To expand communications between Washington and California, the California Institute provides periodic news bulletins regarding current activity on Capitol Hill and other information that directly impacts the state. Bulletins are published weekly during sessions of Congress, and occasionally during other periods.

**APPROPRIATIONS: HOUSE MOVES ON CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR FY11**

The House spent several days of the week of February 14, 2011 considering H.R. 1, the Continuing Resolution to fund the government through the end of FY11 on September 30, 2011. The measure was considered under an open rule and over 600 amendments had been proposed. Most, however, were withdrawn or tabled by points of order.

H.R. 1 would provide $60.9 billion less in funding than was appropriated in fiscal 2010 and about $100 billion less than the Administration proposed in its FY11 Budget last year, fulfilling the Majority’s pledge to cut $100 billion in funding.

The CR makes deep cuts in federal programs, sparing no corner of the government. Some of those cuts, using FY10 funding as the base, include (in millions):

- Agricultural Research Service  -185.1
- Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service  -75.0
- Agricultural Marketing Service  -9.4
- Food and Drug Administration  -241.0
- Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants & Children (WIC)  -747.2
- Economic Development Assistance Programs  -80.0
- NOAA Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery  -30.0
- State & Local Law Enforcement Assistance  -581.3
- Juvenile Justice  -191.1
- COPS Hiring (termination)  -298.0
- COPS programs  -203.1
- NASA  -303.0
- Office of Science & Technology Policy  -0.5
- Investigations, Corps of Engineers  -56.0
- Construction, Corps of Engineers  -441.0
- Water and Related Resources, Bureau of Reclamation  -37.7
- Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy  -786.3
- Science  -893.2
- ARPA-E (from FY11 Budget)  -250.0
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During floor consideration, some of the numerous amendments adopted by the House included:
- reduce funding for state and tribal assistance grants at the Environmental Protection Agency by $10 million; 228-203
- reduce funding for environmental programs and management at the Environmental Protection Agency by $8 million; 239-185
- increase funding for Federal Emergency Management Agency firefighter assistance grants by $510 million to $800 million, with $390 million of that going to SAFER grants. The increase is offset by cuts in Homeland Security’s science and technology R&D office; 318-113
- increase funding for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program by $298 million offset by an equal decrease in NASA funding; 228-203
- reduce by $10,000,000 EPA State and Tribal Assistance Grants; 228-203
- reduce EPA funding by $8,458,000; 239-185
- strike funding for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter alternative engine by $450 million; 233-198
- reduce funding for Interior’s Bureau of Land Management by $2 million and credit the savings to deficit reduction; approved by voice vote
- increase funding for FEMA Firefighter Assistance Grants by $510 million; 318-113
- increase funding for Community Oriented Policing Services by $298 million; 228-203
- increase funding for Commerce’s Economic Development Administration Programs by $80 million; 305-127
- reduce funding for Interior’s Bureau of Reclamation by $1,897,000; approved by voice vote
- bars the Federal Communications Commission from implementing its rule on Net Neutrality; 244-
As the Bulletin was published on Thursday, February 17th, the House was continuing to wade through numerous amendments to the CR. Further floor action on amendments and the Continuing Resolution will be reported in a future Bulletin.

For further information on the House floor activity, go to: http://clerk.house.gov.

TECHNOLOGY: HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEES ASSESS FCC’S NET NEUTRALITY RULE

The House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held a hearing on Wednesday, February 16, 2011 entitled “Network Neutrality and Internet Regulation: Warranted or More Economic Harm than Good?” The witnesses were the five Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission: Chairman Julius Genachowski; Commissioner Michael J. Copps; Commissioner Robert M. McDowell; Commissioner Mignon Clyburn; and Commissioner Meredith Attwell Baker.

In December 2010, the FCC, on a party-line vote, adopted a new regulation governing the policy titled "Network Neutrality." The regulation, among other things, requires Internet providers to allow content providers equal access to networks by prohibiting them from blocking or slowing Internet traffic and services.

The regulation has generated a lot of controversy, with some Members of Congress arguing that the FCC is overstepping its authority, while others support some regulation as necessary to preserve an open Internet.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit found in 2010 that the FCC had overreached in an earlier effort to regulate the Internet. In his opening remarks opposing the FCC regulation, Subcommittee Chairman Greg Walden said “it’s important to realize that the FCC’s underlying theory of authority would allow the commission to regulate any interstate communication service on barely more than a whim and without any additional input from Congress… Under the FCC’s rationale its authority is bounded only by its imagination.”

In her opening remarks, however, Rep. Anna Eshoo (Menlo Park), Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, cautioned: “While the FCC’s open Internet rules are not perfect, a view I’ve made very clear, they are an important step forward. Without some clear rules of the road, large corporations can carve up the Internet into fast and slow lanes, charging a toll for content, and blocking innovators from entering the information superhighway. I believe consumers, not corporations, should be in the driver’s seat to pick the content they view, listen and watch over the Internet.” Ranking Member of the full Committee Henry Waxman (Los Angeles) also supported the FCC regulations saying they represent “landmark action to preserve the open Internet. These rules are a bill of rights for Internet users.”

Commissioner Genachowski defended the FCC’s party-line vote to implement the regulation, saying the FCC “heard from many of the nation’s leading entrepreneurs and early-stage investors who build new companies that their willingness to deploy capital and start and grow businesses was at risk without high-level rules of the road to ensure the Internet would remain an open platform.” He also noted a letter submitted to the subcommittee and signed by dozens of technology investors, which says: “Permitting network operators to close network platforms or control the applications market by favoring certain kinds of content would endanger innovation and investment in an investment sector which represents many billions of dollars in economic activity.”

Commissioner McDowell attached his FCC dissenting opinion to his testimony opposing the regulation. He argued that the rule will allow certain companies to pressure the FCC to regulate their business rivals in order to gain competitive advantage. He laid out his four primary reasons for opposing the regulation: 1) that nothing is broken in the Internet access market that needs fixing; 2) The FCC does not have the legal authority to issue these rules; 3) The proposed rules are likely to cause irreparable harm; and
4) Existing law and Internet governance structures provide ample consumer protection in the event a systemic market failure occurs.

Resolutions to overturn the FCC’s rules have been introduced in both the House and the Senate. And during floor consideration of the Continuing Resolution, H.R. 1, the House adopted an amendment, 244-181 that bars the Federal Communications Commission from implementing its Net Neutrality rule.

For more information on the Subcommittee hearing, go to: http://energycommerce.house.gov

The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition and the Internet also held a hearing on the subject, entitled: “Ensuring Competition on the Internet: Net Neutrality and Antitrust.” The hearing was held on February 15, 2011. Witnesses were: Larry Downes, Senior Adjunct Fellow, TechFreedom; Brett Glass, Proprietor, LARIAT; and Gigi B. Sohn, President and Co-Founder, Public Knowledge. Information on this hearing can be found at: http://judiciary.house.gov.

**Health: Hearing Explores Effects Of Medical Device Regulation**

On Thursday, February 17, 2011, the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Impact of Medical Device Regulation on Jobs and Patients.” The hearing examined the state of the medical device industry and the impact of regulations on job creation and patient access.

Witnesses were: Jeffrey E. Shuren, M.D., J.D., Director, Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH), Food and Drug Administration (FDA); Josh Makower, M.D., Consulting Professor of Medicine, Stanford University, CEO, ExploraMed Development, LLC, Venture Partner, New Enterprise Associates; Mark Deem, Managing Partner and Chief Technology Partner, The Foundry; Ralph F. Hall, Distinguished Professor and Practitioner of Law, University of Minnesota Law School; Dr. Rita Redberg, Director, Women's Cardiovascular Services, University of California San Francisco Medical Center; and Dr. Steven E. Nissen, Professor of Medicine, Cleveland Clinic Lerner School of Medicine at Case Western Reserve University, Chairman, Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, Cleveland Clinic Foundation.

Dr. Shuren began with an overview of FDA’s regulatory authorities for medical devices. He defended the FDA’s record on approval of medical devices and disputed that FDA delays have denied American patients the best available devices or resulted in jobs being moved overseas. He also cautioned against suggestions that the American system of review and approval be replaced by the European Union system.

Dr. Makower, however, contended that the FDA has become the problem. “...I am deeply concerned that we are in jeopardy of losing the US leadership position in medical technology innovation as a result of the current regulatory environment at FDA. Over the past few years it has been increasingly more difficult, more time consuming, more costly and less predictable to navigate the FDA approval process. As a result, investment is drying up, companies are moving overseas or closing their doors and US patients are being denied timely access to safe and effective new medical products.

He and a colleague conducted a survey of over 200 medical technology companies to generate data on their specific experience with FDA. The study found that for low- and moderate-risk devices, the process to navigate the FDA took companies up to two years longer than it did for a similar approval from European regulators. For higher-risk devices, the discrepancy was greater -- in the U.S., it took three and a half years, or five times as long as Europe, to grant approval. Companies also reported that European regulatory authorities were more predictable and transparent than FDA, Makower stated. Almost half the companies reported that key FDA personnel responsible for reviewing their product changed during the course of the review, and one-third reported that appropriate staff were not present at meetings between the companies and FDA to discuss review issues.

Dr. Redberg, on the other hand, testified about her concerns that the FDA’s streamlined approval pathway - the 510(k) process - was being used by the FDA inappropriately to approve high risk devices, instead of the more stringent premarket approval mechanism, and this was creating risks for patients.
importantly, she testified, after device approval there is little or no post-marketing surveillance that would detect serious adverse events in a timely fashion. Dr. Redberg also raised concerns about the amount of off label use of medical devices, and the quality of premarket approval data, and the lack of “high quality clinical studies” before devices were approved.

For the testimony of all the witnesses, go to: http://energycommerce.house.gov

TRANSPORTATION: SENATE CONSIDERS INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING

On Wednesday, February 16, 2011, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee held a hearing entitled, "National Leaders' Call to Action on Transportation." The Committee examined the long-term reauthorization of highway, transit and highway safety programs. Witnesses included: Thomas Donahue, President, U.S. Chamber of Commerce; and Richard Trumka, President, AFL-CIO.

Following President Obama's State of the Union address on January 26, 2011, Mr. Trumka and Mr. Donohue issued a joint statement supporting the President's plan to create jobs and accelerate the economic recovery by investing in the nation's infrastructure. The construction industry lost 32,000 jobs in the past month, 130,000 jobs in the past year, and today there are nearly 1.9 million unemployed construction workers in the United States.

Donahue, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, testified in support of the SAFETEA-LU reauthorization to maintain, modernize, and expand critical surface transportation. Last year, the Chamber developed a way to measure transportation infrastructure performance nationwide and in each of the 50 states. This project, called the Transportation Performance Index (TPI) shows how well the U.S. transportation system is serving the needs of businesses and the overall U.S. economy.

From 1990 to 2008, the TPI increased about 6 percent overall, Donahue said. In contrast, U.S. population grew 22 percent, passenger travel grew 39 percent, and freight traffic grew 27 percent. In contrast, as the TPI projected out to 2015, it declined at a rate of nearly one point per year. "We will observe more traffic congestion, breakdowns of the inland waterway system and delays at airports. We will lose 0.3 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for every one point decline in the TPI, translating to $336 billion based on 2008 GDP," Donahue testified, "Without addressing the transportation problems in this country we will undermine economic growth." The consequences of an underperforming system are hundreds of billions of dollars annually in wasted fuel, lost productivity, avoidable public health costs, and delayed shipments of manufacturing inputs, consumer goods and other items critical to the underlying growth of our businesses.

From the analysis of its TPI findings, the Chamber believes that when formulating policies, programs and investment strategies, four items should be on top of the to-do list:
- Get transportation infrastructure to a state of good repair.
- Fix congestion today.
- Create capacity for the future by both optimizing of systems and building physical capacity.
- Target last mile infrastructure – in particular intermodal freight access-and bottlenecks.

Trumka, President of the AFL-CIO, testified in support of the Transportation Infrastructure Financing and Innovation Act (TIFIA) but also said the bill could do more. The TIFIA helps communities leverage their transportation resources by providing loans and loan guarantees. According to the Federal Highway Administration, every dollar made available through TIFIA can mobilize up to a total of $30 in transportation investments. He also advocated support for the Build America Bond program and other bonding mechanisms to provide for private sector investment in our nation's infrastructure in addition to direct federal support.

On Wednesday, February 23, 2011, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and the House Committee on Transportation and infrastructure will hold a joint Senate-House hearing in Los Angeles on transportation infrastructure needs and proposals. Senate Committee Chairman Boxer said Los Angeles has been a leader in figuring out a way to leverage funds. LA's 30/10 Initiative aims to use the
long-term revenue from the Measure R sales tax as collateral for long-term bonds and a federal loan which will allow Metro to build 12 key mass transit projects in 10 years, rather than 30. Measure R is a half-cent sales tax instituted in 2008 that aims to raise $40 billion over the next 30 years for public transportation in Los Angeles. Boxer testified, “The 30/10 Initiative will improve the local economy by creating hundreds of thousands of jobs, reduce carbon pollution emissions, and ease traffic congestion.”

For more information, go to: http://transportation.house.gov or http://epw.senate.gov/.

TRANSPORTATION: THE HOUSE EXAMINES LEGISLATION TO SPEED UP TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

The House Highways and Transit Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee held a hearing on Tuesday, February 15 titled "Accelerating the Project Delivery Process: Eliminating Bureaucratic Red Tape and Making Every Dollar Count." The Subcommittee received testimony related to improving the existing laws and regulations governing project delivery in order to accelerate the delivery process for surface transportation projects. Witnesses included: Victor M. Mendez, Administrator, Federal Highway Administration; Debra L. Miller, Secretary, Kansas Department of Transportation; Will Kempton, Orange County Transportation Authority; Peter Buffa, Orange County Transportation Authority; Tom Margro, Transportation Corridor Agencies; and Michael Replogle, Institute for Transportation and Development Policy.

This hearing is part of the Subcommittee's effort to reauthorize Federal transportation programs under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). According to the Highway Planning and Project Development Process, the Federal Project delivery process can take up to 15 years from planning through construction. An analysis conducted by the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Committee found that a $500 million project that took 14 years to complete would see its cost double due to the impact of delays and inflation. The Subcommittee discussed ways to speed up the project for process approval to more effectively utilize limited financial resources. Issues raised in the hearing include restrictions of early right-of-way procurement, inefficient utility coordination, demanding environmental review and permitting processes, limitations on innovative contracting and duplicative administrative tasks.

The State of California participated in the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program, which allows the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to delegate its responsibilities for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to the State. Through this delegation pilot program, California has been able to shave approximately 17 months off of the approval process for a standard transportation project. "While these improvements are a good start, we must do more," Subcommittee Chairman John Duncan stated, "There is no silver bullet for speeding up the delivery of transportation projects, but we simply must do better."

Tom Margro, CEO of Transportation Corridor Agencies in Irvine, California, discussed the challenge to secure federal approvals needed to build the 241 toll road in Orange County, a project that has been in the planning process since 1981. Margo put forward several recommendations to the Subcommittee to streamline the federal approval process. His recommendations to the federal government include:
- Allow projects in states with stringent environmental review laws such at California to meet federal review requirements through compliance with state laws.
- Require FHWA to develop a MOU with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding the reasonable range of alternatives for highway projects.
- Establish NEPA safe harbor rules for environmental documents that incorporate FHWA-approaches.
- Adopt tiering regulations to expedite environmental review by avoiding duplication of the analysis of regional and programmatic issues.
- Impose limitations on scope of Resource Agency review.
- Restrict the applicability of the Coastal Zone Management Act to projects that have a direct impact on resources within the coastal zone.

Victor Mendez shared strategies that the FHWA is employing under the Every Day Counts (EDC) initiative to maintain and improve project quality and delivery times. According to Mendez, Every Day Counts is an initiative that presents new technologies, new ideas and new ways of thinking to provide transportation community with a better, faster, and smarter way of doing business. Every Day Counts delivers "innovative contracting practices" including the expanding use of programmatic agreements, the use of use of in-lieu fee and mitigation banking and clarifying the NEPA criteria for the preliminary design phase of projects, Mendez testified.

For more information on the Every Day Counts initiative visit: www.fhwa.dot.gov/everydaycounts/.

In early 2010, the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) created the Breaking Down Barriers initiative, as they held discussions with top United States Department of Transportation officials and Congressional leaders regarding the opportunity to unlock the jobs tied up in the federal project delivery process to create jobs in Orange County. Will Kempton, CEO of OCTA, testified to the committee that bids on construction projects at OCTA, throughout California and around the nation are coming in between 25 and 40 percent below engineering estimates. In the past year alone, Kempton stated, OCTA has saved $138 million from construction bids below engineering estimates. He said these savings would be put to work to pay for other unfunded projects in the county.

The OCTA recommends that the federal government provide for universal pre-award spending to state and local entities; clarify the transportation improvement program amendment process; extend the NEPA delegation authority; remove redundant steps in the environmental review process; and provide for modular or scenario-based conformity determinations. The OCTA also recommends that federal and state project managers work together by entering into project delivery partnering plans, create liaison positions, and expand the use of the joint permitting process.

For more information: www.transportation.house.gov

**Technology: Senate Judiciary Examines Piracy Laws**

On Wednesday, February 16, 2011, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing titled "Targeting Websites Dedicated to Stealing American Intellectual Property." The Committee discussed online copyright infringement and the sale of counterfeit goods. Witnesses included: Tom Adams, Rosetta Stone Inc.; Scott Turow, Authors Guild; Christine Jones, The Go Daddy Group Inc.; Thomas Dailey, Verizon; and Denise Yee, Visa Inc. (San Francisco, CA).

In his opening statement, Chairman Pat Leahy (VT) said copyright piracy and the sale of counterfeit goods are reported to cost the American economy billions of dollars annually and hundreds of thousands of lost jobs. A January study found that nearly 24 percent of all Internet traffic worldwide is infringing. "We cannot excuse the behavior because it happens on the Internet and the owners operate overseas," He said, "The Internet needs to be free and open - not lawless." According to Senator Grassley (IA), one recent report estimated that counterfeiting and piracy have resulted in 2.5 million jobs lost in G20 economies, and that the global value of counterfeited and pirated goods exceeds $650 billion dollars.

The Combating Online Infringement and Counterfeiting Act (COICA) was first introduced in the 111th Congress on September 20, 2010. COICA targets websites dedicated to stealing American intellectual property. The bill empowers the Department of Justice to issue court orders to Internet service providers (ISPs), search engines, payment processors and online advertising networks who do not refrain from providing their services to rogue websites. The DOJ defines these "rogue" websites as those that promote either copyright infringement or the sale of counterfeit goods.
Denise Yee, who testified in support of the Combating Online Infringement and Counterfeiting Act (COICA) on behalf of Visa Inc, told the committee that Visa goes beyond any legal requirements to prevent the use of its payment system for illegal electronic commerce transactions. For example, Visa voluntarily searches the Internet for merchants selling or advertising child pornography or illegally distributing controlled substances and expels them from its system as soon as they are discovered. Visa works with the Secret Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Trade Commission, and State Attorneys General to assist their efforts to stop fraud, identity theft, and data breaches. And most recently, Visa has joined the Center for Safe Internet Pharmacies (CSIP) to combat illegal distribution and counterfeit pharmaceuticals online.

"We still have deep concerns about cross-border disputes, secondary liability, and the unintended consequences of Visa's efforts to help combat infringement." Yee testified to the Committee, "Foreign courts continue to decline to impose liability on foreign websites considered by U.S. rights-holders to facilitate infringement."

Dailey put forward recommendations on behalf of Verizon to prevent COICA from placing undue burdens on service providers. Dailey recommended the bill be clarified to ensure that service providers are required to take action only with respect to their U.S.-based DNS servers. Secondly, Dailey said the legislation should expressly forbid private rights of action and require that DNS restrictions are imposed only where they are the least burdensome form of remedy. Lastly, Verizon recommends, from an operational perspective, that COICA be modified to ensure that i) actions against nondomestic domain names are properly and narrowly tailored; ii) the list of restricted domain names is properly administered and service providers receive timely notification from the Department of Justice of domain names that no longer require restriction; and iii) appropriate limits are placed on the number of domain names that can be subject to restriction and that cost recovery be made available to service providers which request it.


**Technology: Senate debates SBIR/STTR Reauthorization**

The Senate Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee held a hearing entitled "Reauthorization of the SBIR and STTR Programs" on Thursday, February 17, 2011. The Committee examined the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs. Witnesses included: Jere Glover, Small Business Technology Council; Joe Hernandez, Biotechnology Industry Organization; Irwin Mark Jacobs Ph.D., Qualcomm; Matthew Silver Ph.D., Cambrian Innovation; Charles Wessner Ph.D., The National Academics.

The U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) Office of Technology administers the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) Program. Through these two competitive programs, SBA aims to ensure that the nation's small, high-tech, innovative businesses are a significant part of the federal government's research and development efforts. Eleven federal departments participate in the SBIR program; five departments participate in the STTR program awarding $2 billion to small high-tech businesses.

Glover testified in support of SBIR and STTR funding citing examples of the programs' ability to convert federal research and development (R&D) funding into new commercial products and therefore, into new jobs, and new high-technology exports. Glover told the Committee, "The SBIR and STTR programs can provide a very important stimulus to jump start the commercialization of the technologies of the companies awarded contracts."

Hernandez told the committee that SBIR and STTR awards have helped companies fund proof of concept studies which enabled them to attract the private-sector funding required to develop a new treatment or therapy that is ultimately made available to patients. Despite its past, he said, the ability of the SBIR program to provide critical funding for medical research projects will remain hampered unless SBIR
reauthorization modernizes the program to address the current realities facing small, innovative American biotechnology companies.

Another issue discussed was whether or not to allow majority venture capital (VC) owned firms into the program. Late last year, the Small Business Technology Council, the Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO), and others finally reached a compromise, brokered by the staff of the Senate Small Business Committee, which paved the way for last year's proposed legislation (S 4053). Among other things, the compromise allowed majority-VC owned businesses into the program, but limited their participation to ensure that small businesses not backed by large firms are not edged out of the program.

Since the exclusion of small majority venture-backed companies, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) documents a 40% decline in the number of applications between 2004 and 2008 and in 2009 the number of new small businesses participating in the program decreased to the lowest proportion in a decade. "Eligibility for small biotechnology companies that are a majority-owned by multiple venture capital companies should be reinstated." Hernandez said, "This will ensure that awards are provided to small, U.S. biotechnology companies that have the best science and greatest potential to provide treatments and therapies that will improve public health."

On January 26, 2011, the House and Senate passed H.R. 366 to temporarily extend SBIR and STTR programs through May 31, 2011.

For more information:  [http://sbc.senate.gov](http://sbc.senate.gov)

**Invitation: Lunch Briefing on STEM Education and Partnerships**

San Francisco State University is hosting a congressional lunch briefing on Thursday, March 3rd at Noon in the Capitol Visitors Center Room HVC-201.

"Increasing Diversity in STEM Education and Partnerships" will detail the work San Francisco State University is doing, together with the California State University system and K-12 educators, to address both of these challenges.

Participants at the lunch include: Dr. Robert Corrigan, President, San Francisco State University; Dr. Sue V. Rosser, Provost, SFSU; Dr. Eric Hsu, Associate Professor, Mathematics Department, Center for Science and Math Education (CSME), SFSU; and Dr. Carmen Domingo, Professor, Biology Department, SFSU.

To attend the lunch briefing, please RSVP to Natalia Bremer at nbremer@sfsu.edu.