary of some of the FY 2014 budget initiatives.

1.3

2.4

These are new programs that are in our FY budget that Dr. Blank sat down, and most importantly the OMB Director, to try to get some programs in there. We want you to examine them and look at how we're developing and give us some serious evaluations and critique about how we're going to do it and how to make these things work most effectively.

So you all know about ITA, which promotes exports and fair trade and investment in the U.S.

You're going to hear some more about the Economic Development Administration, which provides grants to U.S. communities to make them more attractive for growth.

You know about the U.S. Patent and Trade

Office, which helps inventors and protects intellectual property. You're going to hear a lot about the

National Institute of Standards and Technology from my colleague Phil Singerman. But there's more. That's just a few places within our Department.

The Secretary of Commerce is also the co-chair of the White House Office of Manufacturing Policy.

Together with Gene Sperling, she presides over meetings

with her fellow Cabinet secretaries, many of whom are represented here today, to help develop manufacturing policies and programs. This is something that the President established back in December of 2011.

1.3

2.4

Within the President's Cabinet, she's tasked with being both the thought leader on manufacturing, as well as the public face for the administration. So to do this job successfully she's going to need your help in keeping us connected and fully informed.

So I just want to focus on one of the priorities that she highlighted here today and flesh it out a little bit, and again solicit your help as we start to design this initiative because this is really the signature initiative. She's way too modest to talk too much about what she's done in her role in pushing this forward.

We've developed a program, she's developed a program which basically is a race to the top for economic development. We believe, when companies like yours are making decisions on where to locate a factory, you're going to look at a number of factors: access to skilled workers, good infrastructure, low-cost centers, healthy supply chains, and advanced research institutions.

Rather than pursue short-term policies, we

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

want to condition Federal funding to these communities on long-term plans. So through her chairmanship, Dr. Blank is working with heads of the Departments of Transportation, Energy, Labor, Agriculture, HUD, Defense, the National Science Foundation, SBA, EPA, and we want to award best practices by communities, communities that have identified industries, as she was saying, where they have a comparative advantage and then form partnerships with community colleagues to tailor training for needed skills with universities and create specialized research centers with utilities and airport authorities with the right kind of infrastructure.

1.3

2.4

We're looking for you to provide us with specific data on best practices of what you're seeking, what motivates you to locate a plan in a given region. We need your specific anecdotes, we need your specific case studies to help us develop metrics for measuring progress. How can the Federal Government ensure its partnership with local communities and industries are being developed effectively?

As you look forward to helping us pull out these best practices, we'll begin to shape some of these new initiatives. I think Matt Erskine, who's the Acting Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, is

going to talk in more detail about these and other initiatives.

You have got a solicitation going out in FY 2013 to help communities plan, but in FY 2014 we're going to go full bore ahead with a grant challenge that's going to award these kinds of best practices and we need your help and your input. So we're really looking forward to working with you and I hope that you'll use us as a resource, particularly going through you folks here, so that we can be good partners.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Next, the Associate Director of Innovation and Industry Standards, Phil Singerman.

2.4

\_\_\_

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY Phil Singerman, Associate Director for Innovation and Industry Services

MR. SINGERMAN: Thank you for that generous introduction.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Pretty matter-of-fact.

MR. SINGERMAN: Thank you very much. Good morning. I'm very pleased to be invited to represent my sector. Some of you may be more familiar with this as the old National Bureau of Standards. We've been around since 1901. Actually, the authority to set standards for weights and measures is in the Constitution, Article 2. It gives us kind of a solid constitutional framework.

We are the Nation's national measurement institute, similar to those of other countries. We conduct fundamental research in measurement science and support industry-led standards development in the consortial matter. We also provide specialized funding and services to small- and mid-sized manufacturing.

Under Secretary Pat Gallagher liked to describe us as industry's national laboratory, and I suspect every company and every industry in this room

at one level or another, at one time or another, has been affected by the work that NIST does. We are a non-regulatory agency and we have an explicit congressional mandate to work closely with industry -- flexible authority to work with your firms.

1.3

2.4

Physically, we have two major facilities, one in Gaithersburg, Maryland, the other in Boulder, Colorado. I guess one way to think about NIST is physically it's like a national laboratory, a Los Alamos or Sandia.

Operationally, it's like an engineering school with a \$1 billion budget and no -- so there's a lot of good research that goes on there. We work in a great variety of areas, such as cyber security, aero science and technology, forensic science -- our engineer laboratory -- research on the collapse of the World Trade Center -- organizations to develop appropriate standards.

Our Boulder facility specializes in time frequency measurement and we're very proud that in the last 15 years our scientists in Boulder have won four Nova prizes in physics.

Let me turn to our public/private partnerships, the Hollins Manufacturing Extension Partnership, and our proposed national network for

manufacturing and integration of --

1.3

2.4

The Hollins program provides technical support to small firms. There are 60 centers in every State and Puerto Rico, 1,400 non-Federal specialists -- support is provided one-on-one to firms and they recognize its value by compensating the work -- so we provide about \$100 million a year at 60 centers. Industry provides about \$100 million in fees for services.

The program is overseen by the Federal

Advisory Board similar to this and each center has its

own nonprofit board. We are very pleased that your

Vice Chair, Mary Isbister, is the chair of the

Wisconsin Manufacturing Extension Partnership and has

been on that board for six years.

We don't have to worry about the program -but it's very important to have that kind of connection
to those bodies. Jeff Wilcox from Lockheed Martin is
joining our national advisory board and so he'll be
another point of liaison.

One of the new programs we're launching this year is to work with small firms organized in supply chains to help with resilience and robustness. We are particularly interested in looking to this Council for their advice about what is the best way that the public

sector will support the small- to mid-sized firms as they work with their large OEMs.

1.3

2.4

Finally, let me turn to the program that

Secretary Blank mentioned, and perhaps Jason Miller

from the National Economic Council will also touch upon
the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation.

A key concept there, I think, that Secretary
Blank mentioned is that in order to have a strong
innovation ecosystem we have to have a strong
manufacturing base. Over the last 25 years, the nation
as a whole has under-invested in its advanced
manufacturing capabilities and technologies.

Because of the changes in the global factors of production and legal conditions in this country, the traditional continuing of from basic research to applied research in the manufacturing sector has been fractured.

We no longer have the Bell Labs institutions that provide that bridge between basic research and applied research. So the goal of the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation is in part to replicate and restore that manufacturing and continue that advanced manufacturing -- R&D continued.

There's been a lot of work over the last year and a half to develop a concept where models --

institutes -- and you serve as an example of what an organized public/private partnership can do to guide the manufacturing sector.

As we developed this program over this year and over the next several years, we're particularly

Thank you very much.

move through this --

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you very much. A lot of activity and important work. We'll be working together closely this year.

interested in this Council's advice and guidance as you

Next, we have the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, Matt Erskine.

# 

#### 

#### 

#### 

#### 

# 

# 

# 

# 

#### 

## 

## 

## 

#### 

## 

#### 

#### 

# 

## 

# 

#### 

#### 

#### 

# ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

# Matt Erskine, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Development

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY ERSKINE: Good morning. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to be here and join the Council and my distinguished colleagues. The Economic Development Administration, or the EDA, is one of the bureaus within the Department of Commerce and one of the best ways I think to think about it is we're the only Federal agency with the sole mission of economic development for the United States.

Just to give you a quick summary of the organization, about 200 people distributed across the country in six regions. We have six regional offices. We do about \$300 million of grant co-investments every year.

By grant co-investments, think of us in some ways as a seed capital investor looking to make smart strategic catalytic investments in communities across the country and also in public/private higher education partnerships. So we do not fund for-profit enterprises.

What we do is provide competitive merit-based

grant funding to communities and to the partnerships that are setting the foundation and creating the environment for the private sector job growth, private capital investment. Our grant funds require a local match, so skin in the game from the community, from the public/private higher education partnership, again, all with an explicit link to long-term job creation, leverage private investment and economic growth.

1.3

2.4

We have a portfolio of programs and services that are actually quite flexible and that can be tailored to the needs of the community. So what our program is designed to do is to find those best locally owned ideas on a regional basis, again, with the longterm goal of job growth and leveraging that private investment.

We can invest in both hard infrastructure, so construction, buildings, equipment, the basics of supporting infrastructure, whether it be broad band, water/sewer, transportation, as well as soft infrastructure, technical assistance, strategic planning, helping to bring together the right partners from all sectors in a particular community or region. Specifically with regard to manufacturing, we play the lead role in partnering with the other bureaus and agencies that are here in terms of advancing the

President's agenda for manufacturing.

1.3

2.4

So I am sure Dr. Blank talked to you about the window of opportunity we have, the cusp of the resurgence of investment, whether it be foreign direct investment, re-shoring or expansion and retention of jobs here in the United States.

Our role in that is to help build the capacity of the regions and the communities to both welcome that investment, retain it, and make it lasting. So whether it be a critical piece of infrastructure that a community needs to attract, retain, or expand investment, whether it is the planning and technical assistance expertise that a community needs, a region needs, that's where EDA plays a role.

So let me give you three specific examples of what we're working on right now that I think go right to the heart of this manufacturing push. The first is this year we have launched what is called the Make it in America initiative, which is a \$40 million national challenge grant.

Together with Department of Commerce, both
EDA, NIST, and MEP, together with the Department of
Labor--and you'll hear from Jane Oates on the
Employment and Training Administration, who has been a
great partner of ours in terms of emphasizing the

workforce development importance in economic development.

1.3

2.4

We will make up to 15 grant awards, again, competitive grant co-investments across the country. Applications are due the end of May, so May 31st. Again, these will be both regional public/private higher education partnerships and community groups, partnerships that come to us with the ideas in terms of how to best invest, whether again it's a piece of critical infrastructure or a soft infrastructure funding really to those three key parts of the investment: new foreign direct investment, re-shoring of American jobs, and retention and expansion of existing manufacturing production in their regional economy.

Those awards will be announced before the end of September this year and it builds on what the Obama administration has really led the way on in the last three years, multi-agency coordinated or synchronized funding in order to promote the capacity to attract, retain, and grow the investment.

Also this year, as Neal Orringer mentioned, we're launching a strategic planning grant challenge for communities who have done some strategic planning, economic development planning, but have not taken it to

the level of specifically focusing on manufacturing. This grant challenge--we'll do about 20 to 25 across the country--is to communities to take their existing plans and create implementation-ready plans.

1.3

2.4

So they've done an assessment on their current strengths and assets as a community for attracting and retaining and growing investment and identified those holes in their ecosystem.

Again, whether it be critical pieces of infrastructure, whether it be the need for partnerships, technical assistance, strategic planning so that this will position them in a year to actually have an implementation-ready plan for growing manufacturing in their community.

Then finally, sort of the third part of that progression, next year in the President's budget, \$113 million Investing in Manufacturing Communities Fund, where we will have at-skill grant investments, again, both hard infrastructure and sort infrastructure with those community and regional partnerships to actually start investing and filling those holes in their ecosystem as it relates to attracting the investment, retaining the investment, and growing the investment going forward.

This again is part of the progression of

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

multiple agencies, whole-of-government approach.

You'll hear from Jason Miller from the White House and the NEC in terms of how this fund will represent the corpus of coordinated and synchronized Federal funds from other departments and agencies in a much more coordinated way in terms of investing in the communities going forward. So, thanks again for the opportunity. We're excited to work with you.

1.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Very good. Thank you. Thank you, Matt. Appreciate that.

Our next introduction is Jane Oates, the
Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training. A
little background here. Jane was very helpful to the
last Council, specifically the Workforce Development
Subcommittee, in that as we were drafting our
recommendations Jane and her team actually made
arrangements for us.

I think, at her recommendation to me, the Secretary of Labor, where there was a private meeting that Joe Anderson, Mary and I attended, where for well over an hour he discussed our recommendation letter. To help everyone rest easy, it wasn't so that Labor or anyone could influence how or what we recommended, but it was based on a real sincere desire on the Secretary of Labor, Hilda Solis, to understand our

1	recommendations and to collaborate with us.					
2	So Jane, we really appreciated that					
3	opportunity. I think it made the work that we did all					
4	the more valuable. Welcome to our meeting.					
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

#### 

#### 

#### 

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR INTRODUCTION

#### Jane Oates, Assistant Secretary

#### for Employment and Training

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OATES: Michael, we really appreciated you, Joe, and Mary taking the time to talk with us because we really think that workforce development, along with education and economic development, are a three-legged stool. You can't support yourself without any one of those vibrant entities. So your discussion with us was life-changing within the Department of Labor, and certainly in Employment and Training.

I want to tell you just a little bit about what we did in order to change. First of all, I'm the in-law here at Commerce but I'm surrounded by such wonderful friends and partners. Jason and his alterego Gene Sperling have just been amazing partners. The administration has put a huge magnifying lens as a reality check on all the words that we use, so the first word I'm going to use is partnership.

Our partnerships have to be real or we're called out about it. You heard Matt mention that we share money: unheard of in Federal Government. I mean, I have a rather large budget at ETA but most of it goes

out in formula funds.

1.3

2.4

I have about a \$10 billion budget. But we fund the Workforce Investment Act programs in your communities that are the local -- and the American Job Centers or Career Centers that you see. We have a dual customer there, the job seeker and the employer.

Sadly, unless we had these partnerships, sometimes our business customer gets the short end of the attention at those local areas and we try to improve that. But our partnerships have been extraordinarily catalytic in terms of how we use our money.

The second thing we do is give out discretionary grants. As Matt mentioned, they have some grants. We also contribute with some of these cross-agency grants. But usually in a given year we have about \$1 million that we can put out competitively. The biggest ticket item that we have right now is the community college capacity-building grant. That's \$500 million for you to engage. It has to be business driven.

It has to be two-year degree-granting institutions, looking at areas where they're not meeting business needs as defined by business. Now, Wisconsin has fabulous technical colleges. Michael

knows I have a soft spot in my heart for Gateway because they were out there not only with Rockwell, but with Snap-On Tools and other manufacturers early on before there was any real government money.

1.3

2.4

But we want every community to have community colleges like that that are knocking on your door saying what can we do for you, not showing you an antiquated course catalog, about how maybe they could piece together this and that, but looking at you and saying, what can we develop and speaking to you in business time, making sure they don't say to you, well, the new semester begins in September, making sure that our community colleges, and all of our colleges, understand that not meeting your needs for six months means that you're either going to become reliant on foreign workers or you're going to move your production offshore.

We don't want that to happen. We want you to know that we're talking real time. If no one has approached you about the next round of this, which is on the street right now, please call your local community college president and say, what are you putting forward?

Finally, the administration uses another word called transparency. It's a lot like love and

accountability and all these things. We all use the words. But in this administration you have to show exactly what you're doing in order to meet that definition of transparency.

1.3

2.4

Some of the things that I'm going to tell you, you're going to say, why wasn't that done 100 years ago? I don't know. But we never put our winning grants up on our website so that other people could see what they were doing. A company like IBM has information going out. They're a big partner in a number of our H1B grants.

They have all these entities all over the country. They should see what other people are doing to see how they can change. General Motors should do that. All manufacturers should do that. You should be looking to say to your community college, why are they doing this at North Idaho Community College? Why can't we do that here?

So we have developed and put those grants up so you can see them. We've developed core competency models, the bottom ends of the pyramid, for 16 different sectors. The one I'm most proud of is the utility sector, because then CEWD went off and just made it real for utility employers all over the country.

But we also have made them to our grantees
that we own the curriculum. We, the taxpayers, paid
for it, we own it. We've seen some amazing things,

some things that have grown organically like Amtech and

E3, which we're not funding, but they grew from our

6 grant dollars.

1.3

2.4

But also wonderful things like the opportunities in western Pennsylvania that we funded in shale technology, from certificates all the way up to associates degrees. This is the way government should work. That same curriculum went to the Vulcan development, so now in North Dakota and in Montana they did not have to start at square one. They had the curriculum that was developed at Westmoreland Community College that they could start with.

The same thing, the curriculum we developed, our grantees developed, in mechatronics in North

Carolina, mainly for manufacturing there, is now being used in central Pennsylvania for food manufacturing.

We're going to get that same degree because the same skills were needed, so central Pennsylvania didn't have to figure out how to bring you better potato chips and better pretzels on their own, they used what was developed in metal manufacturing in North Carolina. So I end where I began: thanks, Nicole. What a partner

you've been. Unbelievable. Matt, everyone here, Phil, has just been a terrific partner.

1.3

2.4

But you need to tell us what's next. You need to rate what we've done. You need to tell us not only how we can use our competitive grant money, but also our \$3.7 billion in formula money that funds into your communities now as well as our unemployment insurance program. What do we do when people are unemployed to get them where you need them to be?

How do we put those skills -- just like we have job boards, how do we develop a skills board so you don't tell me--or tell Jason, worse--that you need 100 welders and can't find them? So I look forward to the continued partnership with ETA. I hope, as our new Secretary hopefully gets through confirmation quickly, Tom Perez, I hope you'll give him the same partnership, the same professional friendship that you gave Secretary Solis. Thanks very much, Michael, and to all of you for your service.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: I want to make two quick comments here. First of all, last night when we were meeting people asked how we measured results. It's a different method here than what we're used to. It's not a quarter or annual business.

One way, though, we measure results is in

action. In the Workforce Development recommendations there was a specific focus on ensuring that community colleges didn't duplicate efforts, as they have been, in creating their own curriculum, unfortunately even within States.

1.3

2.4

We've seen it in a good system like Wisconsin, where you have competition between the technical colleges or community colleges. They're all developing their own unique curriculum when in fact industry is looking for a standard across the university.

So the examples Jane gave of where technical colleges are being rewarded and recognized and are seeing success is where they've gained that leverage, so we appreciate that. That's an example I thought you might like to be aware of.

Secondly, administratively, we're going to plan to run about 20 minutes late. So we aren't that far behind, but we are a bit behind. Just so people are aware, we want to keep it moving, but I hope you're finding this as valuable as I am.

So, Jane, thank you. We appreciate that.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OATES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Next, is another regular guest to the Manufacturing Council meetings, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Small Business,

1	Community Development, ar	nd Housing	Policy,	Don Graves.
2	Welcome back.			
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY INTRODUCTION Don Graves, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Small Business, Community Development and Housing Policy

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY GRAVES: Well, thanks so much, Mike. Thank you for yours and Mary's leadership on this, and Joe and Chandra, for what you did over the last few years. The Manufacturing Council — I won't say it's the unsung star because it is sung by the choir in the administration loudly.

You all -- for those that are new to the Council, you don't know but you have some really big shoes to fill because the work of the Manufacturing Council over the first few years of the administration has really changed the way that we go about doing our work, both at a policy level and also programmatically.

So there's a lot of great things that you've already done, and hopefully you'll continue that. It's also good to see some old friends. Andra, hello again. Andra and I got to work together--I won't say how many years ago--during the Clinton administration when she was just out of high school and starting into business.

(Laughter)

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY GRAVES: Anyway,

it's good to be here with you. As all of my colleagues have already said, the work that we do together really makes a huge difference for the American people, for American business.

1.3

2.4

I can't tell you the amount -- the good number of suggestions that have come from folks like you that have led to specific policy changes or program changes. No issue is too small to target, no program or problem is too inconsequential. You should be sure to let us know, let the team here at Commerce know, what you're seeing and what you're hearing because it's really important.

What Mike didn't mention is that I have come to the Council in the past wearing two different hats, one is in my Treasury role and one has been as the Executive Director of the President's Jobs Council for the past couple of years.

I think the work of the Jobs Council was specifically informed by what you did. In fact, we adopted and supported and got behind a good number of the recommendations that you had that were crosscutting issues that would help to lead to greater job creation, greater competitiveness.

I won't go through those lists. If you haven't had the chance, I'm sure you've looked at the

reports from the previous Manufacturing Council's meetings, but go to the Jobs Council website. You can look it up online.

1.3

2.4

We did three reports, including the final or the 2011 year-end report, that were built off of, to a large extent, the work that had been done here.

Ninety-plus recommendations to the President. About two-thirds of those recommendations were specific recommendations that the administration could tackle.

We actually have already fully accomplished or substantially accomplished 90 percent—a little over 90 percent—of those recommendations. So when people say the administration doesn't listen and doesn't actually do things, we actually did, and you can go through the reports and see for yourself.

I won't spend more time on that other than to say that one of the things that we learned very early on, and I know that the Manufacturing Council has taken this to heart, is that no matter how smart this group is—and this is a very smart and talented group—you don't have all of the ideas, you don't see all of the problems facing this country. Go out and talk to folks in your own communities.

We held dozens of listening-and-action sessions with the Jobs Council around the country where

we learned what was going on in those communities. We met with business owners, we met with folks who lived in those communities, we met with local leaders. All those ideas came into the Council, and we shared it with our colleagues here as well, and informed the process going forward.

1.3

2.4

I'll just cover, quickly, some of the things that we've been looking at at Treasury. Part of what Jane, what Matt, and so many others have said is we're looking at making sure that we have a manufacturing ecosystem that works for this country, that continues to allow this country to be the world's leader in manufacturing.

The President has said manufacturing is back.

He's talked about manufacturing all over the country.

Part of what we do at Treasury is think about ways

that we can assist your businesses as you go about

doing the work that you do, which is making products

and employing people and revving up the economy.

So we focus on financing, we focus and look at ways to make sure that businesses have accurate access to credit and capital when they need it. We focus on taxes and making sure that our tax regime works for your businesses. We also focus on economic policy, both domestically and internationally. Those are sort

of the big three areas that I think apply to the work that you do. We are looking for your ideas.

1.3

2.4

I think the President is absolutely committed to getting a new tax system that works for this country. Tax reform is important and we need to have it accomplished. Hopefully our friends down the street are willing to work with us at some point in the next few years to accomplish that.

I will mention there are several specific things that we're doing at Treasury that you may not know about but could be of use to you or your friends in the manufacturing space. In addition to making sure that our financial institutions are in a place where they're able to make loans and commit investments of capital into your organizations, we have several programs that are specifically focused on ensuring that you have adequate access to credit and capital.

The Small Business Credit Initiative that I oversee is \$1.5 billion that goes out through States. It was created specifically to meet the needs of manufacturers that were dealing with the impact of collateral deterioration coming out of the crisis. We can get you more information about that.

The Small Business Lending Fund. Four billion dollars has gone out to community banks across the

country that have an incentive to increase their

lending. If they don't increase their lending they get

a higher interest rate, if they increase their lending

their interest rate goes down.

1.3

2.4

We also have tax credits. I mentioned that we have specific tax credits that are focused on your companies and your communities. The New Markets Tax Credit Program, \$3.5 billion annually, helps to ensure that projects in your communities get that little bit of extra gap financing to make those projects work.

In addition, the President has proposed the Manufacturing Community's Tax Credit for the last two years. Congress hasn't acted on the President's proposed budget, but it is \$2 billion of tax credits specifically targeting communities that have manufacturing needs, that are looking to attract manufacturers, or to grow manufacturing in those communities.

So with that I am available at any point to you, Mike and Mary, and to the rest of you. Feel free to call on me. Obviously we can't get out to communities like we could before the sequester, but I make myself available to you and to the team at your discretion.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Don, thank you. And

you have made yourself available and your team has provided excellent information, so we appreciate that.

Our next introduction, I just met earlier today, but we have a new representative from the Department of Energy, Libby Wayman, Senior Advisor to the Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing. Welcome.

#### 

#### 

#### 

2.4

# U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY INTRODUCTION Libby Wayman, Senior Advisor to the

Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing

MS. WAYMAN: Thank you. Thank you to the Department of Commerce for inviting us here. Thank you, Nicole, and thank you to the Council for also having us here and for letting me fill you in on a little bit of what we're doing in manufacturing at the Department of Energy.

As Chandra brought up earlier, it really comes down to timing. I think, first of all, we're experiencing a time where we are seeing a little bit of upsurge in manufacturing, and also at this time it's a great opportunity within the administration to develop manufacturing priorities. As President Obama has said, it should be our first priority in the U.S. to make manufacturing and jobs happen in America.

Then switching over to Energy, we really are at a unique time in Energy. First, we're at a point where, after decades of innovation in clean energy products, these products have come to a kind of a five-yard line of where they're starting to be competitive with incumbent energy sources. It's time for us to switch -- not really fully switch, but also expand our

focus into manufacturing from just the R&D.

1.3

2.4

Secondly, we're experiencing a time of prevalence of natural gas. We've gone from a relatively energy poor country looking to develop natural gas terminals at our shores to import natural gas, and now we're going to an energy rich country where we're experiencing a competitive advantage due to our energy resources.

So this period of time is an opportunity for us to invest in manufacturing of clean energy products and invest in what we can do with manufacturing to leverage our advantages of natural resources. This also includes investing in energy efficiency in the manufacturing sector so that our advantage in energy and manufacturing is sustained far beyond just the prevalence of natural gas.

Looking around the room, energy really touches a substantial portion of the manufacturing or really all of the manufacturing enterprises represented here, from companies developing energy technologies, to companies using energy in logistics, to companies who use energy in their manufacturing processes. Energy is really a significant driver in manufacturing.

To switch over to the Department of Energy, the Department of Energy also has many offices, many

different technologies under development there and all of those offices touch manufacturing in unique ways.

1.3

2.4

So the Clean Energy Manufacturing Initiative was recently launched at the Department of Energy, actually just a few weeks ago, for a couple of reasons:

1) to integrate all of the manufacturing work that we have gone on at the Department of Energy and to be a conduit for private sector partners and administration partners to access and to guide the Department of Energy's efforts in manufacturing; and 2) to put forward to new goals for energy and manufacturing.

One goal is to increase the competitiveness of the U.S. in manufacturing clean energy products. The second goal is to increase manufacturing competitiveness broadly through investing in energy efficiency and also understanding how we can take advantage of our low-cost natural resources.

There are several things that we can do within the Department of Energy to further these goals. The Department of Energy funds manufacturing and energy R&D, so we would like to understand how we can orient this R&D to further the goals of the initiative. We also fund manufacturing R&D facilities with several partners here. We also invest in industrial energy productivity. The fourth thing, is that we conduct

analysis to inform our priorities and our objectives.

1.3

2.4

So the analysis that we have currently been doing has been the type of analysis we've done for several years. It basically looks at the cost of producing technology today and the cost of producing technology in the future.

Our new competitiveness analysis is looking at the cost to produce energy technologies in the U.S. versus other regions so we can understand how our R&D priorities affect both the cost of production of energy technologies and our ability to produce those technologies competitively in the U.S.

Two other things that we're doing through this initiative are really more about what we can do beyond just the Department of Energy. One is that we are going into the community and collecting new ideas.

We are doing this through two avenues. One-and I'd really like this group to know about both of
these--we have a partnership with an organization
called the Council on Competitiveness, where we are
working with several partners on the council to
understand how we can build a public/private
partnership to advance these goals.

This is a dialogue series that will be carried out over the next nine months with executive level

folks to really understand what we can do to come together between the public sector and the private sector to increase manufacturing competitiveness as it relates to energy.

1.3

2.4

The second thing that we're doing is a series of regional summits, and we'll be doing those in a couple of locations around the country. These convenings are a slightly different focus. One of the objectives is to raise the profile of manufacturing and of energy and manufacturing, so to understand and to spread the understanding that energy manufacturing is happening in the U.S. It's thriving, it's growing, and it is a good industry for the future. The second objective of those convenings are also to collect new ideas for what the Department of Energy and its partners can do.

The last thing that we're doing through this initiative is we are really trying to expand our partnerships, both with the private sector, as I mentioned, through the Council on Competitiveness, and also between other agencies.

So we are really honored to be here today with such strong leaders and partners in manufacturing and we are already kind of working across the board with almost all of them.

With Treasury, we're working on an advanced energy manufacturing tax credit. We're working with the Export-Import Bank. We work with many facets of the Department of Commerce through the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and through many of the initiatives that Dr. Blank mentioned earlier today, like the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation and investing in manufacturing communities.

1.3

2.4

We are working with partners on workforce training and education. We think that it's through these partnerships that we'll be able to really drive toward the goals that I mentioned of our Clean Energy Manufacturing Initiative because those goals are really beyond just only what DOE can do, which is really primarily the R&D focus that I mentioned a little bit earlier.

So thank you for the opportunity to share with you what we're doing at Department of Energy, and thanks to our many partners and especially to the White House for its leadership in manufacturing and priorities there.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you, Libby.

We have just two more presenters. I do want to introduce someone I think is in the room as a resource from the Department of Education, Greg

Henschel.

1.3

2.4

MR. HENSCHEL: Yes, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you. Again,

Department of Education has worked very closely with

this committee in the past and I'm sure we'll call on

you in the future to give you an opportunity to give

your update at one of our next meetings.

MR. HENSCHEL: Yes. We look forward to briefing you. Just briefly, I will say we work closely with Jane's office on community college issues. One of the big problems we hear from so many manufacturers is about the lack of skills. Many of the problems that community colleges are facing is that students don't have the preparation they need to succeed in the training programs. That is our particular part of this mission.

We see the work of the Manufacturing Council and the drive for this as something that can help propel quality programs that have good career pathways from secondary into post-secondary so students are prepared, having taken the right courses to succeed in those training programs. We'll talk more later.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you very much,

Greg. I apologize for the short time, but we'll make

sure that --

MR. HENSCHEL: Another time. CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Next, is Jason Miller, representing the White House. He is a Special Assistant to the President for Manufacturing Policy and was nice enough to invite us to the White House for our final meeting of the last Council. So, welcome. 

#### 

#### 

#### 

,

#### WHITE HOUSE INTRODUCTION

## Jason Miller, Special Assistant to the President for Manufacturing Policy

MR. MILLER: Thank you. Thank you for having me. It's good to see a lot of familiar faces around the room. Thank you to Michael and Mary for your leadership this year. Apparently we seem to be, at least in the recent past, using your positions as a key talent pipeline into the administration.

(Laughter)

MR. MILLER: So we can talk offline about what jobs you're gunning for.

(Laughter)

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BROWN: Hi, Jason.

MR. MILLER: Good to see you. Over the last several years the administration has made a very serious commitment to investing in the manufacturing sector broadly, not just because of a need to strengthen manufacturing in and of itself but because of the broader impact it has on the economy.

We created a dedicated focus within the White House and Office of Manufacturing Policy that is led by the National Economic Council and the Department of Commerce, in part to develop a robust agenda around

manufacturing over the first term.

1.3

2.4

One of the things that was always challenging for us in 2011 and increasingly in 2012 as we talked about what we thought were a pretty strong set of manufacturing policies was that we couldn't overcome the cynicism that this was all part of a strategy to win Ohio in 2012 and, at last for those of us around the room in the administration who work on our manufacturing agenda I think it was nice in the State of the Union that the very first thing that the President talked about, his very first policy, was something that we're trying to do on manufacturing.

The day after the State of the Union, the first State of the Union amplification on that was about our manufacturing agenda. So I think that says pretty clearly about where our priorities lie, at least within the economic team, one of our key areas of focus of the second term.

Now, I mentioned the Office of Manufacturing Policy. I think as you see around this table we have a very broad set of agencies that are working very closely amongst themselves and with the White House on our entire agenda.

What touches the manufacturing sector and all the things that you submitted back were priorities for

you, for the sector, for your companies, does not sit neatly in any one place across the Federal Government so this effort has very much been about, how do we create a process across the entire Federal administration to align multiple policies, but also if you look at specific things that we're doing.

1.3

2.4

The folks before me have talked about some of them, the Investing in Manufacturing Communities

Partnership, the National Network for Manufacturing

Innovation. Those, while both led by the Department of

Commerce, have a very strong partnership across the

administration from the Department of Energy,

Department of Defense, Department of Labor, et cetera.

So we really see this as a whole-of-government approach, which from a management standpoint is always challenging, but I think we have had a great partnership across the administration.

Taking a half step back, when we think about our agenda and when we've talked about our agenda we tend to put it in four general buckets, the first being making the U.S. a cost-competitive location for manufacturing production. That includes a number of things, from corporate tax reform, to investing in infrastructure, to harnessing our natural gas resources and taking advantage of the current moment in energy.

The second is about spurring innovation in manufacturing. That includes increases in Federal R&D for advanced manufacturing platform technologies. That includes our National Network for Manufacturing Innovation. That includes the Clean Energy Manufacturing Initiative at the Department of Energy.

The third around skilling up our workforce and our businesses, at the center of that of course are the things that Jane and Department of Labor are doing around community colleges, what the Department of Education is doing around technical and vocational education, and also the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and others working directly with businesses to strengthen their skills and capabilities.

Then the fourth is around leveling the playing field. That is both the things that the President talked about in the State of the Union, making progress on our Trans-Pacific Partnership and launching the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, as well as strengthening our ability to put in place strong enforcement action when our trading partners are not living up to their part of the bargain.

Then we have talked about a fifth pillar which Matt highlighted, which really cuts across all of those, which is strengthening and enabling locally and

regionally developed strategies to take hold and aligning our Federal resources to strengthen communities to support manufacturing ecosystems and manufacturing investment.

1.3

2.4

So we recognize the breadth and need of an agenda in the manufacturing space. We have called for a lot of things in this area across those different pillars. We really look forward to your feedback, both on the specific things that we've implemented and gaps or areas for us to push.

I think when Don, who has disappeared, was talking about the Jobs Council, I think it's very useful, as you're pushing forward with your priorities and agenda, to think both about, what are the areas where legislation is absolutely needed and how do we generate some momentum behind it.

But specifically where are there areas where the administration can take action with its capabilities and its authorities in place? I think the example of working directly with Jane at the Department of Labor is a good one.

But we are at a point where a lot of the things that we have called for are not always getting the traction that we would like them to get up on the Hill, so the question there is, how do we prioritize

and put some momentum behind them?

1.3

2.4

But we always ask the question, are there things that we can do? While we have a broader vision for what needs to get done, that vision requires either a major investment or legislative change.

Is there something that we can do administratively that either highlights that vision or makes progress some of the way there that can sort of generate additional momentum behind it? I think in that, in particular, I would encourage you to really push on us where you think there are things that we can be doing administratively to be more aggressive on this agenda.

That is something that is obviously fully within our control and we can start acting on. So, thank you to the folks at the Department of Commerce, Nicole, Chandra, Dr. Blank, for including me. But I think the opportunity set is very wide for you so the challenge will be one of prioritization and identifying areas that you can have impact.

So, thank you. I look forward to continuing to work together.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Thank you, Jason.

Our last introduction is Mark Doms, who is the Chief Economists for the Department of Commerce. Thank

1 you.

#### ECONOMIC BRIEFING

#### Mark Doms, Under Secretary for Economic Affairs

1.3

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Thank you. I'm actually something called the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs now. What that job is, I'm basically the Chief Economic Advisor to the Secretary of Commerce. I participate in policy meetings. I think part of my job is to convey the concerns that businesses have on various policies.

So when I'm in a deputies' meeting about, say, immigration policy or corporate tax reform, I try to bring the point of view of businesses into those discussions. So, I really enjoy these meetings. I do these quite often.

One of the reasons I enjoy these meetings so much is that part of my job is to oversee all the statistics that are collected about the U.S. economy, or most of the statistics collected on the U.S. economy, often that you hear in the news every day.

I can show you just charts and charts and lines and lines of bar charts and pie graphs, but it's you

24 folks --

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: And we enjoy every

minute of it.

1.3

2.4

ASSISTANT SECRETARY LAMB-HALE: Isn't he good at it?

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: A real data nerd. But more importantly, it's the businesses who make the decisions on what hiring is going to be, what investment is going to be, how much you're going to do with R&D, whether or not you're going to export. So it's you folks who then tell me why these lines are doing what they're doing. So I'm going to go ahead and show you some of those.

I really would like this, over the next 20 minutes, just to be kind of a real conversation. If you have any questions, just go ahead and pipe in. Like the others said, I'm here for you. If you have any questions that I can't answer we'll get back to you. If you have questions in the future, just go ahead and drop me a line. Okay.

So again, my name is Nicole Lamb-Hale. Just go ahead and email me. I'd be more than happy to -(Laughter)

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: -- to get back to you.

So as soon as we get this going, what I'd like to do is let me give you an outline of some of the things I want to talk to you about.

The first thing I want to talk to you about, and this is in your binder and we'll have this up in a second, is just to talk about some facts about manufacturing. You know a lot of these facts about manufacturing. I might tell you some more.

Basically when we hear these facts and we think about these facts it explains why this administration takes manufacturing so seriously, why we have somebody like Jason in the White House, why we have somebody like Nicole here at the Department of Commerce, why there are so many of us on this side of the table from all across the administration. There is kind of really good economic reasons why we had to do that.

The second thing I'd like to do is talk about what's happening currently in the economy. Again, I'd like this to be much more of a conversation. I'll show you some charts and I'll tell you some numbers.

When we think about the U.S. economy, I think we have to talk about what's currently happening in the current fiscal climate. There's just a lot of noise out there and I want to provide perhaps a little bit of signal as to the effects of what is happening here in Washington and what effects that might have on the economy more generally.

Then I want to talk about just the outlook a little bit, especially kind of foreign events. So foreign events is especially important for the people in this room because if we look at, say, durable goods manufacturing, about 25 percent of what you produce is shipped overseas and there are a lot of things happening overseas and we face some pretty significant headwinds.

So if that is okay with you, I'm going to pretend that there's pictures on the screen and verbally try to describe what those pictures are. So let's talk about manufacturing and jobs. You all hear the phrase "manufacturing is good jobs", right? So everyone says that. The President says that. But let me amplify that a little bit because this is, I think, incredibly important.

So if we look at like average wages, the average person in manufacturing earns more than in other private industry. So if I compare myself to someone just like me who has the same amount of education, same age, there's something called a manufacturing wage premium. That's true regardless of education. So that is part of it.

The big part of total compensation where manufacturing leads other private sectors is in

benefits. So if we're looking at retirement, we're looking at vacation, we're looking at health care, all sorts of benefits, manufacturing has significant advantages over this other.

1.3

2.4

So if we look at the total compensation package then on an hourly basis, the typical manufacturing worker gets about 16 percent more than somebody else. So I think you've probably heard something like that before. Those numbers are floated around the press.

What isn't reported as much is not only on a per-hour basis do manufacturing workers do better, but they tend to work more hours, and they work two more hours in two different dimensions. One, in a typical work week they work more hours per week than your typical worker, and then they also tend to work more weeks per year.

You take those in combination and you multiply those you get that manufacturing workers work about 17 percent more hours per year than other folks in the private sector. So you're earning more and you're working more hours, and combined you have a bigger take-home pay.

Now, why is that really important? Well, that is very consistent with what the President has always

talked about in terms of promoting the middle class. Manufacturing are good middle class jobs. If you just look at the data, you go back the past couple of decades, the data show that the middle class has been hollowed out. Okay. If you just look at the income distribution in the country it has widened. I don't care what side of the hollow you're on, those are the data and that's what's happened.

So manufacturing plays this very key role in maintaining the middle class, as I said, because they earn more, they get good benefits, they work more hours and it really contributes to these middle class jobs. So the fact that you all have added half a million manufacturing jobs over the past couple of years is really great. That's really good news.

The next picture on the screen -- again, imagine -- maybe we should have some alcohol here to help this.

(Laughter)

1.3

2.4

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: So the next picture on the screen is a map of the United States. This map of the United States, imagine it, it's kind of rectangular, Florida hangs off, we've got the whole Michigan thing going on. Then there's always Alaska. It's like, whatever.

## (Laughter)

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: So when you look at that map of the United States, then you have all these different counties that are color coded. What this map basically shows is that manufacturing is really important to a large number of communities.

So, you know how many jobs there are in manufacturing, it's like 11.5, 12 percent of GDP, stuff like that. But it is also incredibly important to a large number of communities. So in fact there are over 600 counties where over 20 percent of their earnings come from manufacturing.

So let me run that again. Let's say we all live in the county, right? Everybody in the county is right here. So what I'm basically saying is that there is over 600 counties where it's the case that over 20 percent of all the income that's earned in that county comes from manufacturing. So, that's really important.

What's kind of interesting there is they tend to be counties that are spread all across the country. There's a whole lot in the Midwest where I know a lot of you have operations, and then there's also a whole lot in the South. But kind of all states have these kind of concentrations in manufacturing, and that's actually a very conservative estimate.

As you all know, manufacturing supports a lot of jobs, both on the upstream and the downstream. So when we say this we know there's a lot of communities that are very, very dependent on manufacturing.

When we think about what's been happening recently, we're having more stories of companies coming back to America, we have more kind of domestic investment, we have had this increase in manufacturing jobs, that means that these trends are only getting stronger in the future. There's going to be even more communities that are going to be dependent on manufacturing.

So I just want to make sure that we realize that when we say, hey, manufacturing is X percent of the economy, we live in such a big, complex society we do have to kind of peel the onion just a little bit to get a little better picture there.

MR. CARDOSO: Mark, one thing that you touched on briefly was for every one manufacturing job created there are three to five jobs that come as a consequence to that, which is the highest percentage of any other sector. The second thing is, I haven't been able to do this exactly but there is a very high level of correlation between the wealth of the middle class and the number of manufacturing jobs.

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. CARDOSO: The data is just really hard to find. My company actually looked at it. It's somewhere about 60 percent plus in the last 20 years where there's a direct correlation of those.

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Right.

MR. CARDOSO: So to solve this middle class -one of the answers is to bring more manufacturing jobs --

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Yes. So then when we talk to manufacturers like yourself and other businesses we often hear about the skills issue. had Jane here, for instance, from the Department of Labor and we have a representative from the Department of Education as well.

We understand that in order to increase employment in your industry, one of the constraints that you face is finding kind of the right skills. that is something that we've been pushing very hard on. Jason touched upon it as well. This is an issue that the administration takes very, very seriously.

So now, if you look at the next slide -- you don't have to look at yours. I think I'm doing an okay job here.

(Laughter)

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: So let's go ahead and talk about what's happening to the economy currently. Again, pipe in with questions or observations. So if we think about the economy, the biggest number that you hear about—and the number is going to be released later this week—is the employment report. How many jobs are we creating? The basic story there is that we've been actually creating jobs for the past 37 straight months, so that's kind of good.

But if you look at the job creation for the past 37 months you see this kind of real sawtooth pattern. It hasn't been a steady progression. We had some bumps in the road. Sometimes when you're hearing about this in the press you don't hear bumps in the road so much, you hear the phrase "headwinds". The President has talked about headwinds, and pretty much everybody talks about headwinds.

Some of these headwinds have actually been pretty important. So for instance, one of the big headwinds that we face that we tend to forget about is that oil prices spiked several times over the past couple years, so your average American family spends a couple thousand dollars on gasoline every year. When gasoline prices go up, most American families don't go out and buy a Prius the next day. What they tend to

do, is they tend to suck it up and buy more gasoline. 1 2 ASSISTANT SECRETARY OATES: They buy a Volt, 3 too. Volts are --UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Oh, Volts. Right. 4 We 5 have GM here, right? 6 (Laughter) 7 UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Okay. That's a

gratuitous suck-up.

(Laughter)

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: So when gasoline prices go up, people spend more out of pocket. When people spend more out of pocket on gasoline, that means they're spending less money on other products. Okay. That's why it's such a detrimental effect to the economy.

When gasoline prices go up, they spend the extra money. Where does that extra money go? Well, a lot of it goes overseas and our trade deficit goes up because we rely on foreign oil for a good chunk. Not as much as we used to, but we still do. So that's one of the headwinds that we have repeatedly faced.

That happened again at the beginning of this year, but now gas prices are down. But that is something that is really important and that's something where our administration has been very actively

pursuing policies to increase domestic, especially oil, production and we're doing a pretty good job there.

1.3

2.4

So when we look at the job growth, what we see is this very kind of sawtooth pattern. Now, we have a number of headwinds. I mentioned gasoline prices.

There's Europe. So, two summers ago that was a big situation and that really affected the stock markets.

That's going to be another picture that we have.

Another one was the draught. Remember, especially in the Midwest last year, it was just horrific for a lot of farmers. Then there's just been a series of others. Remember the Japanese earthquake? That affected, I think, some of your companies and production here in the United States.

So hopefully what most economists are predicting then is that these headwinds -- oh. All right. That's the map. That's pretty much what you had in your minds, so we're cool there. So let's just go there. Let's go to the next one.

So one reason we talk about jobs so much is the unemployment rate spiked in this recession. It was just a really horrific recession. We lost over nine million jobs. You all know that. Manufacturing kind of took it on the chin, right? So manufacturing alone lost two million jobs during the recession. You've

gained about half a million since then.

1.3

2.4

So the reason we focus on jobs numbers so much is that we need pretty strong job growth to lower the unemployment rate. So how many jobs do we need to lower the unemployment rate? You need at least 100,000 or so a month, just because our population is growing, our labor force is growing. So we need at least 100,000 jobs a month to lower the unemployment rate. So any job growth that we can get above 100,000 is really, really important. Okay.

So when we have these various headwinds occurring—and I'll talk about the fiscal situation shortly—that really hurts in terms of lowering the unemployment rate. It's something that we take very seriously because when you look at the unemployment numbers what you see is that this recession was just so horribly in so many dimensions.

One way it was really horrible is this recession we had a real problem with the long-term unemployed. Okay. So we've had people who have been out of jobs and they've been out of jobs for a long time. It's much worse than in previous recessions, so that's just people who are kind of losing their skills. That's why we focus so much on our education policy so we can get people with the right skills to kind of fill

those jobs.

1.3

2.4

So when we're thinking about jobs -- also, I just wanted to show you one picture. When we think about manufacturing and jobs, we mentioned that there's a half a million jobs that have been created and they've been kind of broad-based across lots of different manufacturing industries, though not all. So all this graph shows is, from 2009 to 2012, what's happened to employment. So a lot of the industries here have seen some increases.

One area where we've seen some pretty big increases, thinking about the Chevy Volt, for instance, is that the motor vehicle sector has really come back. Unit sales are now like over 15 million. They've been there, elevated, for a while. We think that's good news. I don't know if you want to talk about that at all. I think that's a good use for the economy.

Again, when you think about these multipliers, the automobile industry especially—I should say motor vehicle industry—is particularly important. So, that's a good—news story. Domestic production is increasing. Our exports of cars are at all—time highs. I was looking at the data. We export cars and trucks everywhere now. I mean, that has been a very good—news story. So we're making really good products and we're

able to get them out, so that's my gratuitous suck-up.

(Laughter)

1.3

2.4

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: But in all seriousness, because there are so many industries that feed into the motor vehicle sector -- you know, GM and Ford, they're not as vertically integrated as they used to be if you go back to decades ago, so they do rely on other manufacturing industries. They especially like the electronics industry. I don't know what the current estimate is on the dollar of electronics in a car. I saw something where it was like \$2,000 or something like that. It's really quite large.

MS. SMYTH: It's really significant. I think you're right, the fully integrated model is a model of the past. As much as public/private partnerships, we have private/private partnerships with our tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 suppliers, whether it's the development of technology or from a production perspective. So I think partnerships are a key word.

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Yes. So one of the headwinds that we faced--let's go to the next chart, please--is what's happening around the world. We'll show you another chart on this, too.

Basically, these are just kind of stock market indices. What you see is that if we go back to before

when Europe kind of blew up, which was two summers ago, it was late July, the same time that our debt was downgraded by S&P, it was that same week that all that stuff happened. You know, there was a stock market correction.

1.3

2.4

There was a stock market correction here in the United States, but Europe really kind of took it on the chin. We also have China on this graph. What you see is that since that time the U.S. has actually fared pretty well.

So if you look at kind of like GDP growth and whatnot, if you look at it compared to other industrialized countries, the U.S. has actually been doing okay. Of course we want to do a whole heck of a lot better, but this is something to keep in mind when I show you a chart that is coming up. So let's go to the next one, please.

Now, one of the big drags that we've been facing, when I think about fiscal drags, is let's not think about the Federal stuff at the moment and the sequester, let's think about state and local governments. This is something I don't think most people realize.

So state and local governments in this recession relative to other recessions, again, really

kind of took it on the chin. So manufacturing really took it on the chin, state and local governments took it on the chin. There's lots of reasons why this recession was really quite different than all the others.

1.3

2.4

What this chart basically shows is that if we look at employment of state and local governments, it fell by over 700,000 during this recession and it's still at these very low levels. That was kind of a big drag on the economy. Usually at this stage of an economic recovery state and local governments have added jobs.

So if we think about the double delta here, we've lost jobs and then relative to where we would usually be. That difference is easily a million. The reason you care about like the number of a million, that's about a percentage point off the unemployment rate, so that's pretty important. So, that's been a big drag.

As you know, state and local governments, not only do they employ people but they buy a bunch of stuff. They do less construction. If we look at manufacturing, a big chunk of manufacturing production goes into the construction industry. So when these state and local governments have these fiscal problems

it has big local effects for the economy as well.

1.3

2.4

Now, the good news there is that when we think about the state and local government as a headwind, hopefully that headwind is dissipating, they're getting their books back into order. A lot of state and local governments are dependent on property tax revenue, and when you have a real estate bust, that's where it takes a big hit.

So let's go to the next one, please. Let's just go to the next one after that. I think we're running over time, but perhaps I can help you on that front.

So now let's talk about the Federal Government. Okay. So you're here in Washington, DC. If you look at the Federal Government and its contribution to GDP, so these are just like the official numbers. It's kind of a confusing chart, so let me just cut to the chase.

If you look at what's helping the Federal Government, that's been a drag on GDP growth. So if you've actually read the stories or heard the news about the latest GDP number, it was like 2.5 percent. Why wasn't it higher? The private sector was expecting something north of 3 percent. Why wasn't it higher? Well, one of the reasons is that the government tends

to be a drag.

1.3

2.4

So, I oversee a couple of agencies. We spend like \$1 billion. Our agencies were cutting back late last year and early this year in anticipation of the sequester because we don't want to furlough people. We want to have kind of smooth operations. We don't want to do something herky-jerky. Just like in your businesses, right? You don't want to do anything super-abrupt either.

So that's been a drag on the economy. If you look at the past nine quarters, if you look at state, local, and the Federal Government, we've been a drag on the economy by about a half a percentage point. Now, half a percentage point, maybe for your businesses in terms of growth rates, I don't know if that's a rounding error for your businesses or not.

For a big economy like the United States, that's really huge. That's tens of thousands of jobs a month. Again, remember how I was talking about how important it was to have job growth over 100,000 or more? It's above 100,000, the unemployment goes down.

So the Federal Government is already in kind of fiscal austerity mode, and that's a drag going forward. We can go ahead and use this as a segue to talk about Europe. So what Europe is finding, if you

look at the IMF, let's go ahead and can we just cut through this? Because again, I want to -- let's go to the next one. Yes, let's look at this one.

1.3

2.4

So let's go ahead and talk about Europe, because about 20 percent of U.S. exports go to Europe. Europe isn't growing very fast. So what this chart basically shows is how much GDP increased in some of our major markets in 2011-2012 and what the International Monetary Fund just came out with for 2013. It's a really interesting story.

So if we look at the bars, the second set from the right, the European Union, what we see is they had pretty weak growth in 2011. We knew that. In 2012, the pain was a little more broad-based. Germany really decelerated quite a bit, for instance, besides the huge negative growth you saw in countries like Spain, Italy, and we all know about Greece.

This year, in 2013, what they're expecting is basically just flat, not much of anything. In 2014, they're expecting there's going to be some growth. But what they're basically finding is that when you impose fiscal austerity very suddenly you can have this huge negative multiplier effect. We talked about multipliers before kind of when we were talking about how important manufacturing is and the upstream and

downstream industry.

1.3

2.4

What the research is basically showing that a lot of people have been doing is that when you cut back on kind of Federal Government spending rather suddenly when you're already in a precarious state, that can have a much bigger negative effect on the economy.

It's not like the European Central Bank can lower interest rates that much further, so traditionally when you have fiscal policy taking a big hit, sometimes you get monetary policy to kind of replace it. Well, monetary policy in Europe is already pretty low, so what else can they do?

I think there are a lot of lessons here to be learned for the U.S. experience. So when the president talks about, yes, we have to deal with our deficit and debt issues, he says we have to do it in a responsible way. I think Europe is providing lots of case studies as to why he makes that statement, so I think that's just something really important.

Now, looking around elsewhere in the world, if you look at China, there's this big fear that China was really going to decelerate sharply. I think people are becoming a little more optimistic about China's growth, and that's one of our biggest export markets now. The numbers that they're producing actually seem to pass

the smell test.

1.3

2.4

I used to work in the Federal Reserve system before joining the administration, so my colleagues actually know this stuff. Then to look at all these other indicators of the Chinese, everything seems to actually be pretty consistent.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: So they do modeling to come up with their own growth numbers?

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Yes. Yes. I knew this was important. I used to work at the Fed, China was approaching 10 percent growth a year. People were like, ah, they're lying. I mean, that was a common sentiment. I never said that, in case there's press here.

(Laughter)

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: It's very black box-y. You can come to the U.S. and we'll tell you exactly how we do it in super-gory detail, you know, how we take about 10,000 different series and construct GDP. In China, that's not the case so there's always skepticism, but history has actually shown that we think they're actually pretty accurate.

MR. CARDOSO: And they are growing. There is growth in China and it's now growing at a higher rate than it was before, so there is an acceleration.

UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Yes. I mean, their problem is they're growing at 7.5 percent but they want to be growing at 8.5 percent. I mean, those are fun problems to have. So, that's what's happening in China.

Another part of the good-news story is if we look at emerging economies, right? That's really what's boosting world GDP growth. Again, why do I care about world GDP growth? World GDP growth is the single biggest explainer of what happens to our export growth. So, that's a first order effect and exchange rate is a distant second. The first effect is GDP growth.

So what is boosting, kind of, GDP growth in 2013 is like Latin and South America, and also like sub-Sahara Africa is doing really well. Not just South Africa, but the rest of the sub-Saharan African countries.

Many of them are actually -- that's kind of a big bright spot in the world economy. I don't know how many of you actually export there, but it sounds like there's going to be more and more opportunities for you to have a relatively vibrant market.

So let's go to the next one. One thing that we look at, and I'll end with this, is we look at something called unit labor cost. Now, you guys are

all business people so you understand this. So in the United States, our wages for manufacturing workers are high. They've been growing some.

1.3

2.4

But what's faster than the growth in wages in the United States is the productivity growth of your businesses, right? So you guys have just become really efficient. If we think about the number, people have always look at, how many person hours does it take to produce a car? I mean, that's just shrunk dramatically.

I was talking at the beginning of this meeting about the semiconductor industry with you guys, and there you just have these huge, huge productivity improvements. I mean, you have a couple thousand people working with these -- but just the amount of chips they produce over time just increases greatly.

So the United States is very productive. What this basic chart shows is that if you look at unit labor cost, again, that's the difference between kind of wage growth and productivity growth, so if the unit labor cost is negative that means productivity growth is faster than the wage growth.

If you look at it over the past 10 years or so, unit labor cost in U.S. manufacturing has fallen. Yes?

MR. FRIESEN: If you take micro-electronics 1 2 production out of that, does it look the same? 3 UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: So it doesn't. electronics helps it go down but it's still down if you 4 5 take it out. Okay. CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: 6 I apologize, but if we 7 can wrap this up in the next couple of minutes. 8 UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: Yes. This is my last 9 point. 10 CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Okay. Thank you. UNDER SECRETARY DOMS: I'll make it brief. 11 what this basically shows is we have this website that 12 1.3 we have up on the Department of Commerce website. It's 14 called the Ace Tool. Basically what we want to do is 15 tell the story that investing in the United States 16 might have some advantages that were under-appreciated 17 over the past couple years. 18 So although wages may be cheaper elsewhere at 19 a point in time, that doesn't guarantee they're going to be cheaper going forward. I think this graph 20 21 illustrates that point very nicely. If you look at then, say, China, you see that their unit labor cost 22

23

2.4

25

surprising.

Economic history says that when countries

has actually gone up quite a bit. That's not

2.4

develop they become more productive and their wage rates go up. Okay. So in this case wages are going up faster than productivity in China, so for a lot of industries that kind of value proposition that you thought might have been true in 2003 may not be as true as it is today.

So I just wanted to give a shout-out to the Department of Commerce who developed this thing called this Ace Tool that basically shows some very nice charts about this just so we can get -- I mean, you all understand this, especially those of you who have multi-national operations, but especially for the people on the Hill to kind of get the story out. We do have a nice story to tell, and of course we have a lot more work to do. But I just wanted to end with that.

So I guess, with that, thank you very much. I appreciate coming here and I look forward to working with you in the future.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: We look forward to seeing you again. Thank you, Mark. Okay.

## PRIORITIES DISCUSSION

1.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: If I could get everyone's attention here, I'm sorry we haven't taken a break. If you need one, I hope you've taken one. We're on the home stretch here. We have about a half hour that we'd like to start to move forward.

Again, as you think about the discussion we've had this morning, this really is, I hope, a good onboarding. You've met some people that you're going to work with in the future. Hopefully you learned a little bit more about the resources that are available to them, and you are not reluctant to contact those participating today. In your packets of information, most of the folks that we had today, their contact information is within your packet.

Next what we'd like to do is talk about the process forward. Mary is going to help out here a little bit by laying out how the Manufacturing Council process works so that we can give you an understanding of what the work looks like and how we expect to go forward.

We hope that in that discussion we can have a little bit of time to hear your thoughts around priorities. We surveyed all of you. We have talked

last night and this morning about many of the things that are important to all of us and we want to move that process forward.

1.3

2.4

So with that, again, if you have to step out, we understand that, but we're going to keep moving. We have to be out of this room at 12:30 and into lunch. So, that's the plan.

So Mary, if you wouldn't mind helping us with process, I'd appreciate it.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Sure. Absolutely.

Thank you again, everyone, for your time and your attention. I'd like just to take a second and remind the Council members why we're here, because I had to remind myself periodically in the process last year why we were here.

At the end of the day, we serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Commerce, so we are a collection of industry representatives and this is an amazingly diverse group. Many different industry sectors are represented here. The size of our companies are very diverse.

I think, thanks to Jenna, Liz, and the others who were responsible in making this collection of individuals on the Council. They did a fantastic job in creating a group that will truly, I think, serve

Commerce well as an Advisory Council. That is our role.

1.3

2.4

So we've talked a lot about what it is we should be advising about. That is what this section of the agenda is, for us to come together and hopefully come up with -- there are so many different issues and lots of different aspects of those issues, many more than we could ever tackle in the next two years and do it well. So we're going to have to make some choices, we're going to have to make some prioritization.

First of all, it was gratifying that those of you who returned the survey, when asked what you thought the priority issues were affecting manufacturing, there was a great deal of confluence.

So, there was a lot of agreement. And what was also incredibly gratifying this morning was to hear how much that was in alignment with what the administration is concerned about and has already identified as its priorities.

So I am going to take one step backwards and remind you that the last two years of the Council, the four subcommittees that were created to deal with the topics that were priority at the time were export/import, competitiveness, workforce, and energy.

As you can imagine, under each of those topic headings

there were a whole lot of different issues that were brought to bear. It was each of the subcommittees jobs to figure out which of those issues were the ones that they were going to tackle.

1.3

2.4

The way I think that I would recommend you think about that when you get to your subcommittees is, where is there—and I think Jason made the point—political will and where is there the ability within the current administration and things that are not going to tax either the legislative side or the finance side?

If we make recommendations that are just above and beyond what can get done, it will not serve anybody's purpose. So that isn't to say that we shouldn't talk about the really important issues, but when it comes down to the recommendations they have to be focused on things that can actually get accomplished.

So I think we did a good job. As you heard, it's gratifying as returning that actually we did help make some recommendations that could inform policy, that could inform program determination and move some things forward.

The list of priorities that came out of the survey for this term were workforce, innovation and

competitiveness, tax policy, technology R&D, energy, and public perception of manufacturing.

1.3

2.4

I would argue that that actually spans all of it so I don't know that we will necessarily treat that as its own subcommittee, but I think it's something that we need to be aware of and something that, as the work of the Council as a whole, we need to actively find ways to elevate the perception of manufacturing and actually educate those that live and work with us that do not really understand what manufacturing is.

So when I look at the list that came out of our independent survey and look at Secretary Blank's and Jason's discussion of what the priorities for this administration and for Commerce are, the overlap here is clearly around innovation, in building on our exports, and in the things that will help make manufacturing in the U.S. competitive, which is a skilled workforce, infrastructure, and finding ways to translate theoretical research into applied research and innovation.

So the good news is, we're all on the same page. The challenge will be, how do we really bring those things and, of all the things that we would work on, how do we prioritize those into a reasonable number of subcommittees, and then within your subcommittees,

as I said, identifying those specific things that
you're going to pursue to do your research around and

make recommendations for.

1.3

2.4

So at this point this is where everyone else gets to talk and make a case for what you think would be an important priority as a subcommittee. We will take this conversation and Mike and I, with the help of Jenna and Liz, will, from this meeting, take all of that information and identify the four to five subcommittees.

We will then basically divide this group up into membership of those subcommittees and we will have some commentary in Next Steps on what happens after that. But this is where we really get to say, what are the key things and kind of begin to focus that conversation.

MS. SMYTH: Mary, I have a question rather than a statement. Why was R&D separated from innovation?

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: It doesn't necessarily need to be. I think the thought around that is if you look at all of the things that fall under innovation and you look at all the things that fall under R&D, you could have separate topics.

So you could have investment in R&D, you could

have what kinds of things, infrastructure included, 1 2 that spur innovation. There's that conversation about, 3 how do you translate theoretical research into applied? So there are many, many topics. I think the fact that 4 both appeared on the list end up just suggesting that 5 6 it's really important. 7 MS. SMYTH: I think it's a huge mistake to 8 separate the two. 9 VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: That's why this 10 discussion is going to be an important one, because together --11

MS. SMYTH: -- silo areas of work. It needs to be really a pipeline mentality -- legalistic approach. There's no point in having a happy, happy thought if you can't figure out the pipeline of getting to where you're going to sell something. So I just think --

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. KELLY: I was going to say the same thing, why are they separated? I would combine them.

MS. SMYTH: It doesn't make any sense.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: So combining R&D and innovation.

MR. CARDOSO: I will give you another perspective. I think innovation could be related to, for example, manufacturing processes and it creates a

major competitive advantage if you're talking about
competing in the global market. I think even with my
own organization I have a really hard time. When you
think of R&D, you think about developing new products
and so forth. But, you know, I'm just giving you a

different perspective.

1.3

2.4

MS. SMYTH: Yes, yes. But Carlos, there's a lot of fundamental R&D in the process, right? So as we move into -- for example, there's two types of R&D for manufacturing. You've got your product enablers and you've got your process enablers.

As we look at introducing electrification of vehicles, people turn around and said, well, there's no need for manufacturing R&D, it's continuous improvement, just keep on going. But welding -- steel is totally different from welding an aluminum to a copper tile.

So we actually have grown in General Motors in R&D for manufacturing process in areas that we were never involved in because, as you say, of our changing and the product. So I think it's important to look at the new products that we're competing in the marketplace and looking at the manufacturing technologies that are a prerequisite to us actually making a profit on making those, because if we don't

make them we'll just design it and somebody will make it overseas.

MR. CARDOSO: I'll give you a real -- if you look at the credit, the R&D tax credit, go look at how many manufacturing processes get credit for that: none.

MS. SMYTH: Absolutely.

1.3

2.4

MR. CARDOSO: Shouldn't there be an R&D tax credit when you develop an innovative new process that is competitive, is intellectual property, that makes us more competitive? I'm just giving you --

MS. SMYTH: No, I totally agree with that.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Yes. In the last

Council this was the discussion. It could be why they
were separated, and maybe the separation doesn't make
sense. But the point the last Council discussed is that
you have basic research and applied research and
applied research would be, to your point, what the
Europeans are doing in terms of investing in
manufacturing process, which I think is part of what
you're responsible for at General Motors. That might
have biased the things, I'm not sure. But I think when
you talk about manufacturing, we're interested in more
of -- equation.

MR. ANDERSON: One point I would make for the new members of the Council which has already surfaced,

one of the eye-openers for me was I thought coming into this, Chandra and I said, well, manufacturing is manufacturing. There are opposing views.

(Laughter)

1.3

2.4

MR. ANDERSON: So I just want everybody to be shocked by that.

(Laughter)

MR. ANDERSON: And figure out how we're going to adjust and adapt to those opposing views, because there are energy issues, there are export issues that different industries are absolutely opposed to and refused to support last year. So, just be aware that that's a reality.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Thank you very much for making that point, Joe. Understand that whatever recommendations come out of your subcommittee are agreed by the whole Council, right, so you don't just represent yourself, your industry, your business, you represent manufacturing as a whole. But lots of opportunity for great, constructive debate.

MS. WILLIAMS: I also don't think we should not go after something to have a discussion, knowing that there's difficulty in the situation.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Right. Yes. Yes.

MS. PILAT: So one process point I'll add to

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

that is that it's a consensus viewpoint. Not everyone has to agree. If there is a dissenting viewpoint that is strongly held, there's an opportunity to illuminate that in the final recommendation as well. So it's not that it gets sorted out of the process altogether, but the Council does have to come to consensus on its recommendations in order for them to be adopted.

1.3

2.4

DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BROWN: And I would say one other point to add to Joe's, is that one of the big differences at the last Council, too, is within size, big companies versus small companies. We want to be really sensitive that we're embracing the viewpoint of all as we move forward as much as possible. So if we can try to think about it both ways and put yourself in both people's shoes, that will be really helpful as you move forward.

MR. GREEN: One thing. It was interesting to hear Mr. Singerman's description of the Manufacturing Network and sort of the model. I look at the model as more of, say, entry or something like that in Taiwan. I think a really important question is to look at how these centers are going to be laid out.

This idea of really funding initiatives that are going to benefit industries, historically what I've seen is that people sort of get woozy when they start

thinking about picking winners and losers, and so on and so forth. That's a really important question because the fact is, other countries do it and they do it really effectively.

1.3

2.4

We're in the display industry. A perfect example is, like, Samsung, where you look at the LCD industry which was zero 25 years ago and it's a multi-hundred billion dollar industry today. That was basically a government/private partnership in Korea, and now basically Korea dominates the LCD industry.

We have to look at those questions to see, what should we be doing in the U.S. to capture certain industries that are going to dominate in the future?

So, I think we should really take a look at that.

MR. FUJITA: Yes. So when we talk about workforce development, I would like to make a note that somehow we have to come up with highly skilled teachers for high school science, especially physics and math. I am serving on the board of trustees at a private high school in Ohio, which is a grade school.

I think it's a grade school, but when it comes to physics education it's so -- because it's taught by, for example, a non-qualified physicist. What happens is that he or she will influence students in the wrong way. They never want to see the subject, ever. So I

see this all the time.

1.3

2.4

Somehow the Federal Government should come up with like a super science teacher for them where you try to attract these qualified people to high school education, junior high school education by having higher pay, for example, which may come from the government in the form of a grant or something.

We have to do it, otherwise when you go to graduate school more students -- as you may know, in science. There are mostly Asians, Indian, and Chinese. I am Asian, but I think we have to fundamentally change the education for science for --

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Thank you for that.

What I took away is that workforce is still a very important issue, one of the priority topics that we need to consider, and you are already coming up with some of the solutions.

MR. FUJITA: I think we have to go deeper. That's the --

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Absolutely. So clearly another vote for workforce as one of the underpinnings of making adequate manufacturing.

MS. WILLIAMS: Let me comment on tax policy. We didn't hear it a lot from actually any of the participants but it came up high obviously from all of

the companies, so again this is one of the topics that can be -- is there political will or is there -- it crosses over into R&D tax credits, global competitiveness, all the kind of challenges or issues that the company said were issues but we didn't hear it today.

1.3

2.4

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Well, I think -- and this is, again, just sort of a suggestion. What's wonderful about having all of this cross-agency and the representation from a lot of different individuals from the administration is there is common ground. I am certain of it.

Our challenge then will be finding that common ground where they can guide us on, you know, where is the administration thinking right now and how can we leverage that, and then how can we make the case from the manufacturing standpoint that it is that important that this goes forward, and then help them leverage that on the Hill.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: So one of the ways that that happens, which you'll never hear the government representatives here say because it's not their scope of responsibility, but as influential businesses in your communities you have influence over your legislators.

/

It's just not a matter of coming here to Washington, DC, and communicating through the Manufacturing Council. The work you'll be asked to do on subcommittees has a lot to do with creating awareness and gaining attention and discussing these issues with your local legislators.

MR. CHANDLER: I think, Mike, that there's a lot of scope -- to help the administration understand that there may be a commonality of interest across the country and across sectors in changing some of the perverse incentives that are in the system today, the tax system that drives decisions to locate manufacturing elsewhere that don't have to be there.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: I think an avenue we have for that is through the Treasury Department. I think if we can come up with a set of recommendations that are obviously beneficial to manufacturing and we get the majority of the team on board, I think you will be surprised at how much influence those recommendations can hold. I can think of many of them myself.

MR. LORENTZEN: I have two comments, if I may. One, is we talk about political will. Political will is making itself in evidence right now in some of the programs that were described that interface with the

R&D and the technical innovation. So the Investing in Manufacturing Communities, the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation, these are clearly already out there. There's kind of budget accommodation for them.

1.3

2.4

If we could perhaps arrange one of our subcommittees that maybe directly deals with those things, those things need to be kind of tuned up.

Frankly, they scare me. The last thing I want to do is be a robotics company in Davenport, Iowa, competing with the federally funded competitor in San Francisco, competing with them for the intellectual property that is emanating from it.

So I think maybe if we combine R&D and the manufacturing innovation and deal directly with those policy issues, that gives us an extreme focus that we can pay attention to that's kind of now.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Absolutely, Joel. I think I heard the Secretary specifically say we would like your input on these programs. It's not just what the impact is going to be on other businesses, but it's also, how do you measure whether or not it's working?

MR. LORENTZEN: Yes. Exactly.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: That is probably one of the biggest differentiators, in my opinion, between business and the government, is business is held very accountable with a balance sheet, the government, not so much. So we have to find other ways to hold them accountable for the performance of these programs.

MR. LORENTZEN: So it's wonderful if I'm the cluster. It's maybe not so wonderful if I'm not.

> VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. LORENTZEN: My second comment is on the workforce development, which is kind of my personal passion. It seems like we focus on developing workforce to a level of what I'll call sufficiency, but not to a level of advantage. I'm wondering if we can expand the dialogue because we talked about vocational skills, like vocational skills are the thing that's missing.

In fact, every emerging market on the face of the planet is investing in the same thing, so what do we do to create advantage with these vocational skills as opposed to sufficiency for competition? I think there's some pretty fertile ground if we can figure out ways that we evolve the proprietary knowledge of employers and manufacturers in that skills development that takes the place of --

> VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Absolutely.

MR. LORENTZEN: -- or something like that.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Absolutely.

probably one of the greatest outcomes that could come out of the workforce subcommittee or conversation is, how do we create that true partnership—that seems to be a word that we're all really interested in—but the true partnership between our education system and our industries. I mean, they should be seamless, and unfortunately they're far from that.

MR. LORENTZEN: Right.

1.3

2.4

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: So sufficiency is one thing. That's what we're all just pleading for at this point. But the country that -- ultimately will be the one that has the advantage.

MR. LORENTZEN: Right. That relies on skill combinations and proprietary that maybe isn't in the public realm.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Right. They don't know.
Yes.

MR. PAREEK: If I could add to Joe's point, workforce development is also a passion of mine. I think we have a good network of community colleges that could be sort of repurposed, where billions of dollars of infrastructure already exist, to emergent needs, what industry needs, but also going back to the gap that we found in vocational training. That already is a gap, but also engineering schools.

1 -

I feel engineering schools have been sort of sabotaged by sciences, so it's become pure science versus applied science and technology to bring back to manufacturing. So if you can sort of bring some people midstream rather than all becoming rocket scientists and engineering -- and I went to engineering school and all we studied was math versus --

MR. BRAIG: I was pleased to see the Department of Energy represented here and appreciate their interest in what we're doing here. I think long term, a profound factor in the competitiveness, the global competitiveness of U.S. manufacturing is having access to energy, although currently it's not something that we should or that we can't take for granted long term. So, I think this should also be part of our topics here as we go forward.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Absolutely. The time is really now for that conversation, more so than ever.

MR. BRAIG: Right. Yes.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Good.

MS. WAYMAN: Actually, just to follow on that point, and also on Joel's point about using this committee and this Council to really inform some of the administration's already budgeted priorities, this is a big budget focus for the Department of Energy. So if

you would also like to, either in a specific sub committee that works on kind of budgeted administration priorities or a specific subcommittee that works on energy, we would love the input of this Council on the Department of Energy's manufacturing initiative.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Duly noted.

1.3

2.4

MS. BARRETT: Mary, just an expansion on some of the discussion. First of all, taking it to a slightly different audience. We talked about individual jobs, people that we would be hiring. The question I'd like to raise to the group is, do we see a gap in capability development for small- and mediumsized companies that particularly make one or two big bets a year, that's all you have time to do. You perhaps don't have the sophistication to do export, applied R&D, access to capital.

There are varied levels to sophistication of small- and medium-sized companies. Companies have employees already, they have customers already, so how can we accelerate their sophistication, their own development as an organization, perhaps, in that SME space, which is a very large part of our economy?

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: One of the things that I think we debated toward the end of the last term was, you know, maybe does it make sense to have almost a

subcommittee that is really focused on the SME world, because it is a little bit different?

1.3

2.4

That's something that either we have to be sure that we have sufficient representation in all of the subcommittees that that voice is brought to bear or that we tackle it as it becomes its own separate topic because you're absolutely right, some of those things are unique to that space and it's going to be a challenge for us to make sure that we are adequately representing those issues.

MR. CARDOSO: Yes. For me personally, you have to make a decision why you're going to be here. Are you here for my industry or are you here for moving manufacturing in this country? The answer is the latter. If I really accept that, 70 percent of manufacturing activity comes from small business, so whether you're a large company or a small company I can tell you from my company's point of view -- I can tell you, we can live with some of the policies. We find a way around it and we do it.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Right. Right. Right.

MR. CARDOSO: What I worry about every day is those small companies, that 70 percent, and how do we make sure that we address their issues and make sure that they're sound, more so than even my company? So

I'm not sure that separating them would be the right thing to do. I think having an understanding that part of the 70 percent of our employment, 70 percent of our manufacturing activity comes from small business, we need to be really focusing on that, even if you're a larger business.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Thank you.

1.3

2.4

MR. GREEN: Mary, I have one other point. I raised this last --

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: The last one. You got it.

MR. GREEN: I raised this last year. I would love to see a discussion in one of the committees on the whole Made in America, Made in the USA thing, which is just a mess. The laws are screwed up. I know there's a lot of stakeholders, but I think it's a conversation that's really important because it penalizes U.S. companies, particularly small companies that can't get around it. They can't get around the legislation associated with what allows you to say that.

MR. FRIESEN: I can maybe just expand on that point a little bit. We sort of have this trifecta of an interest in an innovation-based economy and the realities of global supply chain and global customer

base and an interest in developing an optimized regional manufacturing base, right? We talk about small companies, especially.

1.3

2.4

How do you articulate all those three together and still be talking about U.S. manufacturing, given that the supply chain --

MR. GREEN: Supply chain is all over the world. It's all over the world.

MR. FRIESEN: And how do you best create incentives to guarantee that you do key pieces, the most important pieces in the U.S., right?

MR. GREEN: Exactly.

MR. FRIESEN: So especially when you start thinking about advanced technologies like ours that are just coming out of the gates now, heavily spurred by the DOE, early start-up in 2007. Now we're competing right at the very bottom of the pyramid in emerging markets, so the pressures are immense.

So what are those incentives that drive us to keep not just policy incentives, but also sort of business incentives to keep manufacturing in the U.S.?

We have contract manufacturers in South Carolina and Illinois and we manufacture in Scottsdale, but we also have contract manufacturers in Shenzen for injection molding and pick-and-place assembly in Jakarta, right?

So there's all of these pieces that are 1 2 realities for a company like ours that only has 200 3 employees worldwide. I think this will be an important piece from my perspective for us all to consider and 4 we're really thinking about in every committee how we 5 sort of incentivize that trifecta. 6 7 MR. ZAHNER: Mary, look at the issues there. 8 They all seem to have some level of inter-9 connectedness. Is one of the processes of this group to 10 identify those, how maybe the different issues are certain issues that intertwine and make it more 11 12 possible to introduce back to the government to assist 1.3 us in achieving them? 14 VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Okay. So say that 15 again, that it's cross-cutting? 16 MR. ZAHNER: One of the processes --17 VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Cross-cutting interests? 18 MR. ZAHNER: Yes. 19 VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: And you think those 20 become the more impactful ones? 21 MR. ZAHNER: Would they, or do we do that as 22 part of the --CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: I think we do. 23 2.4 why you had Treasury, you have Energy. What we found 25 in working through our issues in the past is that there are issues that cut across multiple stakeholders and those are the toughest to resolve.

1.3

2.4

I think what Nicole and her team have done is made some of the different cabinet areas much more available to us as we collect information and do our environmental assessments, as we develop our recommendations and we're looking for feedback from key stakeholders and, quite frankly, as we look to align other parts of the cabinet to support our recommendations. So I'm not sure if that was your question, but there are all kinds of cross-functional, cross-department work that gets done here. That's what makes the job so challenging.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: And our recommendations,

I think, also reflected a request that these other

agencies work with us on specific things, so we can't

really tell them, this is what we would recommend to

you but we ask that they would consider partnering on

on certain things in our letters of recommendation.

So, if that helps --

MR. ANDERSON: I think there's one other challenge that we struggled with, is that there are so many stakeholders involved in manufacturing, starting with the Senate committees and the House committees and the Cabinet agencies and the White House, and so forth.

So one of the things that we tried to do along the way
was to make sure that we were aware of what some of
these others are doing and communicate and interact
with them.

I would encourage us to again try to talk
about a map of the players and then what interaction
should we have with them, if any, but most critically,

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Yes. That was a huge -

what are they working on that we could support or cover

gaps that they are not working on, or whatever.

MR. ANDERSON: Because there are just so many players in manufacturing, which is nice, but how can we align? The word you just used, how can we align ourselves?

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: So Roy, last one, okay?

Then I think we have to bring it --

MR. SWEATMAN: Since we're talking about the different departments, I'm surprised that the Department of Defense isn't included because I can't think of another part of the government that is more dependent and needs the innovation and a strong manufacturing community.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Well, I think, did I misunderstand in our discussion yesterday, but I think

we're looking to get a representative from DoD to participate with this Council.

MS. PILAT: I think as we further define the scope of work, we'll try to engage them in the appropriate ways, yes.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: That suggestion has been made by several.

MS. PILAT: Yes. Actually, Neal came from DoD, so we can make that his follow-up priority.

(Laughter)

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: And something that I learned in the process is that there are ex-officio members from other agencies and there is a certain requirement for what makes them a member of the Council, and then there's an invitation that goes out to the other agencies to participate.

So my understanding is that we will extend that invitation because we think it is important to include them in this conversation and certainly get their perspective, but we can't — they don't have to be here. But we can certainly ask. I think we made note of that, for sure. All right. Thank you all. The conversation was extremely good, and hopefully we'll continue over lunch. So this isn't a hard stop on the conversation, just that the meeting needs to —

1.3

2.4

## NEXT STEPS AND MEETING ADJOURNMENT

1.3

2.4

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: So sort of the next steps on the process so you understand. We're going to take the conversation that happened here and during May we will identify specifically the subcommittees and the membership of those subcommittees, and that information will be relayed to you in May.

In June, we will have the first calls with the subcommittees altogether, so you will have your chair and your vice chair who will be appointed. Mike and I are going to make ourselves available to participate with all of those subcommittees, the first call, one or the other or both of us, to assist you.

The thought is, during June you will start to determine the scope of your work. That's really going to be the challenge, so June is going to be a lot of hard work because you're going to have to come together, narrow the scope. There's going to have to be some agreement within your subcommittee about what it is you are willing and able to tackle.

Then our next meeting is scheduled for July 23rd. Jenna and Liz, is that correct? July 23rd is our next meeting.

MS. EMANUEL: Anyone in the room can -- unless

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

1 there's anything major going on that would take away a 2 large portion of this group, some conflict that you 3 guys can think of, July 23rd is the date we'll meet. 4 VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Okay. 5 MS. EMANUEL: In Washington. 6 VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Thank you. 7 Washington. And at that meeting, each of the 8 subcommittees will then articulate what they have come 9 up with for the scope of their work and there will be 10 some discussion, refinement, and then basically leaving the meeting with a general understanding of what each 11 12 subcommittee's plan will be. 1.3 The next meeting after July will be in 14 November, the second or third week in November. will, before July, make sure that you have that date. 15 16 It will be outside of Washington. So it is our hope to 17 be in different regions. We think that's really 18 helpful in making sure we have a broad perspective. 19 MR. FRIESEN: I was just going to vote for St. 20 Martin. VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Oh, I like that. 21 MR. FRIESEN: I don't know if that's on the 22 23 table.

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

So that's the process.

VICE CHAIR ISBISTER: Is it a U.S. territory?

2.4

25

Okay.

CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: Jenna, what's the procedure on lunch and what's next?

1.3

2.4

MS. PILAT: All right. So from here we're going to go to 3407. Anybody from Commerce in the room can take you there. It's one floor below, down the corridor. Down to the left here, down to the right in the first corridor and down one floor. So, left, right, down one floor. We will be happy to escort you there.

We can stay there until 1:30. We really want to continue the conversation over lunch, so please join us. For the Commerce team and the other guests that we have in the room, please feel free to join us. We just want to thank you all. I want to thank our Commerce and U.S. Government partners for being here.

To the Council members, this is not typically how our meetings are done. The point of these meetings is really to hear from you. However, we have so much focus and prioritization right now within the administration and the Federal agencies on manufacturing programs and policies, we wanted to show you the way that we coordinate, what we're working on, and what you can expect to hear from us and be asked from us throughout the course of your term.

So thank you for your patience on these

LISA DENNIS COURT REPORTING 410-729-0401

briefings. I hope that they were informative. Our team here was super-engaged and looks forward to working with you. They are committed to these issues. They spent several lifetimes, if you look at the room, collected here. So thank you.

1.3

2.4

I think we are moving towards recommendations. The ideal product that we want, the products of the Council, once they're adopted, become public documents and they are a very powerful tool for both you and for us when we are trying to make our point. So we ask that recommendations be specific, actionable, and measurable. So tell us, Mary, to your point, how it's working, how we know that it's a success, how we know it's falling short.

Beyond that, everyone at this table is a resource to you. When you're coming into DC and want to meet someone at a Federal agency. Please contact Liz or I to help you do that. As you get into your subcommittee work if there's a program or a policy you want to be briefed on, you can see it, we will bring our whole team to your help. If there's anything else we can do, just let us know.

So, just thank you very much. A sincere thank you to Nicole for her leadership with the Council.

She's not going very far, so she will still get --

1	thank you all.
2	CHAIRMAN LASZKIEWICZ: The meeting is
3	adjourned.
4	(Whereupon, at 12:36 p.m. the meeting was
5	adjourned.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## $\texttt{C} \ \texttt{E} \ \texttt{R} \ \texttt{T} \ \texttt{I} \ \texttt{F} \ \texttt{I} \ \texttt{C} \ \texttt{A} \ \texttt{T} \ \texttt{E}$

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings of a meeting of the Manufacturing Council, held on April 30, 2013, were transcribed as herein appears, and this is the original transcript thereof. LISA L. DENNIS, CVR Court Reporter