Trade: Trade Agreements And TAA Bill Head To President

On October 12, 2011, the House and Senate passed comprehensive free trade agreements with Colombia (HR 3078), Panama (HR 3079), and South Korea (HR 3080). Concomitantly, the House also passed legislation, previously approved by the Senate, reauthorizing Trade Adjustment Assistance to provide workers displaced by foreign trade expansion with training in new skills and other assistance. The President is expected to sign all of the legislation shortly. The trade agreements were approved with wide bipartisan support. In the House, the Colombia vote was 262-167, Panama 300-129, and South Korea 278-151. In the Senate, the votes were: Colombia 66-33; Korea 83-15; and Panama 77-22.

Negotiations with the three countries were first completed under the Bush Administration but strong differences among the various interests in the United States held up congressional action. Major disagreements focused on concerns over jobs lost in the United States because of further globalization, and the labor and environmental protections contained in the agreements, especially Colombia’s history of violence against union organizers and workers. A separate labor action plan was negotiated with Colombia to ensure that it strengthens law enforcement and prosecution efforts in worker violence cases. Opponents of the agreement remained concerned, however, that it was not made an integral part of the trade agreement.

Proponents of the agreements stress the economic benefits to the United States. For California, South Korea was California’s fifth largest export market in 2010, with exports totaling more than $8.1 billion, up from $5.9 billion in 2009. In 2010, Colombia was California’s 34th largest export market with exports totaling $408.7 million – a 24-percent increase over the previous year. Panama was California’s 42nd largest export market in 2010, with exports totaling $252 million. According to the
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California Chambers of Commerce Council for International Trade, California manufacturers will also gain significant access to the $5.25 billion Panama Canal expansion project as the agreement eliminates the 5 percent duty on construction equipment and infrastructure machinery.

Senator Dianne Feinstein in remarks on the Senate floor in support of the Panama agreement noted that the project will ultimately reduce transportation costs for California exports.

The Administration has said the three trade agreements could result in about $13 billion dollars more in U.S. exports annually and create as many as 250,000 jobs. The agreements ensure market access, national treatment, and regulatory transparency in the signatory countries for U.S. goods and services, and will eliminate or substantially reduce tariffs and non-tariff trade barriers on U.S. exports in all sectors.

The American Farm Bureau Federation estimates that U.S. farm exports could increase by more than $690 million per year to Colombia, more than $195 million per year to Panama, and more than $1.8 billion per year to South Korea.

For more information on the agreements and their impact on the U.S. economy, go to:
http://waysandmeans.gov
or
http://waysandmeans.house.gov/waysandmeanstraderesources/
or

TRADE: SENATE APPROVES CHINA CURRENCY LEGISLATION

The Senate approved S. 1619, the Currency Exchange Rate Oversight Reform Act, on October 11, 2011, by a bipartisan vote of 63-35. The legislation is aimed at China’s currency practices. Most economists agree that the country manipulates its currency, the renminbi (RMB), to keep it artificially low. This makes Chinese exports less expensive and imports more expensive, thus harming American businesses. As the U.S. trade debt with China has grown, pressure has steadily increased to make China align its currency more fairly with other currencies of the world, especially the dollar.

Under S. 1619, if an evaluation of economic indicators show that a country is “misaligning” its currency to its advantage, the Treasury Department could move to impose economic sanctions against that country, including opening countervailing and antidumping investigations against imports.

There is a similar bill in the House, H.R. 639, which has 225 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. Speaker John Boehner (OH), however, has so far balked at bringing a China currency bill to the floor, because of concerns that it would start a trade war with China. The Obama Administration has also expressed concern with the legislation, but has not indicated it would veto a currency manipulation bill.

For more information, go to: http://finance.senate.gov

TAX: WAYS & MEANS APPROVES HERGER BILL ELIMINATING CONTRACTOR WITHHOLDING REQUIREMENT

The House Ways and Means Committee approved H.R. 674, sponsored by Rep. Wally Herger (Marysville) by voice vote on October 13, 2011. The bill would eliminate a tax law requiring the
withholding of three percent of payments made to contractors providing services to federal, state, and local governmental entities.

In his remarks at the markup, Rep. Herger said: “The 3% withholding tax stands in the way of jobs because it threatens to constrict the cash flow of thousands of small businesses that provide goods and services to federal, state, and local government agencies. Permanently repealing this tax is an important step toward giving these businesses the assurance that it’s safe to invest, grow, and hire more workers.

It’s important to emphasize that while H.R. 674 is scored as reducing revenue by $11 billion, it also eliminates the far greater cost of implementing this looming tax, a cost that’s been estimated at $17 billion for the Department of Defense alone. Repeal is fiscally responsible.”

The law was originally enacted in 2005 and was aimed at improving tax compliance by government contractors, but it was never enforced. As part of the 2009 stimulus bill, Congress deferred its implementation by one year and earlier this year the IRS, in a rulemaking, further delayed implementation until the start of 2013.

For more information, go to: http://waysandmeans.house.gov.


By a vote of 19 to 13, the House Homeland Security Committee approved H.R. 3116, the “Department of Homeland Security Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.” The bill reauthorizes the authorities, activities, and programs of the Department of Homeland Security, and reauthorizes several grant and assistance programs for state and local governments.

Among its many provisions, the bill authorizes the Securing the Cities Program to help prevent a nuclear or radiological attack in high-risk metropolitan areas, and reauthorizes first responder grant programs. The bill also directs DHS to provide assurances that it is expeditiously working to develop and implement measures and metrics for the evaluation of grant expenditures.

Regarding border security, among other provisions the bill requires the development of a strategy for gaining operational control of the border; requiring interdepartmental and interagency consultation of border security technology; and allowing for the Border Patrol to have regular access to Federal borderlands;

During its two day mark up of the bill, the Committee considered 122 amendments and held 77 votes. Amendments aimed at increasing authorization levels for Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grants and firefighter assistance grants, among others, were defeated.

The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee passed a DHS authorization bill (S. 1546) on Sept. 21, 2011.

For more information, go to: http://homeland.house.gov.

Education: Senate HELP Chairman Introduces NCLB Reauthorization

Senator Tom Harkin (IA), Chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee unveiled his proposal for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also known as No Child Left Behind, on October 11, 2011. The Committee expects to begin a four-day mark-up of the draft bill on October 18th, with many amendments expected to be offered.

The 860 page bill would significantly rewrite NCLB. One major change is that it would eliminate the law’s accountability system, which mandates that all students, without exception, be proficient in reading and math by 2014. This requirement has come under heavy criticism over the last several years, as it makes no differentiation among typical students, those with learning disabilities, or those from disadvantaged circumstances.

The bill would also legislate the Administration’s Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation competitive grant programs. Additionally, it would expand charter school initiatives and give states more
flexibility in how they use federal dollars. States would also be able to develop their own process for identifying struggling schools and those with significant achievement gaps.

A section-by-section analysis of the bill can be found at: http://help.senate.gov.

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT: HOUSE SUB COMMITTEE EXAMINES STREAMLINING EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**


**Witnesses included:** The Honorable W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Mr. Matthew A. Jadacki, Assistant Inspector General, Emergency Management Oversight, Department of Homeland Security; Mr. Dean Hunter, Deputy Director, Facilities, Security, and Contracting, U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Mr. Mike Dayton, Acting Secretary, California Emergency Management Agency; and Chief William R. Metcalf, Second Vice President, International Association of Fire Chiefs.

Mr. Dayton testified that the most significant problem facing streamlining emergency management in California is the overall decrease and inconsistency of federal funding, which is exacerbated by the inflexibility of the federal funds the state does receive. He suggested the following changes, among others:

- Allow federal grants to state and local governments to be used to sustain previous facility and personnel costs, including the state’s Fusion Centers;
- Increase, or at the very least sustain, federal grant funding to states, especially when FEMA receives increases to its Management and Administration accounts (which manage and administer grants);
- Expedite processing of pre-disaster and hazard mitigation grant projects (some going back to 2005), eliminate projects’ “unduly and burdensome bureaucratic hurdles,” and streamline the “environmental and judicial review processes of critical mitigation projects;”
- Align Assistance to Firefighters Grants (AFG) with state population and/or fire risk. This would be especially useful to regions with high incidences of urban wildland fires. Also, allow states to apply for funding to purchase the equipment necessary for the initial attack phase of firefighting;
- Fund catastrophic planning efforts through federal block grants, allowing more flexibility for states to focus on significantly at-risk areas (for example, earthquake risk in the Bay Area and Southern California).

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

**IMMIGRATION: HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE EXAMINES ICE PRIORITIES & ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

On October 12, 2011, the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement held a hearing entitled *U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement: Priorities and the Rule of Law.*

**Witnesses included:** Mr. John Morton, Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE); Mr. Chris Crane, President, National ICE Council; Mr. David B. Rivkin, Jr., Partner, Baker & Hostetler, LLP; Mr. Ray Tranchant, Director, Advanced Technology Center, Tidewater Community College; and Mr. Paul Virtue, Partner, Baker & McKenzie LLP.

Director Morton acknowledged that in recent months there has been much discussion about the immigration activities of the Administration, Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and ICE, which have “been alternatively described at times as either an unprecedented effort to deport record numbers of individuals arbitrarily, or as an administrative amnesty that ignores the Government’s responsibility to enforce immigration laws.” He went on to say that “both characterizations are inaccurate.”
Rather, Morton testified that in light of recent fiscal constraints the Administration has “worked to develop guidance to help focus ICE’s enforcement efforts on our highest priorities, including: aliens who pose dangers to national security or risks to public safety; recent illegal entrants; repeat violators of immigration law; and aliens who are fugitives from justice or otherwise obstruct immigration controls.” This does not mean that other illegal immigrants receive “a free pass” but that priorities must be made and the agency must utilize prosecutorial discretion on a case-by-case basis in order to fulfill the mission of ICE with limited resources.

In addition, Director Morton provided the committee with recent ICE detention and deportation and removal statistics, stating that in FY2010, ICE removed almost 200,000 illegal aliens, fifty-percent of whom had criminal convictions. Furthermore, the Safe Communities program, he said, is one of the “best tools to help focus our immigration enforcement resources” and should be deployed nationwide by the end of 2013.

Subcommittee Chairman Elton Gallegly (Simi Valley) questioned ICE’s prioritization of resources and prosecutorial discretion, stating “they are part of the administration’s ongoing efforts to grant amnesty to illegal immigrants.” In addition, Chairman Gallegly said that the Administration’s recent announcement “opened the door to the possible amnesty of 300,000 immigrants who are currently in the process of being deported. This is a clear abuse of discretion.” Full Committee Chairman Lamar Smith also commented, saying that the Administration’s actions, as enacted by ICE, constitute “backdoor amnesty without Congressional approval.”

For more information on the hearing, please visit: http://judiciary.house.gov/.

**EDUCATION: HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE EXAMINES STEM APPROACHES IN K-12 EDUCATION**

On October 12, 2011, the House Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Research and Science Education held a hearing entitled *What Makes for Successful K-12 STEM Education: A Closer Look at Effective STEM Education Approaches*.

Witnesses included: Dr. Adam Gamoran, Director, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin; Mr. Mark Heffron, Director, Denver School of Science and Technology: Stapleton High School; Dr. Suzanne Wilson, Chair, Department of Teacher Education, Division of Science and Math Education, Michigan State University; Dr. Elaine Allensworth, Senior Director and Chief Research Officer, Consortium on Chicago School Research, University of Chicago; and Dr. Barbara Means, Director, Center for Technology in Learning, SRI International.

Dr. Gamoran presented findings from the National Research Council (NRC) report *Successful K-12 STEM Education: Identifying Effective Approaches in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. The report committee was charged with “outlining criteria for identifying effective STEM schools and programs and identifying which of those criteria could be addressed with available data and research, and those where further work is needed to develop appropriate data sources.” He stated that a major finding was that “knowledge about successful K-12 STEM education is unevenly distributed across the STEM domains: research on mathematics education is more extensive than that on science education. . . there has simply been very little research about K-12 education in engineering and technology.” The report further examined types of STEM schools, including selective, inclusive and STEM-focused career and technical education, and their respective “success rates” at meeting the committee’s three goals.

Mr. Heffron testified that the success of the inclusive enrollment Denver School of Science and Technology Public Schools network relies on three principles: 1) the premise that all students deserve quality STEM instruction, not just the “smart kids,” 2) rigorous preparatory STEM education that prepares students for STEM in college, and 3) creation of a school culture that “focuses on building character and creating an accountable environment that expects all students to be college ready.”

Other topics discussed at the hearing included:
- Success of STEM in K-12 schools depends on high quality teachers. Those teachers need extensive initial training, continued professional development, and further support in their early years in the classroom. But the U.S. has no unified system on how to prepare teachers, how to structure that preparation, and how to differentiate between the initial preparation of teachers and professional support and development once they begin teaching.

- Only well-organized schools can make good use of STEM high-quality curriculum, respond to accountability standards, and retain good STEM teachers. Schools without the organizational or leadership capacity to respond to the policies react in counter-productive ways.

For more information, please visit: http://science.house.gov/.

**TRANSPORTATION: HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE EXAMINES NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE BANK**

On October 12, 2011, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Highways and Transit held a hearing entitled National Infrastructure Bank: More Bureaucracy and Red Tape.

Witnesses included: The Honorable Gary Ridley, Secretary, Oklahoma Department of Transportation; Mr. Gabriel Roth, Civil Engineer and Transport Economist, The Independent Institute; Mr. Scott Thomasson, Director of Public Policy, Progressive Policy Institute; Mr. Ron Utt, Senior Research Fellow, The Heritage Foundation; and Mr. Geoffrey Yarema, Partner, Nossaman LLP.

The hearing began with testimony by Mr. Ridley, who emphasized that there is a need for “new and effective transportation revenue streams” but no need for “new ideas about how to go into debt.” Programs such as “GARVEE, Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA), Public/Private Partnerships, state infrastructure banks and other such financing methodologies” have worked in the past, and the U.S. “should focus on enhancing the effectiveness of these existing programs” rather than add the proposed National Infrastructure Bank (NIB) which would “organize, support and provide states with insight into innovative financing options” but “is ill conceived.” Mr. Yarema also testified that a new bank is unnecessary because “as far as transportation projects are concerned, we already have a national infrastructure bank - it’s called TIFIA” and that TIFIA should be improved upon instead of creating a new national bank “when federal funding is in scarce supply.”

Mr. Thomasson, however, testified in support of the proposed NIB, saying that the idea of infrastructure banks to facilitate private capital investment in infrastructure has been widely implemented in other developed countries and has a good record of success. He also testified that U.S. states, including Virginia, have implemented infrastructure banks and that both domestically and abroad they are considered a “proven approach to lowering financing costs and attracting private capital investment for badly needed new projects.” Furthermore, the idea is supported by “top corporate CEOs, Wall Street investors, organized labor, and local government leaders.” Additionally, Mr. Thomasson stated that given the Committee’s expressed interest in “dramatically expanding the TIFIA program and opportunities for state infrastructure banks,” a national infrastructure bank may be the next step in implementing the Committee’s goals, as changes to TIFIA and other programs only go so far.

For more information, visit: http://transportation.house.gov/.

**ENVIRONMENT: HOUSE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE HOLDS HEARING ON THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT**

The House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing on October 13, 2011 titled The Endangered Species Act: Reviewing the Nexus of Science and Policy.

Witnesses included: Mr. Jonathan Adler, Professor, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; Mr. Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Endangered Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Craig Manson, General Counsel, Westlands Water District, CA; Mr. Douglas Vincent-Lang, Special Assistant,
Subcommittee Chairman Paul Broun (GA) in his opening remarks said that "in terms of effectiveness, I believe it would be hard to argue that the [Endangered Species Act] has been anything but an abject failure." He stated that the purpose of the hearing was to "explore how the science is used to inform policy decisions under ESA" and that "the written testimonies provided by our witnesses highlight major flaws in the basic construct and implementation of the Act." The Chairman also pointed out that "recent events at the Department of Interior have also attracted the Subcommittee's attention. . . On September 16, 2011 U.S. District Court Judge Oliver Wanger of California sharply criticized the work and testimony concerning the Delta Smelt Biological Opinion by two federal scientists, one from the Fish and Wildlife Service and one from the Bureau of Reclamation."

Mr. Frazer testified that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service places great emphasis on "the importance of having a science-driven, transparent decision-making process in which the affected public can participate effectively," and said that the Service does solicit public review and comment as well as independent scientific peer reviews on its scientific findings and proposed listings of species. He then detailed the process by which species are listed or re-categorized on the endangered species list. However, Mr. Frazer also noted that the Service has to rely on "best scientific and commercial data available" at the time in question and may not have all of the information it would ideally want. Nevertheless, Mr. Frazer testified that the Service's success can be marked not only by the number of species taken off the endangered species list, but more importantly by "the fact that relatively few observed extinctions have occurred in the United States during the last four decades" since the ESA was established. He also stated that he believes that the Service's "scientists and managers continue to do an exceptional job, under increasingly difficult circumstances, of using the best available scientific information to make decisions that comply with the law, can withstand challenge and thus can be trusted by the public."

Mr. Manson of Westlands testified that one of the principal problems with the ESA, and one of the main reasons for recent criticism is that "some scientists, lawyers, and policymakers misunderstand the relationship between science and policy in ESA decision-making." This stems, at least in part, from the following wording of the rule: "The Secretary shall make determinations required by subsection (a)(1) of this section solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available . . . ."

Mr. Manson stated that "the use of the term 'solely' has led to the belief that there is no room for anything but a scientific basis for listing decisions. There is, under this belief, no space to be given over to policy decisions. Indeed, perhaps this interpretation of this part of the statute is correct. But this interpretation has over time been exaggerated into two other 'beliefs' that are demonstrably incorrect. The first fallacy is that all listing decisions are purely the purview of field scientists, the closer to the bottom of the organization, the better. The second fallacy is that all decisions having to do with the ESA," including regulation, "are safeguarded against so-called 'political interference'."

To address this misunderstanding, Mr. Manson suggests a "return to the notion that science can tell us what is, while policy determines what ought to be done. To do that, the listing decisions should be de-coupled from the automatic, discretion-less application of regulation. That would require Congressional action. Additionally, the quality of science would be vastly improved and court litigation sharply reduced if the Secretary was required to make listing determinations by formal-rule making under the Administrative Procedure Act."

For more information, please visit: http://science.house.gov/ .
ENERGY/ENVIRONMENT: SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE EXAMINES INTERSECTION OF GREEN INNOVATION, POLLUTION REDUCTION, AND JOBS

The Senate Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Green Jobs and the New Economy held a hearing on October 13, 2011 titled Innovative Practices to Create Jobs and Reduce Pollution.

Witnesses included: Mr. Phil Schoen, CEO, GEO-Enterprises; Mr. Kyle W. Kempf, Senior Director, Government Affairs, National Small Business Association; Mr. Edward White, Jr., Vice President of Energy Products, National Grid; Dr. Anne Smith, Senior Vice President, NERA Economic Consulting; and Mr. Steve Rowlan, General Manager, Environment, Nucor Corporation.

Mr. White testified on behalf of one the "largest utilities in the United States, as measured by total customers" and detailed how investing in energy efficiency could help with the current challenges the U.S. faces in job creation, energy security, and clean power. Furthermore, he said that energy efficiency measures are the cheapest way to meet demand, and can provide one kilowatt-hour of energy savings for 3-5 cents. When compared to the average cost of electricity in the U.S. today (6.5-16.5 cents per kilowatt-hour), that cost savings would translate into a $3-4 savings for each dollar invested in such technology.

To implement energy efficiency programs, Mr. White focused on the success of "customer payment plans that allow our customers to make energy efficiency improvements and pay for them in installments on their electric bill" (also called "On-Bill" repayment or investment). This has allowed many customers, including hotels, schools, and private citizens, the ability to immediately save money on energy bills without the need to have capital up-front to fund the project. The On-Bill program has also allowed the integration of private and public capital, and funded larger energy efficiency projects. And, according to Mr. White, "every new project means additional jobs, additional reductions in energy use, and fewer emissions."

Other topics addressed at the hearing included:
- The geothermal power sector could highly benefit from On-Bill financing. Geothermal heat pumps provide hot water at 40-70 percent below the cost of conventional heating, operate at 400 percent efficiency, and use 25-50 percent less electricity than conventional sources.
- Environmental mandates may increase employment in pollution control and clean technology sectors. But Dr. Smith noted that these results ignore the jobs lost in the rest of the economy due to other impacts of the regulations, including increased electricity and other energy prices.
- The impact of small increases in the cost per kilowatt-hour of electricity for large consumers, especially to those who already invest in energy efficiency projects.

For more information: http://epw.senate.gov/.

APPROPRIATIONS: INSTITUTE REPORT ON FY12 SENATE LABOR/HHS/ED APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE ON WEBSITE


REPORT: CIS RELEASES MEMORANDUM ON TRENDS IN IMMIGRATION


According to the memo, “new data from the Census Bureau show that the nation’s immigrant population (legal and illegal), also referred to as the foreign-born, reached 40 million in 2010, the highest number in American history. Nearly 14 million new immigrants (legal and illegal) settled in the country from 2000 to 2010, making it the highest decade of immigration in American history.”
Additionally, the memo states that immigration increased despite a net decline of jobs during the
decade, indicating that immigration is not only tied to labor-market conditions. Compared to the decade from
2000-2010, “1990 to 2000 job growth was 22 million and 13.2 million new immigrants arrived.” The memo
emphasizes that jobs are not the only driving factor; “such factors as the desire to be with relatives or to
enjoy the political freedoms and lower levels of official corruption play a significant role in the decision to
come to the United States.” Also, “the generosity of America’s public benefits and the quality of public
services can also make this country an attractive place to settle.” In a recession, “these things do not
change... Moreover, the employment and wages available in the United States may still be much better than
in many of the primary immigrant-sending countries, even during a severe economic downturn or a
prolonged period of weak job growth such as the past decade.”

The memo also shows “that the immigrant population continues to grow outside of traditional areas
of immigrant settlement” and that there were “13 states where the immigrant population grew by more than
twice the national average of 28 percent.” Latin American countries continue to “dominate the flow of
immigrants into the United States,” with Latin American immigration making up “58 percent of the growth
in the foreign-born population between 2000 and 2010,” the report states.

Other key findings include:
- The nation’s immigrant population has doubled since 1990, nearly tripled since 1980, and
  quadrupled since 1970, when it stood at 9.7 million.
- New arrivals are offset by out-migration and deaths. As a result, the net increase in the immigrant
  population was more than 8.8 million over the last decade, from 31.1 million in 2000.
- While the number of immigrants in the country is higher than at any time in American history, the
  immigrant share of the population (12.9 percent) was higher 90 years ago.
- Growth in the immigrant population has primarily been driven by high levels of legal immigration.
  Roughly three-fourths of immigrants in the country are here legally.
- Immigrants continue to head to non-traditional states of settlement. The six states with the largest
  immigrant populations accounted for 65 percent of the total in 2010, 68 percent in 2000, and 73 percent in
  1990.
- States with the largest numerical increases over the last decade were: California, Texas, Florida,
  New York, New Jersey, Georgia, Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, Washington, Illinois, Pennsylvania,
  and Massachusetts.
- With nearly 12 million immigrants, Mexico was by far the top immigrant-sending country,
  accounting for 29 percent of all immigrants and 29 percent of growth in the immigrant population from 2000
  to 2010.

For more information, please visit: http://www.cis.org.

EVENT: UCSF CHANCELLOR KEYNOTES GOLDEN STATE ROUNDTABLE BREAKFAST

On October 13, 2011, the California State Society’s Golden State Roundtable hosted a breakfast with
the University of California, San Francisco Chancellor Susan Desmond-Hellmann, MD, MPH, addressing
the attendees on The Future of Medicine: Connecting Patients to Promising Research.

Rep. Jackie Speier (Hillsborough), who spoke of her dedication to the San Francisco Bay Area and
noted that she has represented UCSF in the California state legislature and in Congress for more than twenty
years. Rep. Speier introduced Chancellor Desmond-Hellman, who presented a power point on current UCSF
activities, including the University's focus on innovation and translational medicine. She also highlighted a
recent economic impact report, which found that UCSF generates about 40,000 San Francisco Bay Area jobs
and contributes about $6.2 billion per year in economic output in the region.

In answer to an audience question, Chancellor Desmond-Hellmann stated that the University needs
"two main things from Washington:" sustained or increased funding levels for both graduate medical
education and the National Institutes of Health. Without such funding, UCSF will not be able to fund its research and will graduate professional and graduate students with large debt burdens, limiting their freedom to pursue public-service careers after graduation.

For more information, please visit the Chancellor's webpage at http://ucsfchancellor.ucsf.edu/ or the main UCSF webpage at http://www.ucsf.edu/.