

## Current Topics

---

### Assembly and Trafficking of Heterotrimeric G Proteins<sup>†</sup>

Yannick Marrari, Marykate Crouthamel, Roshanak Irannejad, and Philip B. Wedegaertner\*

*Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107*

*Received February 16, 2007; Revised Manuscript Received May 2, 2007*

**ABSTRACT:** To be activated by cell surface G protein-coupled receptors, heterotrimeric G proteins must localize at the cytoplasmic surface of plasma membranes. Moreover, some G protein subunits are able to traffic reversibly from the plasma membrane to intracellular locations upon activation. This current topic will highlight new insights into how nascent G protein subunits are assembled and how they arrive at plasma membranes. In addition, recent reports have increased our knowledge of activation-induced trafficking of G proteins. Understanding G protein assembly and trafficking will lead to a greater understanding of novel ways that cells regulate G protein signaling.

Heterotrimeric G proteins, composed of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  subunits, function to transduce signals from agonist-bound heptahelical G protein-coupled receptors (GPCR) to intracellular effector proteins. G protein signaling pathways mediate a vast number of physiological responses, and dysregulation of these pathways contributes to many diseases, including cancer, heart disease, hypertension, endocrine disorders, and blindness (1–5). Extracellular ligands that bind to and activate GPCRs to initiate G protein signaling pathways include small molecule neurotransmitters, peptide hormones, chemokines, lipids, and environmental stimuli, such as light, odorants, and tastes. Because of such ubiquitous importance, GPCRs are major targets for pharmaceutical therapeutics.

For G proteins, the accepted mechanism of action is visualized as a continuous cycle of activation and inactivation

of the G protein  $\alpha$  subunit ( $G\alpha$ ). Agonist binding to a GPCR at the extracellular cell surface induces a conformational change in the GPCR that allows it to directly promote GDP release from the inactive  $G\alpha$ , which is in the heterotrimeric ( $\alpha\beta\gamma$ ) complex. Next, GTP binds to  $G\alpha$ , and  $G\alpha$  and the  $\beta\gamma$  dimer ( $G\beta\gamma$ ) dissociate, giving rise to signaling-competent GTP-bound  $G\alpha$  and free  $G\beta\gamma$ . With the exception of the  $\beta_5$  subunit (6),  $\beta$  subunits ( $G\beta$ ) and  $\gamma$  subunits ( $G\gamma$ ) appear to irreversibly associate and exist as  $\beta\gamma$  dimers, whether as free  $G\beta\gamma$  or  $G\beta\gamma$  bound to  $G\alpha$ . To complete the G protein cycle,  $G\alpha$  hydrolyzes its bound GTP and then GDP-bound  $G\alpha$  reassociates with  $G\beta\gamma$  (1).

To be activated by a cell-surface GPCR, G proteins must be located at the intracellular surface of the cell's plasma membrane (PM). As peripheral membrane-associated proteins, G proteins thus require mechanisms that allow tight membrane binding. G proteins undergo covalent modification by several different lipids, myristoylation and/or palmitoylation for  $G\alpha$ , and isoprenylation for  $G\gamma$  (Table 1), and these attached lipids play an essential role in serving as hydrophobic anchors to localize the G protein subunits to membranes (7). However, the cellular pathways by which G protein subunits are assembled and reach the PM after their synthesis are not well understood. Moreover, it has

---

<sup>†</sup> Research in the authors' laboratory was supported by NIH grants GM56444 and GM62884, and an Established Investigator Award from the American Heart Association.

\* To whom correspondence should be addressed. Philip B. Wedegaertner, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Thomas Jefferson University, 233 S. 10th St., 839 BLSB, Philadelphia, PA 19107. Tel: 215-503-3137. Fax: 215-923-2117. E-mail: P\_Wedegaertner@mail.jci.tju.edu.

Table 1: Sites of G Protein Lipid Modifications<sup>a</sup>

Gα subunits	N-termini of α subunits	lipid modification
α <sub>i1</sub>	<b>MG</b> CTLSAEDKAAVERSKMID-	myristoylation, palmitoylation
α <sub>o1</sub>	<b>MG</b> CTLSAEERAALERSKAIE-	myristoylation, palmitoylation
α <sub>z</sub>	<b>MG</b> CRQSSEEKEAARRSRRID-	myristoylation, palmitoylation
α <sub>t</sub>	<b>MG</b> AGASAEKHSREL-	myristoylation
α <sub>s</sub>	<b>MG</b> CLGNSKTEDQRNEEDAQR-	palmitoylation
α <sub>q</sub>	<b>MT</b> LESIMACCLSEEAKEARR-	palmitoylation
α <sub>i4</sub>	<b>MAG</b> CCCLSAEEKESQRISAE-	palmitoylation
α <sub>i6</sub>	<b>MARS</b> LRWRCCPWCLTEDEKA-	palmitoylation
α <sub>i2</sub>	<b>MSG</b> VVRTLSRCLLPAAEAGAR-	palmitoylation
α <sub>i3</sub>	<b>MAD</b> FLPSRSVLSVCFPGCVL-	palmitoylation
Gγ subunits	C-termini of γ subunits	lipid modification
γ <sub>1</sub>	-KGIPEDKNPFKELKGGC↓VIS	farnesylation
γ <sub>2</sub>	-TPVPASENPFREKKFFC↓AIL	geranylgeranylation

<sup>a</sup>The N-terminal sequences of several Gα and the C-terminal sequences of two Gγ are shown. Myristate links through an amide bond to an N-terminal glycine after the removal of the initiating methionine as indicated by *G*. Palmitate attaches via a thioester bond to cysteine (in bold and italics) residues in the N-terminus of Gα. γ<sub>1</sub> and γ<sub>2</sub> are isoprenylated through a thioether bond to a cysteine, indicated by *C*. After isoprenylation, the C-terminal three amino acids are removed (↓), and the new C-terminus is carboxyl methylated. This is a representative listing of G protein subunits. In humans, 16 genes encode Gα (plus additional splice variants), 5 genes encode Gβ (Gβ proteins are not known to be lipid-modified), and 12 genes encode Gγ.

become increasingly clear that G protein localization is dynamic, and activation can promote a reversible redistribution of Gα and Gβγ to discrete membrane subdomains or different regions of the cell. This current topic will focus on recent work that provides new insight into the cell biology of G proteins, including chaperone proteins that facilitate folding of nascent Gβ and assembly of Gβγ, mechanisms and pathways involved in the targeting of nascent Gα and Gβγ to the PM, and activation-induced trafficking of G proteins.

### SYNTHESIS OF β AND γ, DIMER FORMATION, AND ISOPRENYLATION

Although Gβ and Gγ subunits interact to form the irreversible Gβγ dimer rapidly after synthesis (beginning within 2.5 min) in cultured cells (8), new evidence has demonstrated that this critical process of βγ dimer formation is regulated by proteins that act as chaperones for Gβ. The chaperone protein CCT (chaperonin containing tailless complex polypeptide 1) is involved in the proper folding of proteins having the seven-bladed β-propeller structure such as that occurring in Gβ, and using in vitro transcription/translation systems, it has been shown recently that the CCT complex binds newly synthesized Gβ (9, 10). The CCT complex is necessary to prevent the formation of Gβ aggregates (9). Moreover, Gγ does not bind to the CCT complex (10), suggesting that CCT is specifically involved in the folding of Gβ.

Another protein involved in the folding of Gβ is the phosducin-like protein (PhLP1), and it appears that PhLP1 functions in concert with the CCT complex (Figure 1). Previous work suggested that PhLP1 functions to inhibit G protein signaling by binding free Gβγ; however, it is now

clear that a major role of PhLP1 is to facilitate the formation of Gβγ by promoting the folding of Gβ. In *Dictyostelium discoideum* cells deficient in the phosducin-like protein PhLP1 or in HeLa and HEK 293 cells depleted of PhLP proteins by siRNA, the level of the Gβ subunit was strongly reduced, and G protein signaling was impaired (11, 12). Conversely, overexpression of wild-type (wt) PhLP1 increased the quantity of Gβ subunits in cultured cells (12). Nascent Gβ, but not Gγ, was shown to interact with PhLP1 by co-immunoprecipitation (12). Previous studies had demonstrated that PhLP1 binds to CCT and regulates the ability of CCT to catalyze the folding of newly synthesized proteins (13, 14), and indeed, PhLP1 could be immunoprecipitated in a ternary complex containing CCT and Gβ subunits. Taken together, the above studies suggest that PhLP1 functions as a co-chaperone to facilitate the CCT-mediated folding of Gβ.

An analysis of the role of phosphorylation of PhLP1 in Gβγ assembly has provided some mechanistic insight (15). Mutation of N-terminal casein kinase 2 (CK2) phosphorylation sites in PhLP1 prevented PhLP1 from promoting the expression of Gβγ in cells (12, 16); however, expression of the mutant PhLP1 strongly increased the binding of nascent Gβ to CCT (15). Using a pulse-chase analysis, it was observed that the expression of wt PhLP1, but not CK2 phosphorylation deficient PhLP1, stimulated the release of nascent Gβ from CCT. Lukov et al. have presented the most complete model to date for the assembly of Gβγ (15). The key steps in the model are as follows: (1) Newly synthesized Gβ cannot fold properly on its own and thus binds the chaperone CCT. (2) PhLP1 binds, forming a ternary complex. (3) Phosphorylation of PhLP1, likely by CK2, releases a PhLP1-Gβ complex in which the Gβ subunit is now properly folded into its seven-bladed propeller structure. (4) The Gγ subunit then binds to form PhLP1-Gβγ. How and when Gβγ is dissociated from PhLP1 is unclear. It is possible that Gβγ binding to a membrane surface, likely the ER, and/or binding to Gα promotes PhLP1 release because the PhLP1 binding site on Gβγ overlaps with both a basic membrane-association region and the Gα-binding surface (15, 17). Although aspects of this model need to be confirmed and refined, these novel demonstrations that Gβγ formation is a regulated process (9–12, 15, 16) add a new layer of complexity to understanding the regulation of G protein signaling. Particularly intriguing is the speculation that cells may regulate the phosphorylation of PhLP1 to control levels of G protein Gβγ subunits under varying circumstances.

Another key question is to understand where in the cell newly synthesized Gβ, likely as a PhLP1-Gβ complex, interacts with Gγ and whether Gβγ dimer formation precedes or follows isoprenylation of Gγ. Previous work with purified subunits showed that Gβ could bind to either isoprenylated or non-processed Gγ, although there was a preference for non-processed Gγ (18). In addition, pulse-chase studies in cultured cells are consistent with Gβγ formation in the cytoplasm, that is, before attachment of the hydrophobic isoprenyl group (8). Consistent with this, when PhLP1 is depleted in *Dictyostelium discoideum*, Gγ is not isoprenylated, as measured indirectly by a detergent partitioning assay, suggesting that Gγ isoprenylation is dependent on PhLP1-mediated Gβγ formation (11). Moreover, Gγ protein levels are decreased when Gβ protein levels are reduced by depletion of TCP-1 (tailless complex polypeptide-1), one of




FIGURE 1: Model of G protein assembly and trafficking to the plasma membrane. Recent studies have suggested a model for the plasma membrane targeting of nascent G protein subunits. The following key steps are indicated in the figure and further discussed in the text: (1) the CCT chaperone complex binds to nascent Gβ and promotes proper folding. (2) PhLP1 binds to form a ternary complex, and then PhLP1 phosphorylation stimulates the release of PhLP1-Gβ. (3) Nascent Gγ then binds to form PhLP1-Gβγ. It is not clear when and where PhLP1 and Gβγ dissociate. In addition, proteins such as DRiP78 may facilitate the folding of Gγ. (4) Gγ is farnesylated or geranylgeranylated by a cytoplasmic farnesyl transferase or geranylgeranyl transferase (FT/GGT), and then Gβγ is targeted to the cytoplasmic surface of the ER. (5) An ER-localized protease (Rce or ras-converting enzyme) specifically cleaves the C-terminal three amino acids (i.e., the -aaX of the CaaX motif) from isoprenylated Gγ. (6) The new isoprenylcysteine carboxyl terminus of Gγ is methylated by a specific ER-localized carboxyl methyl transferase (Icmt). (7) Similar to Gβ, chaperone proteins may exist to promote proper folding and membrane targeting of Gα. Ric-8 or similar proteins have been speculated to play such a role for Gα; however, this remains to be defined. (8) Unanswered questions include exactly where in the cell Gα and Gβγ interact to form the heterotrimer and where Gα is palmitoylated. Specific palmitoyl acyl transferases (PATs) have not been clearly defined for Gα, although many PATs are localized at Golgi or ER membranes. On the basis of several studies (see text), we speculate that the ER is a site of heterotrimer formation and Gα palmitoylation. (9) Finally, in this model the newly formed heterotrimer moves from an intracellular location to the PM. The details of this process are mostly unknown. Some evidence supports a Golgi-independent pathway, but a role for the Golgi cannot be ruled out.

the CCT subunits, or by expression of dominant negative phosphorylation-deficient PhLP1 (15, 16). These results indicate that the formation of the Gβγ dimer stabilizes the Gγ protein. Thus, most studies support a model in which nascent Gβγ is assembled in the cytoplasm, and subsequently, the Gγ subunit of the Gβγ dimer is isoprenylated.

Does Gγ, like Gβ, also require auxiliary proteins for its proper folding and stability? Because Gγ is a small protein (~70 amino acids) consisting mostly of two helices, it may not require as much help as Gβ to attain its proper structure. However, a recent report provided the first evidence that a chaperone protein exists for Gγ (19). It was found that an ER-resident protein termed DRiP78 interacts with Gγ, and Gβ can compete with DRiP78 for binding to Gγ. Furthermore, siRNA-mediated knockdown of DRiP78 resulted in reduced protein levels of overexpressed γ<sub>2</sub> or γ<sub>3</sub> in HEK 293 cells. Intriguingly, DRiP78 also interacted with PhLP, as analyzed by BRET studies with overexpressed proteins, suggesting the possibility that DRiP78 and PhLP could coordinate in the formation of Gβγ dimers. It will be important in future studies to look more closely at the role of DRiP78 or similar proteins in the stability of endogenous Gγ. In addition, the ER location of DRiP78 suggests that Gβγ assembly could take place at the ER rather than in the cytoplasm.

Processing of Gγ involves not only lipid modification but also subsequent modification of the isoprenylated C-terminus. Gγ subunits are members of a specific set of proteins in eukaryotic cells that contain covalently attached C-terminal isoprenyl groups (15-carbon farnesyl or 20-carbon geranylgeranyl). The protein isoprenyl transferases, which attach isoprenyl groups to proteins, have been well characterized (20). A carboxyl-terminal CaaX motif (where C = cysteine, a = aliphatic amino acid, and X = any amino acid) is a feature common to Gγ subunits and other known isoprenylated proteins such as Ras (21, 22). The X residue specifies which isoprenyl group will be linked to the cysteine via a thioether bond. Among 12 human Gγ, γ<sub>1</sub>, γ<sub>9</sub>, and γ<sub>11</sub> have serine in the X position and are farnesylated, and the rest of them have leucine and are modified with a geranylgeranyl group (Table 1). This process occurs in the cytoplasm, as has been shown for other isoprenylated proteins such as Ras (23). Isoprenylated proteins are then targeted to the cytoplasmic surface of the ER, through an unknown mechanism, for further processing (Figure 1). Mutation studies have shown that isoprenyl modification at the C-terminal CaaX motif is a prerequisite for ER targeting (22, 24–26). At the ER the -aaX is cleaved by a protease called Ras converting enzyme-1 (RCE-1) (27, 28). Upon removal of the C-terminal three amino acids (i.e., -aaX), the C-terminal isoprenylated



cysteine is methylated by the isoprenyl cysteine carboxyl methyl transferase (Icmt)(28, 29). Although the isoprenyl group provides a hydrophobic membrane anchor, the physiological role for  $\alpha$ -X proteolysis and carboxyl methylation is not clear. However, for proteins that are modified by the less hydrophobic farnesyl rather than geranylgeranyl, carboxyl methylation appears to provide an added hydrophobicity that is important for efficient membrane binding. Consistent with this, farnesylated G $\gamma$  failed to localize to membranes when overexpressed in cells lacking Icmt, while geranylgeranylated G $\gamma$  were not affected in their ability to localize to endomembranes (24).

## SYNTHESIS OF $\alpha$ SUBUNITS AND LIPID MODIFICATION

In contrast to the strong evidence implicating CCT and PhLP1 in folding and assembly of G $\beta\gamma$ , less is known regarding potential chaperones for G $\alpha$  subunits. Pulse-chase experiments in cells indicate that newly synthesized G $\alpha$  are produced on free ribosomes in the cytoplasm (8, 30), but whether additional proteins promote folding and/or eventual interaction with G $\beta\gamma$  is not clear. However, such a role has been speculated recently for a protein called Ric-8, which has been demonstrated to function as a non-GPCR guanine-nucleotide exchange factor (GEF) for certain G $\alpha$  (31). Recently, it has become clear that G proteins are involved in regulating asymmetric cell division, and three parallel studies showed that loss-of-function Ric-8 mutants in *Drosophila* caused defects in gastrulation, neuroblast differentiation, spindle orientation, and asymmetric division (32–34). The surprising finding from these studies was that  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\alpha_o$ , and G $\beta$  were mislocalized in the Ric-8 mutant; instead of localizing to plasma membranes as in wild-type *Drosophila* cells,  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\alpha_o$ , and G $\beta$  were found in the cytoplasm. A diminution of the amount of  $\alpha_i$  as well as the *Drosophila* G $\beta$ ,  $\beta$ 13F, was also detected by western blot and immunofluorescence in Ric-8 mutants compared to those in wild-type cells. Moreover,  $\beta$ 13F did not interact with  $\alpha_i$  in Ric-8 mutant cells. These results argue that Ric-8 is somehow involved in the targeting of  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\alpha_o$ , and G $\beta$  to plasma membranes (32–34), and it was speculated that Ric-8 might function as a chaperone that binds  $\alpha_i$  and promotes the assembly of a G protein heterotrimer (33). Because *Drosophila* G $\beta$  and Ric-8 did not interact with each other in these studies, and mammalian Ric-8 did not interact with mammalian G $\beta\gamma$  (31), the mislocalization of G $\beta$  in the Ric8 mutant is likely a consequence of the unavailability of  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_o$  to interact with G $\beta\gamma$  (32–34); as discussed below, G $\alpha$  and G $\beta\gamma$  require interaction with each other for proper plasma membrane targeting. An additional study in *C. elegans* showed that Ric-8 was required for cortical localization of one G $\alpha$ , GPA-16, but not for another one termed GOA-1 (35). Further elucidation of the role of Ric-8 or similar proteins in assembly and plasma membrane localization of G proteins is eagerly awaited. It is tempting to speculate that all G $\alpha$  require interaction with specific proteins that would facilitate folding, heterotrimer assembly, and plasma membrane targeting.

The critical membrane-binding determinant for G $\alpha$  is lipid modification by myristoylation and/or palmitoylation (Table 1). Myristoylation only occurs on G $\alpha$  of the  $\alpha_i$  family, including  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\alpha_o$ ,  $\alpha_z$ , and  $\alpha_t$  subunits. Myristoylation, attach-

ment of the 14-carbon fatty acid myristate to a glycine at the free N-terminus, is catalyzed by *N*-myristoyl transferase (NMT). The glycine at position 2 becomes the extreme N-terminal residue after removal of the initiating methionine. In addition to the key glycine, other N-terminal residues are important for recognition by NMT; particularly important is a serine or threonine at position 6 (36). Myristoylation is an irreversible co-translational modification and thus constitutes the earliest event that promotes membrane targeting for G $\alpha$  of the  $\alpha_i$  family.

Palmitoylation, however, is a reversible post-translational modification occurring on all G $\alpha$ , with the exception of  $\alpha_i$ . The 16-carbon fatty acid palmitate is attached via a thioester bond to one or more cysteine residues within the N-terminal 20 amino acids (Table 1). The mechanisms of palmitoylation have long been unclear and controversial in terms of much debate as to whether palmitoylation is an enzymatic or nonenzymatic reaction. However, numerous reports over the last several years have identified a family of palmitoyl acyltransferases (PATs). These enzymes were initially identified in and purified from yeast. One called Erf2 palmitoylates Ras in vitro (37) and another called Akr1 palmitoylates the casein kinase Yck2 (38). This family of PATs are also termed DHHC proteins because they all contain a conserved Asp-His-His-Cys motif (for review see ref 39). Seven DHHC genes have been identified in yeast and at least 22 exist in the human genome, but their physiological and pathological importance have not been well described. Defining the palmitoylated proteins that are substrates for specific DHHC PATs is the focus of current studies in this field. In terms of specificity for G $\alpha$ , a recent study showed that overexpressed DHHC-3 and 7 could enhance the palmitoylation of co-expressed  $\alpha_s$  (40), whereas another report showed that DHHC-9/GCP16, which shows specificity for H-Ras and N-Ras, had no PAT activity for  $\alpha_i$  (41). As mentioned above, palmitoylation is reversible, and an acyl-protein thioesterase (APT1) that can depalmitoylate G $\alpha$  has been identified (42, 43). APT1 was able to depalmitoylate both  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_s$  in purified preparations, and coexpression of APT1 with  $\alpha_s$  in HEK293 cells resulted in a faster turnover of palmitate on  $\alpha_s$  compared to  $\alpha_s$  in the absence of APT1 coexpression (43). Furthermore, an APT1 was identified in *S. cerevisiae* and shown to be responsible for virtually all of the depalmitoylating activity in yeast. Accordingly, yeast mutants lacking the APT1 gene failed to depalmitoylate the yeast G $\alpha$ , Gpa1. Unfortunately, APT1 deletion strains showed no defect in the G protein-mediated pheromone response. Thus, a clear physiological role for depalmitoylation remains to be defined (42). Finally, a novel site and type of palmitoylation of  $\alpha_s$  has been detected by mass spectrometry. In this study, palmitate was attached to the N-terminal glycine via a stable amide bond, but the role of this modification is unknown (44).

## PLASMA MEMBRANE TARGETING OF G PROTEINS

As described above, both G $\alpha$  and G $\gamma$  are covalently modified by lipids, and these modifications are essential for membrane targeting. However, our current understanding suggests that PM targeting of G proteins is a complex process requiring assembly of the heterotrimer, specific trafficking

pathways, and additional potential membrane binding motifs in the G protein subunits.

One lipid modification alone may not provide enough energy to keep a protein anchored to a cellular membrane, and a lipid modification often occurs in conjunction with another membrane-targeting signal (45–48). In this two-signal model, the other signal can be a second lipid modification, an interaction with a plasma membrane protein, or a polybasic motif in the sequence of the targeted protein (49). For example, in  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\alpha_o$ , and  $\alpha_z$ , two membrane-targeting signals are myristoylation and palmitoylation; co-translational myristoylation is considered the first signal, whereas palmitoylation is the second signal (7). Moreover, the two-signal model definition can be extended to include the idea that more than two membrane-targeting signals can function together.

The interaction of G $\alpha$  with G $\beta\gamma$ , that is, formation of the heterotrimer, appears to function as a key additional signal for PM targeting. Several recent studies, discussed below, using expression of G protein subunits in cultured cells or genetic deletion of select subunits are consistent with a model in which G $\alpha$  or G $\beta\gamma$  alone are not properly targeted to the PM but instead require interaction with each other. First, overexpression of G $\alpha$  or G $\beta\gamma$  in cultured cells often results in inefficient PM localization of the individual subunits, but coexpression of G $\alpha$  and G $\beta\gamma$  leads to very strong PM localization of both G $\alpha$  and G $\beta\gamma$ . Although it had been well documented that coexpression of G $\beta\gamma$  could increase the amount of membrane-bound G $\alpha$  in various expression systems, including insect cells (50), more recent observations indicated that in a reciprocal manner, G $\alpha$  was necessary for efficient membrane targeting of G $\beta\gamma$ . This was demonstrated by showing that overexpression of several different combinations of G $\beta$  and G $\gamma$  followed by detection by fluorescence microscopy resulted in weak localization of the G $\beta\gamma$  at the PM and an accumulation of the majority of the G $\beta\gamma$  at intracellular structures, predominantly ER (24, 26, 51). In contrast, coexpression of  $\alpha_s$ ,  $\alpha_q$ , or  $\alpha_i$  resulted in strong PM localization of different G $\beta\gamma$  (24, 26, 51). A second line of evidence demonstrating a reciprocal role for G $\alpha$  and G $\beta\gamma$  in the subcellular localization of each other is that when one subunit, either G $\alpha$  or G $\beta\gamma$ , is intentionally mistargeted, the other subunit also mislocalizes. When  $\beta_1\gamma_2$  was targeted to the cytoplasmic surface of mitochondria via a mitochondria-targeting signal fused to  $\gamma_2$ , coexpressed wild-type  $\alpha_z$  was also found localized to mitochondria (52). Using an identical strategy,  $\alpha_s$  was targeted to mitochondria, and coexpressed wild-type  $\beta_1\gamma_2$  could be recruited to that organelle (26).

Third, a role for heterotrimer formation in PM targeting of G $\alpha$  and G $\beta\gamma$  has been shown through the generation of mutant subunits that are defective in binding to their partner. When a mutant G $\beta\gamma$  in which the G $\beta$  subunit contains several mutations that disrupt binding to G $\alpha$  was expressed in HEK293 cells, this G $\alpha$ -binding-defective G $\beta\gamma$  remained at endomembranes even when a G $\alpha$  was coexpressed (26). Similarly, G $\alpha$  mutants containing mutations in N-terminal residues that contact G $\beta$  fail to localize to the PM when expressed in cells. Such G $\beta\gamma$ -binding-defective mutants of  $\alpha_s$  and  $\alpha_q$  appeared to be predominantly cytoplasmic (53), whereas a G $\beta\gamma$ -binding-defective  $\alpha_z$  was localized to endomembranes (52). This difference in the localization of G $\beta\gamma$ -binding-defective  $\alpha_z$  versus G $\beta\gamma$ -binding-defective  $\alpha_s$

and  $\alpha_q$  is likely due to co-translational myristoylation of  $\alpha_z$  (Table 1). Moreover, there appears to be cooperation between G $\alpha$  palmitoylation and interaction with G $\beta\gamma$  for proper PM targeting of G proteins. G $\beta\gamma$ -binding-defective  $\alpha_s$  and  $\alpha_q$  are poorly palmitoylated (53), and palmitoylation site mutants of several G $\alpha$  fail to promote PM localization of coexpressed G $\beta\gamma$  (26). In other words, palmitoylation of G $\alpha$  is necessary for PM localization of the heterotrimer, and interaction with G $\beta\gamma$  is necessary for the palmitoylation of G $\alpha$ .

Last and possibly most compelling, genetic deletion of G $\alpha$  or G $\beta\gamma$  in model organisms confirm the reciprocal role of G $\alpha$  or G $\beta\gamma$  for proper PM localization of each subunit. In the yeast *S. cerevisiae*, G $\beta\gamma$  is not able to properly localize at the PM in a null mutant for the yeast G $\alpha$ , Gpa1 (54). When two critical G $\alpha$ , GOA-1 and GPR-16, were disrupted by RNAi in *C. elegans* embryos, the G $\beta$  GPB-1 failed to localize at the PM but instead was detected intracellularly (55). Similar results were also obtained using a third model system, the *Drosophila* eye.  $\alpha_q$ , which mediates light-dependent signaling of rhodopsin in *Drosophila* photoreceptors, is predominantly found in a membrane fraction; however, in fractions prepared from a mutant that expresses very low amounts of an eye-specific G $\beta$ ,  $\alpha_q$  shows a substantial shift into a cytosolic fraction (56, 57). Conversely, *Drosophila* eye-specific G $\beta$  shifts from being equally distributed between a membrane and cytosolic fraction in wild-type flies to being 80% in the cytosolic fraction in mutant flies having negligible amounts of  $\alpha_q$  (57). Taken together, an abundance of recent data supports a model in which a key determinant of PM localization of G proteins is the proper formation of the heterotrimer. As discussed later in this current topic, these results beg the question of where in the cell G $\alpha$  and G $\beta\gamma$  interact because this model seems incompatible with heterotrimer formation after the subunits reach the PM. Instead, the above results suggest that G $\alpha$  and G $\beta\gamma$  would interact before reaching the PM.

Polybasic stretches of amino acids can also act as an additional signal in conjunction with lipid modifications to promote membrane targeting in a multitude of proteins (46, 47, 58). In the case of G $\beta\gamma$ , although membrane association is due primarily to the attachment of the isoprenyl group on the G $\gamma$  subunit, structural studies of transducin G $\beta\gamma$  ( $\beta_1\gamma_1$ ) indicate that there is a region of positive electrostatic potential on a surface of  $\beta_1$  that surrounds the site of farnesylation (59). It has been shown that  $\beta_1\gamma_1$  binds more strongly to vesicles formed from the acidic lipid phosphatidylserine (PS) than to vesicles formed from the neutral lipid phosphatidylcholine (PC) (60, 61), supporting a role for ionic interactions in the membrane association of  $\beta_1\gamma_1$ . When calculations of electrostatic interactions between  $\beta_1\gamma_1$  and 2:1 PC/PS phospholipid membranes were made, it was found that electrostatic interactions were predicted to enhance the membrane partitioning of  $\beta_1\gamma_1$  by about an order of magnitude (62). This is not as strong as the electrostatic contribution of other basic proteins (58, 63, 64) but is still significant. The residues that form the basic surface patch on  $\beta_1$  are conserved in  $\beta_2$ ,  $\beta_3$ , and  $\beta_4$ , suggesting that the electrostatic contribution is a common feature among these G $\beta$  as well. When the sequences of G $\beta$  isoforms from a wide range of species were examined through homology modeling, prominent basic surface patches were found in sequences that possessed at least 50% identity to  $\beta_1$  (62). Taken together, the demon-

strated electrostatic attraction between  $\beta_1\gamma_1$  and PC/PS membranes combined with the conservation of basic residues among other  $G\beta$  isoforms and across related species strongly suggests that this polybasic patch plays a role in regulating the membrane association of  $G\beta\gamma$ . We can speculate that the positive patch on  $G\beta$  may have a greater influence on the membrane binding of  $G\beta\gamma$  combinations in which the  $G\gamma$  is farnesylated, that is,  $\gamma_1$ ,  $\gamma_9$ , and  $\gamma_{11}$ , compared to  $G\beta\gamma$  containing a more hydrophobic geranylgeranylated  $G\gamma$ .

In the case of  $G\alpha$ , a polybasic motif can be detected in the N-termini of nonmyristoylated subunits through homology modeling and electrostatic surface maps (65). Helical wheel diagrams show that this motif maps to one face of the helix at the opposite side of the residues contacting  $G\beta\gamma$ . Consequently these positively charged residues are free to interact with the negatively charged interface of the plasma membrane whether or not  $G\alpha$  is bound to  $G\beta\gamma$ . Indeed, substitution of N-terminal basic residues results in decreased membrane localization of  $\alpha_s$  and  $\alpha_q$  (Crouthamel, M., and Wedegaertner, P., unpublished results). Also, given that this positively charged motif is much less pronounced in members of the myristoylated  $\alpha_i$  family, it was proposed that the polybasic motif substitutes for myristoylation as a membrane-targeting signal in the non-myristoylated  $G\alpha$  (65). These results, combined with the fact that other proteins, such as growth-associated protein-43 (GAP43) and RGS proteins (66–69), that undergo palmitoylation also have  $\alpha$ -helical polybasic motifs in their N-termini, suggest the likelihood that this motif serves as a membrane-targeting signal for  $G\alpha$ . On the basis of the above evidence, the two-signal model for G proteins can be extended to state that for  $\alpha_i$  family members myristoylation is the first membrane-targeting signal, and interactions with  $G\beta\gamma$  and palmitoylation are critical additional signals. For the non-myristoylated  $G\alpha$  (Table 1),  $G\beta\gamma$  binding can be considered the first signal with palmitoylation and the polybasic region of the N-terminus comprising critical additional signals. However, for  $G\beta\gamma$ , isoprenylation likely functions as the first membrane-targeting signal with polybasic surfaces in  $G\beta$  and interaction with  $G\alpha$  as key second signals.

In summary, it is clear that G protein localization at the PM is a complex process, requiring lipid modifications, polybasic motifs, and chaperone proteins. Moreover, a number of recent studies suggest a model in which the heterotrimer is assembled before the subunits reach the PM.

## ROLE OF ORGANELLES IN G PROTEIN TRAFFICKING

It has become increasingly clear that G proteins are not simply directly transferred to the PM after synthesis in the cytoplasm but instead utilize intracellular organelles as intermediates in trafficking. A strong indication of this is the organelle localization of enzymes involved in lipid modification and processing of  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$ . As mentioned above, after  $G\gamma$  is isoprenylated, likely as a  $G\beta\gamma$  dimer, by cytoplasmic isoprenyl transferases, further CaaX processing of –aaX proteolysis and carboxyl methylation is carried out by ER-localized enzymes. Thus,  $G\beta\gamma$  localize to the cytoplasmic surface of the ER as a key step in their eventual targeting to the PM (Figure 1).

Intracellular organelles may also be sites of palmitoylation of  $G\alpha$  and assembly of the heterotrimer, two interrelated

processes. Although a specific DHHC enzyme that serves as a PAT for any  $G\alpha$  has not been clearly identified yet, a number of studies are consistent with a model for intracellular organelle palmitoylation of  $G\alpha$ . Localization studies of all members of the DHHC family indicate that most of the DHHC proteins are found at intracellular organelles, mainly the ER and Golgi, at least when overexpressed (70). DHHC PATs have been identified for yeast and mammalian Ras, and they localize to the ER and Golgi, respectively (37, 41). Finally, DHHC-3 can enhance palmitoylation of  $\alpha_s$  when coexpressed, and overexpressed DHHC-3 is found predominantly at the Golgi (70, 71). However, PM-enriched fractions contain a PAT activity that can palmitoylate certain  $G\alpha$  (72), suggesting that a relevant  $G\alpha$  PAT may exist at the PM. Identifying specific PATs for  $G\alpha$  and determining where they are localized and how they influence PM targeting are current challenges that will lead to great insight into G protein trafficking.

The assembly of the G protein heterotrimer has been proposed to occur on intracellular organelles. The reciprocal requirement for  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  interaction for PM targeting is most consistent with a model in which assembly occurs prior to the subunits reaching the PM. On the basis of the colocalization of a palmitoylation site mutant of  $G\alpha$  with  $G\beta\gamma$  in a region of cells containing the Golgi, it was proposed that  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  first interact together at this organelle and that the Golgi would be the site of palmitoylation of  $G\alpha$  (24). However, the expression of a dominant negative mutant of Sar1, a small GTPase involved in ER to Golgi trafficking, or the treatment of cells with the Golgi disruptor Brefeldin A perturbed neither the PM targeting of  $\alpha_s$ ,  $\alpha_q$ , and  $\alpha_z$  nor the palmitoylation of  $\alpha_q$ ,  $\alpha_i$ , and  $\alpha_z$  (30, 73, 74). Moreover, a recent report did not detect Golgi localization of either a non-palmitoylated  $\alpha_s$  or  $\alpha_q$  mutant or a coexpressed  $G\beta\gamma$  (73). Thus, the lack of requirement for an intact Golgi and the observed lack of  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  localization at the Golgi in some studies (30, 73, 74) suggest an alternative trafficking pathway that does not require the Golgi. Although ER-restricted palmitoylation of  $G\alpha$  and assembly of the heterotrimer has not been demonstrated, we propose the ER as a likely site (Figure 1). A recent report provided a possible explanation to some of the discrepancies of whether or not the Golgi is required for G protein trafficking to the PM. The authors showed that overexpressed  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  displayed Golgi-independent PM localization; however, when a GPCR was also overexpressed, PM targeting of overexpressed  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  was Golgi-dependent (75). The implication was that when  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  assembled into an intracellular complex with a GPCR, the complex followed the typical secretory pathway, as would be expected for a transmembrane GPCR. Thus, G proteins may utilize different trafficking pathways depending upon additional proteins that might pre-form signaling complexes. An alternative explanation for the requirement for organelles, such as ER and potentially Golgi, in the PM targeting of G proteins is that these organelles are not required to move G proteins along the typical secretory pathway, but instead, the importance of the organelles is that they are sites for critical enzymes such as DHHC PATs. In this scenario, if a key DHHC PAT was localized to the Golgi, secretory pathway disruptors would not affect the ability of a  $G\alpha$  to be palmitoylated



because the DHHC PAT may dynamically redistribute to other organelles that can be accessed by  $G\alpha$ .

Recently, a protein called  $G\alpha$ -interacting vesicle (GIV)-associated protein was identified in GC pituitary cells. As shown using a pull-down assay, this GIV interacts via its C-terminus with  $\alpha_{13}$ . GIV interacts also with other members of the  $\alpha_i$  family and with  $\alpha_s$ . Using fluorescent microscopy, GIV has been detected in vesicles in the cytoplasm and enriched in COPI vesicles co-localizing with  $\alpha_i$ ; GIV was also associated with the cis Golgi region and detected close to the ER. More precisely, GIV has been detected in a specific fraction of liver extract enriched in ER/Golgi transport vesicles. Interestingly it interacts weakly with a GTP-bound form of  $\alpha_s$ , suggesting that GIV would be a partner of the inactive GDP-bound  $\alpha_s$ . On the basis of these results, the authors proposed that  $\alpha_s$  would regulate vesicle trafficking through its interaction with GIV (76), but it is also possible that conversely, GIV would be involved in the trafficking of inactive  $\alpha_s$ . Experiments taking advantage of advances in live cell imaging may help define G protein trafficking pathways. In addition, most of the studies to date have used overexpression of proteins, and much more difficult studies of endogenous proteins are required to increase our understanding of organelle involvement in G protein trafficking to the PM. Figure 1 presents a model showing our current state of knowledge regarding the trafficking of nascent G proteins to the PM.

### PLASMA MEMBRANE DISTRIBUTION OF THE THREE SUBUNITS

Another level of organization in the localization of G proteins is their organization into cell surface microdomains termed lipid rafts. Because of the enrichment in cholesterol and glycosphingolipids of these membrane domains, they resist solubilization by non-ionic detergent and display low-buoyant density in sucrose density gradients (77). Caveolae are a subset of these domains, and they are defined morphologically by flask-shaped invaginations of the plasma membrane and biochemically by the residence of caveolin (78–80).

There is substantial evidence that  $G\alpha$  localize to lipid raft and caveolae membrane microdomains (81). Numerous studies using immunofluorescence microscopy, electron microscopy, and density gradient fractionation have demonstrated that various  $G\alpha$ , namely,  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\alpha_s$ , and  $\alpha_q$ , are significantly enriched in lipid rafts and caveolae in several cell lines and tissues (82–87). Dual acyl chains, composed of either tandem palmitoylation or myristoylation plus palmitoylation, are well characterized signals for targeting proteins to these microdomains (88–90), and thus, lipid modifications play a critical role in localizing  $G\alpha$  to membrane microdomains (91, 92). In addition, lipid rafts contain a PAT activity capable of palmitoylating  $\alpha_i$  (93). Another key mode of targeting  $G\alpha$  to microdomains may be interactions with other microdomain-associated proteins; in particular, interaction with caveolin could allow differential targeting of  $G\alpha$  to caveolae versus caveolin-lacking lipid rafts. Interaction of  $G\alpha$  with caveolin has been demonstrated (92, 94, 95), but others have not observed direct binding of  $G\alpha$  to caveolin (83, 94). Overall, while the existence of an interaction between  $G\alpha$  and caveolin seems debatable, it

appears clear that at least a portion of  $G\alpha$  localize in caveolae and lipid rafts.

However, the situation with  $G\beta\gamma$  is less clear.  $G\beta\gamma$  has been found present but not enriched in microdomains with techniques that utilize Triton X-100 extraction (8, 85, 94, 96), but  $G\beta\gamma$  has been found in these domains to a greater extent using detergent-free methods (86). In contrast, purified  $G\beta\gamma$  did not incorporate into detergent-resistant membranes (DRM), that is, lipid rafts, of reconstituted sphingolipid- and cholesterol-rich liposomes (91). Another study found that in reconstituted PS/SM/Ch (phosphatidyl serine/sphingomyelin/cholesterol) membranes, tryptophans and tyrosines of  $G\beta\gamma$  are less accessible to quenching by iodide ions over a large concentration range compared to that when  $G\beta\gamma$  is bound to PS/PC (phosphatidyl serine/phosphatidyl choline) membranes. This indicates that the presence of lipid rafts protects a portion of tryptophan and tyrosine residues from anionic quenchers. Moreover, when  $G\beta\gamma$  is bound to PS/SM/Ch membranes, it is more susceptible to trypsin digestion than when it is bound to PS/PC membranes, implicating a difference in the disposition of  $G\beta\gamma$  when it is bound to membranes containing lipid rafts. It was speculated that while excluded from lipid rafts,  $G\beta\gamma$  may localize close to the domain interface, which occludes a portion of the protein (97). The reason for the differences in lipid raft localization of  $G\beta\gamma$  in extracts from cells versus reconstitution approaches is unclear; it is possible that  $G\beta\gamma$  may transiently associate with lipid rafts or have a weaker association with them than  $G\alpha$  (91).

Localization of G proteins to membrane microdomains may serve as a mode of regulation of G protein signaling pathways. The colocalization of G proteins, GPCRs, and effectors in microdomains may enhance signaling by increasing their local concentration and promoting interactions among them (98–100). If this were the case for a particular signaling pathway, then disruption of lipid rafts and caveolae would disrupt signaling of the pathway. For example, in platelets, thrombin stimulation causes a translocation of  $\alpha_q$  to lipid rafts, and cyclodextrin (CD) treatment, which depletes cholesterol, impairs this recruitment of  $\alpha_q$  to rafts along with the production of phosphatidylinositol second messengers and consequent activation of platelets (101). CD treatment also leads to a loss of PIP<sub>2</sub> and  $\alpha_q$  from caveolin-enriched membrane fractions in A431 cells (102). This redistribution is associated with a decrease in EGF- or bradykinin-stimulated inositol phosphate production. However, cholesterol depletion had no effect on bradykinin-stimulated phospholipase A2 activation (103). This suggests that the effects of cholesterol depletion may differ among signaling pathways, and microdomains may serve to modulate signaling specificity.

Alternatively, membrane microdomains may serve to negatively regulate signaling. In this model, caveolae and lipid rafts would sequester G proteins from other proteins of the pathway that are not present in these microdomains, thus inhibiting interactions among components. For example, recent results using reconstitution of purified proteins suggest that lipid rafts could inhibit association of PLC $\beta$ 2 and  $G\beta\gamma$  and the subsequent activation of PLC $\beta$ 2 (97). In rat salivary epithelial A5 cells, isoproterenol-stimulated cAMP accumulation was slightly but significantly increased when cells were depleted of cholesterol via treatment with CD (104).

In cardiac myocytes, the  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor ( $\beta_2$ AR) and  $\alpha_i$  are found in caveolae, whereas the majority of the  $\beta_1$ AR and  $\alpha_s$  are not (105). Filipin treatment, another technique for cholesterol depletion, increases  $\beta_2$ AR physiological signaling and has no effect on  $\beta_1$ AR signaling (106). Treatment with pertussis toxin, which inactivates  $\alpha_i$ , in conjunction with filipin caused an even greater increase in  $\beta_2$ AR signaling, implying that the filipin-induced increase is due to enhanced activation of  $\alpha_s$  and not to a decrease in interaction with  $\alpha_i$  in caveolae. These results could imply that lipid rafts serve as a mode of inhibiting interactions of proteins in the  $\alpha_s$  signaling pathway. An alternative explanation is that since lipid rafts may facilitate internalization, then disruption of lipid rafts would lead to increased receptors,  $\alpha_s$ , and adenylyl cyclase at the membrane. This is another possible mechanism of regulation of G protein signaling by membrane microdomains (98–100, 106).

In conclusion, it seems clear that at least some portion of G proteins are targeted to membrane microdomains, and the degree of enrichment in lipid rafts and/or caveolae may vary among G protein families and among cell types. This localization can serve as a means of modulating signaling specificity and may either positively or negatively regulate interactions among G proteins, receptors, and effectors, at least for some signaling pathways.

### G PROTEIN TRAFFICKING AFTER RECEPTOR STIMULATION

Once G proteins reach the PM, they do not necessarily statically reside there. Instead, similar to the well-studied internalization of GPCRs, G proteins, at least select subunits, can undergo activation-dependent translocation from the PM to the cytoplasm followed by recycling back to the PM (Figure 2). The trafficking of G proteins after receptor activation has been mostly based on observations of  $\alpha_s$  redistribution after agonist stimulation of the  $\beta_2$ -AR. However, new reports have described receptor-dependent trafficking of  $\alpha_q$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  as well as provided new data about  $\alpha_s$  trafficking, and these new findings are highlighted below. Additionally, the vertebrate photoreceptor-specific G protein transducin, consisting of  $\alpha_t$  and  $\beta_1\gamma_1$ , has been well-documented to translocate off of membranes upon activation; this has been well reviewed recently (107) and will be only briefly discussed in this section.

Activation of  $\alpha_s$  by mutational activation, cholera toxin-mediated ADP ribosylation, or agonist-stimulated  $\beta_2$ -AR causes  $\alpha_s$  to translocate off of the PM, as assayed by fractionation, immunofluorescence microscopy, and live cell imaging (82, 108–113). Most studies agree that the  $\beta_2$ -AR-dependent release of  $\alpha_s$  from the PM is fairly rapid, observable within 1–5 min after agonist addition (82, 111–113), and in addition,  $\beta_2$ -AR and  $\alpha_s$  show a similar time course of internalization (111, 112). The exact subcellular location of internalized  $\alpha_s$  remains to be well-defined. Mutationally activated  $\alpha_s$  appears diffusely localized throughout the cytoplasm by immunofluorescence and is found predominantly in a soluble cytosolic fraction (109, 110, 112, 114).  $\beta_2$ -AR-activated  $\alpha_s$  also appears by immunofluorescence to be somewhat diffusely localized throughout the cytoplasm (110, 112), but fractionation studies reveal only a very small increase in soluble  $\alpha_s$  upon agonist stimulation




FIGURE 2: Model for agonist-induced trafficking of GPCRs and G proteins. (a) After the addition of the agonist, a typical GPCR, e.g.,  $\beta_2$ -AR, internalizes following a classical endocytic pathway depending on dynamin and clathrin (pink).  $\alpha_s$  (green) is enriched in rafts (thick line), and its palmitoylation state is modified (orange). (b)  $\alpha_s$  internalizes (in some cases  $\alpha_q$  too). This internalization is dependent on cholesterol, a lipid raft constituent (82). The location of  $\alpha_s$  after internalization is not clear; maybe it diffuses in the cytoplasm or accumulates in small vesicles containing raft markers. GPCR is detected in endosomes.  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  subunits (blue) also can internalize and would accumulate in vesicles or close to the Golgi. (c) The removal of the agonist induces the recycling of GPCR and also  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  subunits to PM. For  $\beta_2$ -AR and a number of other GPCRs, the recycling follows an actin-dependent pathway (red).  $\alpha_q$  recycling is dependent on an actin-dependent molecular motor myosin III Ninac and  $G\beta\gamma$  in *Drosophila* photoreceptor cells (56, 115).

(112, 113). A possible explanation for the lack of soluble  $\alpha_s$  after receptor activation is that the internalized  $\alpha_s$  is actually bound to membrane vesicles; indeed, recent studies using live cell imaging of  $\alpha_s$ -GFP or  $\alpha_s$ -CFP indicate that internalized  $\alpha_s$  is, at least partially, localized to vesicle structures (82, 111, 113).

Compared to  $\alpha_s$ , there has been much less evidence for activation-induced internalization of other  $G\alpha$ . However, two recent reports provide strong evidence for  $\alpha_q$  redistribution in *Drosophila* eyes (56, 115). Using subcellular fractionation and electron microscopy,  $\alpha_q$  was shown to internalize when rhodopsin is activated with light (56, 115). Consistent with demonstrations of  $\alpha_q$  translocation in *Drosophila* eyes, earlier reports showed that endogenous  $\alpha_{q/11}$  was also detected inside cultured cells when the angiotensin II receptor or thyrotropin-releasing hormone receptor-1 were stimulated with their respective ligands (116–118). In the *Drosophila* studies and the study with the angiotensin II receptor in HEK293 cells,  $\alpha_{q/11}$  redistribution into the cytoplasm occurred in 5–20 min, on a time scale similar to that for  $\alpha_s$  described above (56, 115, 117). However,  $\alpha_{q/11}$  translocation in response to agonist activation of thyrotropin-releasing hormone receptor-1 was much slower, requiring more than 2 h of stimulation, and showed an intracellular punctate pattern of internalization (116). Small shifts into the cytoplasm and soluble fractions have also been observed for mutationally activated  $\alpha_q$  (110, 119). Clearly, at least under some conditions,  $\alpha_q$ , in addition to  $\alpha_s$ , can redistribute from the PM upon activation.



Interestingly,  $G\beta\gamma$  also appears to be capable of receptor-dependent redistribution from the PM, as revealed by recent live cell imaging studies. When  $\beta_1\gamma_7$  was visualized with the technique of bimolecular fluorescence complementation (BiFC) and was coexpressed with  $\alpha_s$ -CFP,  $\beta_1\gamma_7$  showed a similar co-internalization with  $\alpha_s$  into apparent vesicle structures upon  $\beta_2$ -AR stimulation (111). In another series of recent studies in which either  $G\beta$  or  $G\gamma$  was fused to YFP,  $\beta_1\gamma_{11}$  rapidly (<20 s) translocated from the PM to a Golgi region of CHO cells upon agonist stimulation of M2 muscarinic acetylcholine receptors (120).  $\beta_1\gamma_5$  showed significantly less and slower translocation (120, 121).  $\gamma_5$  is geranylgeranylated, whereas  $\gamma_{11}$  contains a less hydrophobic farnesyl group. However, this only partially explained the difference in translocation between  $\beta_1\gamma_{11}$  and  $\beta_1\gamma_5$ ; the authors provided evidence to support a model in which a high-affinity interaction of the  $\gamma$  subunit with a GPCR inhibits  $G\beta\gamma$  translocation, but a lower-affinity  $G\gamma$ -GPCR interaction allows rapid translocation of  $G\beta\gamma$  (121). In addition, the same group showed that coexpression of  $\beta_1\gamma_{11}$  with  $\alpha_s$ ,  $\alpha_q$ ,  $\alpha_o$ , or  $\alpha_i$  allowed different GPCRs to stimulate PM to Golgi translocation of  $\beta_1\gamma_{11}$  (122). The kinetics of the internalization of  $\beta_1\gamma_{11}$  depended on which  $G\alpha$  was coexpressed and correlated with the rate of GTP/GDP exchange for the particular  $G\alpha$  (122). The recent studies described above suggest that  $G\beta\gamma$  can redistribute in the cell in response to GPCR activation. Additional studies should help clarify a number of important questions such as whether  $G\beta\gamma$  translocates to the Golgi (120–122) or other subcellular locations (111).

The mechanisms of the trafficking of G protein subunits after receptor stimulation are poorly understood. There is a strong correlation between activation, depalmitoylation and internalization, particularly in the case of  $\alpha_s$ : mutational activation of  $\alpha_s$  or activation of  $\alpha_s$  via the  $\beta_2$ -AR induces a fast turnover of the palmitate group attached to  $\alpha_s$  as observed by pulse/chase and palmitate-labeling experiments (123, 124). GPCR-regulated changes in palmitoylation have also been observed for other  $G\alpha$  (123–127), suggesting that it is a general phenomenon. Consistent with the importance of the rapid turnover of palmitate on  $\alpha_s$  for activation-induced internalization, replacing the N-terminus of  $\alpha_s$  with other PM-targeting motifs produces an  $\alpha_s$  that does not internalize in response to activation (110); however, a causative role for the depalmitoylation of  $G\alpha$  controlling internalization remains to be formally established.

Exactly how activation of a  $G\alpha$  leads to more rapid turnover of its attached palmitate is not completely understood. Studies with purified proteins indicate that association of  $G\beta\gamma$  with  $\alpha_s$  inhibits  $\alpha_s$  depalmitoylation, and thus, it appears that a key factor in activation-induced depalmitoylation is the decreased affinity of interaction of the activated  $G\alpha$  with  $G\beta\gamma$  (7, 128). This may simply allow access of a palmitoyl thioesterase. It is worthwhile mentioning that  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  may not always fully dissociate upon activation. Although this is contrary to the G protein dogma, several recent studies using a variety of experimental approaches, including coprecipitation, FRET, and  $G\alpha$ - $G\beta\gamma$  fusions, have obtained results consistent with the proposal that G protein signaling can occur in the absence of subunit dissociation (129–132). As the mechanisms of activation-induced trafficking of G proteins are explored further, it will be important

to consider that  $G\alpha$  and  $G\beta\gamma$  may remain associated. Finally, several studies have determined that downstream signaling pathways do not influence receptor-dependent changes in  $G\alpha$  redistribution or palmitate turnover (56, 115, 133). Thus, at least the initial events involved in depalmitoylation and release from the PM of  $\alpha_s$  and  $\alpha_q$  are a direct result of activation (GTP binding) of the  $G\alpha$ .

Light-driven translocation of vertebrate transducin is also clearly dependent on activation but does not involve depalmitoylation because  $\alpha_t$  is the only  $G\alpha$  that does not undergo palmitoylation (Table 1). For transducin, the key to its translocation ability is that  $\alpha_t$  is modified by myristate only and that  $\gamma_1$ , of transducin  $G\beta\gamma$ , is modified by farnesyl. In the transducin heterotrimer, these two lipids together provide tight binding to membranes. However, upon activation-dependent dissociation, either myristate or farnesyl does not provide strong membrane binding, and  $\alpha_t$  and  $\beta_1\gamma_1$  redistribute off of membranes (107, 134–136).

Several studies have indicated that internalization of  $G\alpha$  does not require internalization of the activating GPCR and occurs independently of typical endocytic pathways used by GPCRs. First,  $\alpha_s$  can be activated independently of GPCR activation, for example, by mutational activation or cholera toxin, and exhibits redistribution off the PM. Second,  $\alpha_s$  and  $\alpha_q$  retain internalization in response to GPCR activation under conditions in which the internalization of the GPCR has been blocked by mutation of the GPCR, expression of a dominant negative dynamin, or treatment of cells with hypertonic sucrose, a disruptor of clathrin-coated pit-mediated endocytosis (111, 112, 115, 117). In contrast, a dominant negative dynamin prevented  $\beta_2$ -AR-stimulated internalization of  $\alpha_s$ -GFP in C6 glioma cells (82). Dynamin can be involved in both clathrin-coated pit-mediated endocytosis and lipid-raft-mediated endocytosis, and these differing results in terms of the requirement for dynamin in  $G\alpha$  internalization may indicate that  $G\alpha$  utilize different mechanisms for internalization depending upon the cell type. Indeed, a role for caveolae/lipid rafts is indicated by a recent report (82).  $\alpha_s$  and also  $\alpha_q$  were enriched in a detergent-resistant membrane fraction after the addition of agonists (82, 137); the depletion of membrane cholesterol blocked the internalization of  $\alpha_s$  (82), and internalized  $\alpha_s$ -GFP co-localized with the lipid-raft marker cholera toxin B (82). Last, internalized  $\alpha_s$  appears not to associate with early endosomes (82, 111), consistent with translocation independent of a GPCR endocytic pathway. In summary, activated  $\alpha_s$ , and possibly  $\alpha_q$ , traffic from the PM into a cell's interior following a pathway that is independent of GPCR endocytic pathways and may involve lipid rafts.

After internalization,  $\alpha_s$  and  $\alpha_q$  recover localization at the PM when the GPCR agonist is removed, suggesting an active recycling process (56, 112, 115). Recycling to the PM occurred somewhat slowly, taking approximately 1 h for either internalized  $\alpha_s$  in HEK293 cells or internalized  $\alpha_q$  in *Drosophila* eyes, and this time course of  $\alpha_s$  recycling to the PM was identical to the time course of  $\beta_2$ -AR PM recycling (112). Very little is known about the mechanisms of recycling of internalized G proteins, although the first clues were provided recently. Internalized  $\alpha_s$ -CFP was shown to co-localize with Rab11 containing vesicles in HEK293 cells (111), suggesting the possibility that  $\alpha_s$  utilizes these vesicles to recycle to the PM (111). Moreover, one of the studies

using *Drosophila* eyes showed that recovery of internalized  $\alpha_q$  at the PM was much slower in mutant flies that possessed much reduced levels of  $G\beta\gamma$  (56). Thus, it seems that both the initial targeting of a  $G\alpha$  to the PM as well as its recycling require interaction with  $G\beta\gamma$ . Finally, the other recent study using *Drosophila* eyes showed that PM recycling of  $\alpha_q$  was specifically defective in flies lacking the photoreceptor-specific myosin III NINAC (115). It will be important to determine whether similar motor proteins also play a role in trafficking/recycling of G proteins in cells other than photoreceptor cells.

In summary, observations of activation-induced G protein trafficking have recently moved beyond only  $\alpha_s$ , and live cell imaging studies and studies using model systems have begun to provide novel insights into the trafficking itineraries and mechanisms of G proteins after GPCR activation at the PM. The physiological function of activation-induced G protein translocation remains elusive. In photoreceptors, translocation of G proteins likely plays a role in light adaptation (138). Activation-induced G protein internalization may be a general mechanism contributing to desensitization and may also provide a regulatable mechanism for transporting G proteins to diverse subcellular locations to carry out signaling functions.

## CONCLUSIONS

A number of exciting recent studies have increased our understanding of how G proteins are assembled and targeted to the PM and how G proteins redistribute in response to activation. Yet, many important questions remain unanswered, including a detailed mechanistic understanding of G protein trafficking and its functional consequences. G proteins typically need to be localized at the cytoplasmic surface of plasma membranes to couple an activated GPCR to downstream effectors, and thus understanding how G proteins arrive at the PM is of fundamental importance. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that G proteins have signaling roles at subcellular locations in addition to the PM (3). A recent study demonstrated that a constitutively active form of Gpa1, a yeast  $G\alpha$ , can be found at endosomes, where it can activate a phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (139). In addition, a series of studies have implicated  $G\beta\gamma$  in functioning at the Golgi to direct a protein kinase D and protein kinase C-dependent pathway that promotes the formation of Golgi transport vesicles (140–142). Not only can G proteins signal at various intracellular membranes,  $G\beta\gamma$  appears to function in the nucleus where it can regulate the glucocorticoid receptor (143). Thus, it will be essential to understand how G proteins localize to diverse subcellular locations, and understanding mechanisms of G protein trafficking will certainly provide insight into novel G protein signaling functions.

## REFERENCES

- Cabrera-Vera, T. M., Vanhauwe, J., Thomas, T. O., Medkova, M., Preininger, A., Mazzoni, M. R., and Hamm, H. E. (2003) Insights into G protein structure, function, and regulation, *Endocr. Rev.* 24, 765–781.
- Spiegel, A. M., and Weinstein, L. S. (2004) Inherited diseases involving G proteins and G protein-coupled receptors, *Annu. Rev. Med.* 55, 27–39.
- Spiegelberg, B. D., and Hamm, H. E. (2007) Roles of G-protein-coupled receptor signaling in cancer biology and gene transcription, *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* 17, 40–44.
- Melien, O. (2007) Heterotrimeric G proteins and disease, *Methods Mol. Biol.* 361, 119–144.
- Malbon, C. C. (2005) G proteins in development, *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 6, 689–701.
- Sondek, J., and Siderovski, D. P. (2001) Ggamma-like (GGL) domains: new frontiers in G-protein signaling and beta-propeller scaffolding, *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 61, 1329–1337.
- Wedegaertner, P. B. (1998) Lipid modifications and membrane targeting of G alpha, *Biol. Signals Recept.* 7, 125–135.
- Rehm, A., and Ploegh, H. L. (1997) Assembly and intracellular targeting of the betagamma subunits of heterotrimeric G proteins, *J. Cell Biol.* 137, 305–317.
- Kubota, S., Kubota, H., and Nagata, K. (2006) Cytosolic chaperonin protects folding intermediates of G{beta} from aggregation by recognizing hydrophobic {beta}-strands, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 103, 8360–8365.
- Wells, C. A., Dingus, J., and Hildebrandt, J. D. (2006) Role of the chaperonin CCT/TRiC complex in G protein betagamma-dimer assembly, *J. Biol. Chem.* 281, 20221–20232.
- Knol, J. C., Engel, R., Blaauw, M., Visser, A. J., and van Haastert, P. J. (2005) The phosducin-like protein PhLP1 is essential for G{beta}{gamma} dimer formation in *Dictyostelium discoideum*, *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 25, 8393–8400.
- Lukov, G. L., Hu, T., McLaughlin, J. N., Hamm, H. E., and Willardson, B. M. (2005) Phosducin-like protein acts as a molecular chaperone for G protein betagamma dimer assembly, *EMBO J.* 24, 1965–1975.
- Martin-Benito, J., Bertrand, S., Hu, T., Ludtke, P. J., McLaughlin, J. N., Willardson, B. M., Carrascosa, J. L., and Valpuesta, J. M. (2004) Structure of the complex between the cytosolic chaperonin CCT and phosducin-like protein, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 101, 17410–17415.
- McLaughlin, J. N., Thulin, C. D., Hart, S. J., Resing, K. A., Ahn, N. G., and Willardson, B. M. (2002) Regulatory interaction of phosducin-like protein with the cytosolic chaperonin complex, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 99, 7962–7967.
- Lukov, G. L., Baker, C. M., Ludtke, P. J., Hu, T., Carter, M. D., Hackett, R. A., Thulin, C. D., and Willardson, B. M. (2006) Mechanism of assembly of G protein beta gamma subunits by CK2-phosphorylated phosducin-like protein and the cytosolic chaperonin complex, *J. Biol. Chem.* 281, 22261–22274.
- Humrich, J., Bermel, C., Bunemann, M., Harmark, L., Frost, R., Quitterer, U., and Lohse, M. J. (2005) Phosducin-like protein regulates G-protein betagamma folding by interaction with tailless complex polypeptide-1alpha: dephosphorylation or splicing of PhLP turns the switch toward regulation of Gbetagamma folding, *J. Biol. Chem.* 280, 20042–20050.
- Savage, J. R., McLaughlin, J. N., Skiba, N. P., Hamm, H. E., and Willardson, B. M. (2000) Functional roles of the two domains of phosducin and phosducin-like protein, *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 30399–30407.
- Higgins, J. B., and Casey, P. J. (1996) The role of prenylation in G-protein assembly and function, *Cell. Signalling* 8, 433–437.
- Dupre, D. J., Robitaille, M., Richer, M., Ethier, N., Mamarbachi, A. M., and Hebert, T. E. (2007) Dopamine receptor interacting protein 78 acts as a molecular chaperone for Ggamma subunits prior to assembly with Gbeta, *J. Biol. Chem.* 282, 13703–13715.
- Lane, K. T., and Beese, L. S. (2006) Thematic review series: lipid posttranslational modifications. Structural biology of protein farnesyltransferase and geranylgeranyltransferase type I, *J. Lipid Res.* 47, 681–699.
- Wright, L. P., and Philips, M. R. (2006) Thematic review series: lipid posttranslational modifications. CAAX modification and membrane targeting of Ras, *J. Lipid Res.* 47, 883–891.
- Gelb, M. H., Scholten, J. D., and Sebolt-Leopold, J. S. (1998) Protein prenylation: from discovery to prospects for cancer treatment, *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.* 2, 40–48.
- Hancock, J. F., Magee, A. I., Childs, J. E., and Marshall, C. J. (1989) All ras proteins are polyisoprenylated but only some are palmitoylated, *Cell* 57, 1167–1177.
- Michaelson, D., Ahearn, I., Bergo, M., Young, S., and Philips, M. (2002) Membrane trafficking of heterotrimeric G proteins via the endoplasmic reticulum and Golgi, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 13, 3294–3302.
- Fu, H. W., and Casey, P. J. (1999) Enzymology and biology of CaaX protein prenylation, *Recent Prog. Horm. Res.* 54, 315–342; discussion 342–343.

26. Takida, S., and Wedegaertner, P. B. (2003) Heterotrimer formation, together with isoprenylation, is required for plasma membrane targeting of Gbetagamma, *J. Biol. Chem.* 278, 17284–17290.
27. Gutierrez, L., Magee, A. I., Marshall, C. J., and Hancock, J. F. (1989) Post-translational processing of p21ras is two-step and involves carboxyl-methylation and carboxy-terminal proteolysis, *EMBO J.* 8, 1093–1098.
28. Fung, B. K., Yamane, H. K., Ota, I. M., and Clarke, S. (1990) The gamma subunit of brain G-proteins is methyl esterified at a C-terminal cysteine, *FEBS Lett.* 260, 313–317.
29. Schmidt, W. K., Tam, A., Fujimura-Kamada, K., and Michaelis, S. (1998) Endoplasmic reticulum membrane localization of Rce1p and Ste24p, yeast proteases involved in carboxyl-terminal CAAX protein processing and amino-terminal a-factor cleavage, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 95, 11175–11180.
30. Fishburn, C. S., Herzmark, P., Morales, J., and Bourne, H. R. (1999) Gbetagamma and palmitate target newly synthesized Galphaz to the plasma membrane, *J. Biol. Chem.* 274, 18793–18800.
31. Tall, G. G., Krumins, A. M., and Gilman, A. G. (2003) Mammalian Ric-8A (synembryn) is a heterotrimeric Galpha protein guanine nucleotide exchange factor, *J. Biol. Chem.* 278, 8356–8362.
32. David, N. B., Martin, C. A., Segalen, M., Rosenfeld, F., Schweisguth, F., and Bellaiche, Y. (2005) *Drosophila* Ric-8 regulates Galphai cortical localization to promote Galphai-dependent planar orientation of the mitotic spindle during asymmetric cell division, *Nat. Cell Biol.* 7, 1083–1090.
33. Hampoelz, B., Hoeller, O., Bowman, S. K., Dunican, D., and Knoblich, J. A. (2005) *Drosophila* Ric-8 is essential for plasma-membrane localization of heterotrimeric G proteins, *Nat. Cell Biol.* 7, 1099–1105.
34. Wang, H., Ng, K. H., Qian, H., Siderovski, D. P., Chia, W., and Yu, F. (2005) Ric-8 controls *Drosophila* neural progenitor asymmetric division by regulating heterotrimeric G proteins, *Nat. Cell Biol.* 7, 1091–1098.
35. Afshar, K., Willard, F. S., Colombo, K., Siderovski, D. P., and Gonczy, P. (2005) Cortical localization of the Galpha protein GPA-16 requires RIC-8 function during *C. elegans* asymmetric cell division, *Development* 132, 4449–4459.
36. Farazi, T. A., Waksman, G., and Gordon, J. I. (2001) The biology and enzymology of protein N-myristoylation, *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 39501–39504.
37. Lobo, S., Greentree, W. K., Linder, M. E., and Deschenes, R. J. (2002) Identification of a Ras palmitoyltransferase in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *J. Biol. Chem.* 277, 41268–41273.
38. Roth, A. F., Feng, Y., Chen, L., and Davis, N. G. (2002) The yeast DHHC cysteine-rich domain protein Akr1p is a palmitoyl transferase, *J. Cell Biol.* 159, 23–28.
39. Mitchell, D. A., Vasudevan, A., Linder, M. E., and Deschenes, R. J. (2006) Protein palmitoylation by a family of DHHC protein S-acyltransferases, *J. Lipid Res.* 47, 1118–1127.
40. Fukata, M., Fukata, Y., Adesnik, H., Nicoll, R. A., and Brecht, D. S. (2004) Identification of PSD-95 palmitoylating enzymes, *Neuron* 44, 987–996.
41. Swarthout, J. T., Lobo, S., Farh, L., Croke, M. R., Greentree, W. K., Deschenes, R. J., and Linder, M. E. (2005) DHHC9 and GCPI6 constitute a human protein fatty acyltransferase with specificity for H- and N-Ras, *J. Biol. Chem.* 280, 31141–31148.
42. Duncan, J. A., and Gilman, A. G. (2002) Characterization of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* acyl-protein thioesterase 1, the enzyme responsible for G protein alpha subunit deacylation in vivo, *J. Biol. Chem.* 277, 31740–31752.
43. Duncan, J. A., and Gilman, A. G. (1998) A cytoplasmic acyl-protein thioesterase that removes palmitate from G protein alpha subunits and p21(RAS), *J. Biol. Chem.* 273, 15830–15837.
44. Kleuss, C., and Krause, E. (2003) Galpha(s) is palmitoylated at the N-terminal glycine, *EMBO J.* 22, 826–832.
45. Dunphy, J. T., and Linder, M. E. (1998) Signalling functions of protein palmitoylation, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 1436, 245–261.
46. Hancock, J. F., Patterson, H., and Marshall, C. J. (1990) A polybasic domain or palmitoylation is required in addition to the CAAX motif to localize p21ras to the plasma membrane, *Cell* 63, 133–139.
47. McLaughlin, S., and Aderem, A. (1995) The myristoyl-electrostatic switch: a modulator of reversible protein-membrane interactions, *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 20, 272–276.
48. Morales, J., Fishburn, C. S., Wilson, P. T., and Bourne, H. R. (1998) Plasma membrane localization of G alpha z requires two signals, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 9, 1–14.
49. Resh, M. D. (1999) Fatty acylation of proteins: new insights into membrane targeting of myristoylated and palmitoylated proteins, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 1451, 1–16.
50. Hepler, J. R., Kozasa, T., Smrcka, A. V., Simon, M. I., Rhee, S. G., Sternweis, P. C., and Gilman, A. G. (1993) Purification from Sf9 cells and characterization of recombinant Gq alpha and G11 alpha. Activation of purified phospholipase C isozymes by G alpha subunits, *J. Biol. Chem.* 268, 14367–14375.
51. Evanko, D. S., Thiyagarajan, M. M., Siderovski, D. P., and Wedegaertner, P. B. (2001) Gbeta gamma isoforms selectively rescue plasma membrane localization and palmitoylation of mutant Galphas and Galphaq, *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 23945–23953.
52. Fishburn, C. S., Pollitt, S. K., and Bourne, H. R. (2000) Localization of a peripheral membrane protein: Gbetagamma targets Galpha(Z), *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 97, 1085–1090.
53. Evanko, D. S., Thiyagarajan, M. M., and Wedegaertner, P. B. (2000) Interaction with Gbetagamma is required for membrane targeting and palmitoylation of Galpha(s) and Galpha(q), *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 1327–1336.
54. Song, J., Hirschman, J., Gunn, K., and Dohlman, H. G. (1996) Regulation of membrane and subunit interactions by N-myristoylation of a G protein alpha subunit in yeast, *J. Biol. Chem.* 271, 20273–20283.
55. Gotta, M., and Ahringer, J. (2001) Distinct roles for Galpha and Gbetagamma in regulating spindle position and orientation in *Caenorhabditis elegans* embryos, *Nat. Cell Biol.* 3, 297–300.
56. Kosloff, M., Elia, N., Joel-Lamagor, T., Timberg, R., Zars, T. D., Hyde, D. R., Minke, B., and Selinger, Z. (2003) Regulation of light-dependent Gqalpha translocation and morphological changes in fly photoreceptors, *EMBO J.* 22, 459–468.
57. Elia, N., Frechter, S., Gedi, Y., Minke, B., and Selinger, Z. (2005) Excess of Gbetas over Gqalphas in vivo prevents dark, spontaneous activity of *Drosophila* photoreceptors, *J. Cell Biol.* 171, 517–526.
58. Murray, D., Hermida-Matsumoto, L., Buser, C. A., Tsang, J., Sigal, C. T., Ben-Tal, N., Honig, B., Resh, M. D., and McLaughlin, S. (1998) Electrostatics and the membrane association of Src: theory and experiment, *Biochemistry* 37, 2145–2159.
59. Sondek, J., Bohm, A., Lambright, D. G., Hamm, H. E., and Sigler, P. B. (1996) Crystal structure of a G-protein beta gamma dimer at 2.1 Å resolution, *Nature* 379, 369–374.
60. Matsuda, T., Takao, T., Shimonishi, Y., Murata, M., Asano, T., Yoshizawa, T., and Fukada, Y. (1994) Characterization of interactions between transducin alpha/beta gamma-subunits and lipid membranes, *J. Biol. Chem.* 269, 30358–30363.
61. Seitz, H. R., Heck, M., Hofmann, K. P., Alt, T., Pellaud, J., and Seelig, A. (1999) Molecular determinants of the reversible membrane anchorage of the G-protein transducin, *Biochemistry* 38, 7950–7960.
62. Murray, D., McLaughlin, S., and Honig, B. (2001) The role of electrostatic interactions in the regulation of the membrane association of G protein beta gamma heterodimers, *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 45153–45159.
63. Ben-Tal, N., Honig, B., Peitzsch, R. M., Denisov, G., and McLaughlin, S. (1996) Binding of small basic peptides to membranes containing acidic lipids: theoretical models and experimental results, *Biophys. J.* 71, 561–575.
64. Ben-Tal, N., Honig, B., Miller, C., and McLaughlin, S. (1997) Electrostatic binding of proteins to membranes. Theoretical predictions and experimental results with charybdotoxin and phospholipid vesicles, *Biophys. J.* 73, 1717–1727.
65. Kosloff, M., Elia, N., and Selinger, Z. (2002) Structural homology discloses a bifunctional structural motif at the N-termini of G alpha proteins, *Biochemistry* 41, 14518–14523.
66. Bernstein, L. S., Grillo, A. A., Loranger, S. S., and Linder, M. E. (2000) RGS4 binds to membranes through an amphipathic alpha-helix, *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 18520–18526.
67. Tu, Y., Woodson, J., and Ross, E. M. (2001) Binding of regulator of G protein signaling (RGS) proteins to phospholipid bilayers. Contribution of location and/or orientation to Gtpase-activating protein activity, *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 20160–20166.
68. Chen, C., Seow, K. T., Guo, K., Yaw, L. P., and Lin, S. C. (1999) The membrane association domain of RGS16 contains unique amphipathic features that are conserved in RGS4 and RGS5, *J. Biol. Chem.* 274, 19799–19806.
69. Hayashi, N., Matsubara, M., Titani, K., and Taniguchi, H. (1997) Circular dichroism and 1H nuclear magnetic resonance studies on the solution and membrane structures of GAP-43 calmodulin-binding domain, *J. Biol. Chem.* 272, 7639–7645.



70. Ohno, Y., Kihara, A., Sano, T., and Igarashi, Y. (2006) Intracellular localization and tissue-specific distribution of human and yeast DHHC cysteine-rich domain-containing proteins, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 1761, 474–483.
71. Fernandez-Hernando, C., Fukata, M., Bernatchez, P. N., Fukata, Y., Lin, M. I., Bretz, D. S., and Sessa, W. C. (2006) Identification of Golgi-localized acyl transferases that palmitoylate and regulate endothelial nitric oxide synthase, *J. Cell Biol.* 174, 369–377.
72. Dunphy, J. T., Greentree, W. K., Manahan, C. L., and Linder, M. E. (1996) G-protein palmitoyltransferase activity is enriched in plasma membranes, *J. Biol. Chem.* 271, 7154–7159.
73. Takida, S., and Wedegaertner, P. B. (2004) Exocytic pathway-independent plasma membrane targeting of heterotrimeric G proteins, *FEBS Lett.* 567, 209–213.
74. Gonzalo, S., and Linder, M. E. (1998) SNAP-25 palmitoylation and plasma membrane targeting require a functional secretory pathway, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 9, 585–597.
75. Dupre, D. J., Robitaille, M., Ethier, N., Villeneuve, L. R., Mamabachi, A. M., and Hebert, T. E. (2006) Seven transmembrane receptor core signaling complexes are assembled prior to plasma membrane trafficking, *J. Biol. Chem.* 281, 34561–34573.
76. Le-Niculescu, H., Niesman, I., Fischer, T., DeVries, L., and Farquhar, M. G. (2005) Identification and characterization of GIV, a novel G $\alpha$  i/s-interacting protein found on COPI, endoplasmic reticulum-Golgi transport vesicles, *J. Biol. Chem.* 280, 22012–22020.
77. Brown, D. A., and Rose, J. K. (1992) Sorting of GPI-anchored proteins to glycolipid-enriched membrane subdomains during transport to the apical cell surface, *Cell* 68, 533–544.
78. Parton, R. G. (1996) Caveolae and caveolins, *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* 8, 542–548.
79. Smart, E. J., Graf, G. A., McNiven, M. A., Sessa, W. C., Engelman, J. A., Scherer, P. E., Okamoto, T., and Lisanti, M. P. (1999) Caveolins, liquid-ordered domains, and signal transduction, *Mol. Cell Biol.* 19, 7289–7304.
80. Simons, K., and Toomre, D. (2000) Lipid rafts and signal transduction, *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 1, 31–39.
81. Allen, J. A., Halverson-Tamboli, R. A., and Rasenick, M. M. (2007) Lipid raft microdomains and neurotransmitter signaling, *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 8, 128–140.
82. Allen, J. A., Yu, J. Z., Donati, R. J., and Rasenick, M. M. (2005) Beta-adrenergic receptor stimulation promotes G  $\alpha$  s internalization through lipid rafts: a study in living cells, *Mol. Pharmacol.* 67, 1493–1504.
83. Huang, C., Hepler, J. R., Chen, L. T., Gilman, A. G., Anderson, R. G., and Mumby, S. M. (1997) Organization of G proteins and adenylyl cyclase at the plasma membrane, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 8, 2365–2378.
84. Sargiacomo, M., Sudol, M., Tang, Z., and Lisanti, M. P. (1993) Signal transducing molecules and glycosyl-phosphatidylinositol-linked proteins form a caveolin-rich insoluble complex in MDCK cells, *J. Cell Biol.* 122, 789–807.
85. Chang, W. J., Ying, Y. S., Rothberg, K. G., Hooper, N. M., Turner, A. J., Gambliel, H. A., De Gunzburg, J., Mumby, S. M., Gilman, A. G., and Anderson, R. G. (1994) Purification and characterization of smooth muscle cell caveolae, *J. Cell Biol.* 126, 127–138.
86. Lisanti, M. P., Scherer, P. E., Vidugiriene, J., Tang, Z., Hermanowski-Vosatka, A., Tu, Y. H., Cook, R. F., and Sargiacomo, M. (1994) Characterization of caveolin-rich membrane domains isolated from an endothelial-rich source: implications for human disease, *J. Cell Biol.* 126, 111–126.
87. Smart, E. J., Ying, Y. S., Mineo, C., and Anderson, R. G. (1995) A detergent-free method for purifying caveolae membrane from tissue culture cells, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 92, 10104–10108.
88. Milligan, G., Parenti, M., and Magee, A. I. (1995) The dynamic role of palmitoylation in signal transduction, *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 20, 181–187.
89. Shenoy-Scaria, A. M., Dietzen, D. J., Kwong, J., Link, D. C., and Lublin, D. M. (1994) Cysteine3 of Src family protein tyrosine kinase determines palmitoylation and localization in caveolae, *J. Cell Biol.* 126, 353–363.
90. Arni, S., Keilbaugh, S. A., Ostermeyer, A. G., and Brown, D. A. (1998) Association of GAP-43 with detergent-resistant membranes requires two palmitoylated cysteine residues, *J. Biol. Chem.* 273, 28478–28485.
91. Moffett, S., Brown, D. A., and Linder, M. E. (2000) Lipid-dependent targeting of G proteins into rafts, *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 2191–2198.
92. Galbiati, F., Volonte, D., Meani, D., Milligan, G., Lublin, D. M., Lisanti, M. P., and Parenti, M. (1999) The dually acylated NH<sub>2</sub>-terminal domain of g $\alpha$ 1 $\alpha$  is sufficient to target a green fluorescent protein reporter to caveolin-enriched plasma membrane domains. Palmitoylation of caveolin-1 is required for the recognition of dually acylated g-protein  $\alpha$  subunits in vivo, *J. Biol. Chem.* 274, 5843–5850.
93. Dunphy, J. T., Greentree, W. K., and Linder, M. E. (2001) Enrichment of G-protein palmitoyltransferase activity in low density membranes: in vitro reconstitution of G $\alpha$ 1 $\alpha$  to these domains requires palmitoyltransferase activity, *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 43300–43304.
94. Oh, P., and Schnitzer, J. E. (2001) Segregation of heterotrimeric G proteins in cell surface microdomains. G(q) binds caveolin to concentrate in caveolae, whereas G(i) and G(s) target lipid rafts by default, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 12, 685–698.
95. Li, S., Okamoto, T., Chun, M., Sargiacomo, M., Casanova, J. E., Hansen, S. H., Nishimoto, I., and Lisanti, M. P. (1995) Evidence for a regulated interaction between heterotrimeric G proteins and caveolin, *J. Biol. Chem.* 270, 15693–15701.
96. Rehm, A., and Ploegh, H. L. (1997) The betagamma subunits of heterotrimeric G proteins acquire detergent insolubility directly at the plasma membrane, *FEBS Lett.* 416, 39–44.
97. Scarlata, S. (2002) Regulation of the lateral association of phospholipase C $\beta$ 2 and G protein subunits by lipid rafts, *Biochemistry* 41, 7092–7099.
98. Pike, L. J. (2003) Lipid rafts: bringing order to chaos, *J. Lipid Res.* 44, 655–667.
99. Insel, P. A., Head, B. P., Ostrom, R. S., Patel, H. H., Swaney, J. S., Tang, C. M., and Roth, D. M. (2005) Caveolae and lipid rafts: G protein-coupled receptor signaling microdomains in cardiac myocytes, *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* 1047, 166–172.
100. Insel, P. A., Head, B. P., Patel, H. H., Roth, D. M., Bunday, R. A., and Swaney, J. S. (2005) Compartmentation of G-protein-coupled receptors and their signalling components in lipid rafts and caveolae, *Biochem. Soc. Trans.* 33, 1131–1134.
101. Bodin, S., Giuriato, S., Ragab, J., Humbel, B. M., Viala, C., Vieu, C., Chap, H., and Payastre, B. (2001) Production of phosphatidylinositol 3,4,5-trisphosphate and phosphatidic acid in platelet rafts: evidence for a critical role of cholesterol-enriched domains in human platelet activation, *Biochemistry* 40, 15290–15299.
102. Pike, L. J., and Miller, J. M. (1998) Cholesterol depletion delocalizes phosphatidylinositol biphosphate and inhibits hormone-stimulated phosphatidylinositol turnover, *J. Biol. Chem.* 273, 22298–22304.
103. Sabourin, T., Bastien, L., Bachvarov, D. R., and Marceau, F. (2002) Agonist-induced translocation of the kinin B(1) receptor to caveolae-related rafts, *Mol. Pharmacol.* 61, 546–553.
104. Miura, Y., Hanada, K., and Jones, T. L. (2001) G(s) signaling is intact after disruption of lipid rafts, *Biochemistry* 40, 15418–15423.
105. Rybin, V. O., Xu, X., Lisanti, M. P., and Steinberg, S. F. (2000) Differential targeting of beta-adrenergic receptor subtypes and adenylyl cyclase to cardiomyocyte caveolae. A mechanism to functionally regulate the cAMP signaling pathway, *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 41447–41457.
106. Xiang, Y., Rybin, V. O., Steinberg, S. F., and Kobilka, B. (2002) Caveolar localization dictates physiologic signaling of beta 2-adrenoceptors in neonatal cardiac myocytes, *J. Biol. Chem.* 277, 34280–34286.
107. Calvert, P. D., Strissel, K. J., Schiesser, W. E., Pugh, E. N., Jr., and Arshavsky, V. Y. (2006) Light-driven translocation of signaling proteins in vertebrate photoreceptors, *Trends Cell Biol.* 16, 560–568.
108. Ransnas, L. A., Svoboda, P., Jasper, J. R., and Insel, P. A. (1989) Stimulation of beta-adrenergic receptors of S49 lymphoma cells redistributes the  $\alpha$  subunit of the stimulatory G protein between cytosol and membranes, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 86, 7900–7903.
109. Levis, M. J., and Bourne, H. R. (1992) Activation of the  $\alpha$  subunit of Gs in intact cells alters its abundance, rate of degradation, and membrane avidity, *J. Cell Biol.* 119, 1297–1307.
110. Thiagarajan, M. M., Bigras, E., Van Tol, H. H., Hebert, T. E., Evanko, D. S., and Wedegaertner, P. B. (2002) Activation-induced subcellular redistribution of G  $\alpha$ 1 $\alpha$  is dependent upon its unique N-terminus, *Biochemistry* 41, 9470–9484.
111. Hynes, T. R., Mervine, S. M., Yost, E. A., Sabo, J. L., and Berlot, C. H. (2004) Live cell imaging of Gs and the beta2-adrenergic receptor demonstrates that both  $\alpha$ 1 $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ 1 $\gamma$ 7 internal-

- ize upon stimulation and exhibit similar trafficking patterns that differ from that of the beta2-adrenergic receptor, *J. Biol. Chem.* 279, 44101–44112.
112. Wedegaertner, P. B., Bourne, H. R., and von Zastrow, M. (1996) Activation-induced subcellular redistribution of Gs alpha, *Mol. Biol. Cell* 7, 1225–1233.
  113. Yu, J. Z., and Rasenick, M. M. (2002) Real-time visualization of a fluorescent G(alpha)(s): dissociation of the activated G protein from plasma membrane, *Mol. Pharmacol.* 61, 352–359.
  114. Wedegaertner, P. B., and Bourne, H. R. (1994) Activation and depalmitoylation of Gs alpha, *Cell* 77, 1063–1070.
  115. Cronin, M. A., Diao, F., and Tsunoda, S. (2004) Light-dependent subcellular translocation of Gqalpha in *Drosophila* photoreceptors is facilitated by the photoreceptor-specific myosin III NINAC, *J. Cell. Sci.* 117, 4797–4806.
  116. Drmot, T., Novotny, J., Kim, G. D., Eidne, K. A., Milligan, G., and Svoboda, P. (1998) Agonist-induced internalization of the G protein G11alpha and thyrotropin-releasing hormone receptors proceed on different time scales, *J. Biol. Chem.* 273, 21699–21707.
  117. Miserey-Lenkei, S., Lenkei, Z., Parnot, C., Corvol, P., and Clauser, E. (2001) A functional enhanced green fluorescent protein (EGFP)-tagged angiotensin II at(1a) receptor recruits the endogenous Galphaq/11 protein to the membrane and induces its specific internalization independently of receptor-g protein coupling in HEK-293 cells, *Mol. Endocrinol.* 15, 294–307.
  118. Drmot, T., Novotny, J., Gould, G. W., Svoboda, P., and Milligan, G. (1999) Visualization of distinct patterns of subcellular redistribution of the thyrotropin-releasing hormone receptor-1 and gqalpha /G11alpha induced by agonist stimulation, *Biochem. J.* 340, 529–538.
  119. Hughes, T. E., Zhang, H., Logothetis, D. E., and Berlot, C. H. (2001) Visualization of a functional Galphaq-green fluorescent protein fusion in living cells. Association with the plasma membrane is disrupted by mutational activation and by elimination of palmitoylation sites, but not by activation mediated by receptors or A1F4, *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 4227–4235.
  120. Akgoz, M., Kalyanaraman, V., and Gautam, N. (2004) Receptor-mediated reversible translocation of the G protein betagamma complex from the plasma membrane to the Golgi complex, *J. Biol. Chem.* 279, 51541–51544.
  121. Akgoz, M., Kalyanaraman, V., and Gautam, N. (2006) G protein betagamma complex translocation from plasma membrane to Golgi complex is influenced by receptor gamma subunit interaction, *Cell. Signalling* 18, 1758–68.
  122. Azpiazu, I., Akgoz, M., Kalyanaraman, V., and Gautam, N. (2005) G protein betagamma11 complex translocation is induced by Gi, Gq and Gs coupling receptors and is regulated by the alpha subunit type, *Cell. Signalling* 18, 1190–1200.
  123. Wedegaertner, P. (2003) Reversible Palmitoylation in G-Protein Signaling, in *Handbook of Cell Signaling* (Bradshaw, R. A., and Dennis, E. A., Eds.) pp 651–656, Elsevier Science, New York.
  124. Chen, C. A., and Manning, D. R. (2001) Regulation of G proteins by covalent modification, *Oncogene* 20, 1643–1652.
  125. Chen, C. A., and Manning, D. R. (2000) Regulation of galphai palmitoylation by activation of the 5-hydroxytryptamine-1A receptor, *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 23516–23522.
  126. Bhamre, S., Wang, H. Y., and Friedman, E. (1998) Serotonin-mediated palmitoylation and depalmitoylation of G alpha proteins in rat brain cortical membranes, *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 286, 1482–1489.
  127. Gurdal, H., Seasholtz, T. M., Wang, H. Y., Brown, R. D., Johnson, M. D., and Friedman, E. (1997) Role of G alpha q or G alpha o proteins in alpha 1-adrenoceptor subtype-mediated responses in Fischer 344 rat aorta, *Mol. Pharmacol.* 52, 1064–1070.
  128. Iiri, T., Backlund, P. S., Jr., Jones, T. L., Wedegaertner, P. B., and Bourne, H. R. (1996) Reciprocal regulation of Gs alpha by palmitate and the beta gamma subunit, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 93, 14592–14597.
  129. Evanko, D. S., Thiagarajan, M. M., Takida, S., and Wedegaertner, P. B. (2005) Loss of association between activated Galphaq and Gbetagamma disrupts receptor-dependent and receptor-independent signaling, *Cell. Signalling* 17, 1218–1228.
  130. Bunemann, M., Frank, M., and Lohse, M. J. (2003) Gi protein activation in intact cells involves subunit rearrangement rather than dissociation, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 100, 16077–16082.
  131. Klein, S., Reuveni, H., and Levitzki, A. (2000) Signal transduction by a nondissociable heterotrimeric yeast G protein, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 97, 3219–3223.
  132. Levitzki, A., and Klein, S. (2002) G-protein subunit dissociation is not an integral part of G-protein action, *ChemBioChem.* 3, 815–818.
  133. Degtyarev, M. Y., Spiegel, A. M., and Jones, T. L. (1993) Increased palmitoylation of the Gs protein alpha subunit after activation by the beta-adrenergic receptor or cholera toxin, *J. Biol. Chem.* 268, 23769–23772.
  134. Kassai, H., Aiba, A., Nakao, K., Nakamura, K., Katsuki, M., Xiong, W. H., Yau, K. W., Imai, H., Shichida, Y., Satomi, Y., Takao, T., Okano, T., and Fukada, Y. (2005) Farnesylation of retinal transducin underlies its translocation during light adaptation, *Neuron* 47, 529–539.
  135. Kerov, V., Chen, D., Moussaif, M., Chen, Y. J., Chen, C. K., and Artemyev, N. O. (2005) Transducin activation state controls its light-dependent translocation in rod photoreceptors, *J. Biol. Chem.* 280, 41069–41076.
  136. Nair, K. S., Hanson, S. M., Mendez, A., Gurevich, E. V., Kennedy, M. J., Shestopalov, V. I., Vishnivetskiy, S. A., Chen, J., Hurley, J. B., Gurevich, V. V., and Slepak, V. Z. (2005) Light-dependent redistribution of arrestin in vertebrate rods is an energy-independent process governed by protein-protein interactions, *Neuron* 46, 555–567.
  137. Pesanova, Z., Novotny, J., Cerny, J., Milligan, G., and Svoboda, P. (1999) Thyrotropin-releasing hormone-induced depletion of G(q)alpha/G(11)alpha proteins from detergent-insensitive membrane domains, *FEBS Lett.* 464, 35–40.
  138. Sokolov, M., Lyubarsky, A. L., Strissel, K. J., Savchenko, A. B., Govardovskii, V. I., Pugh, E. N., Jr., and Arshavsky, V. Y. (2002) Massive light-driven translocation of transducin between the two major compartments of rod cells: a novel mechanism of light adaptation, *Neuron* 34, 95–106.
  139. Slessareva, J. E., Rout, S. M., Temple, B., Bankaitis, V. A., and Dohlman, H. G. (2006) Activation of the phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase Vps34 by a G protein alpha subunit at the endosome, *Cell* 126, 191–203.
  140. Jamora, C., Yamanouye, N., Van Lint, J., Laudenslager, J., Vandenheede, J. R., Faulkner, D. J., and Malhotra, V. (1999) Gbetagamma-mediated regulation of Golgi organization is through the direct activation of protein kinase D, *Cell* 98, 59–68.
  141. Diaz Anel, A. M., and Malhotra, V. (2005) PKCeta is required for beta1gamma2/beta3gamma2- and PKD-mediated transport to the cell surface and the organization of the Golgi apparatus, *J. Cell Biol.* 169, 83–91.
  142. Bard, F., and Malhotra, V. (2006) The formation of TGN-to-plasma-membrane transport carriers, *Annu. Rev. Cell. Dev. Biol.* 22, 439–455.
  143. Kino, T., Tiulpakov, A., Ichijo, T., Chheng, L., Kozasa, T., and Chrousos, G. P. (2005) G protein beta interacts with the glucocorticoid receptor and suppresses its transcriptional activity in the nucleus, *J. Cell Biol.* 169, 885–896.