1. "20% (or whatever) success rate is the minimum acceptable." Doesn't it depend on the reason why? If everyone submits five proposals instead of one proposal, with no other changes in the system, the selection rate plummets but there is no real problem that needs fixing (other than the fear that drove everyone to submit five proposals). Or if a bunch of previously state and privately funded researchers start proposing for Federal support, then the problem is not necessarily one that needs a Federal solution. The reason driving the change in selection rates matters.

2. "The decreased selection rate is due to reduced funding for competed research." Although true for NSF astronomy and NASA heliophysics (Todd's target program), it is not true for NASA astrophysics.

3. "More resources need to be allotted to competed research programs." Implying that the solution is increased funding for competed programs, without any reference to what that does to the rest of the portfolio or a need to maintain program balance within fixed budgets, ignores all the other parts of the Federal system needed to enable compelling, world class research. If the balance between competed research and everything else (missions, technology, capabilities, etc.) is the same now as when you thought things were good (as I can show it is in NASA astrophysics), what is the argument that we should decrease investment in those other areas to restore selection rates in competed programs?