This Week . . .

☑ Senate Subcommittee Slashes Fulbright Appropriation
☐ More Funds for AIDS: More Involvement for Social Scientists?
☑ Congress Returns: Is Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Dead?
☐ Help Needed on NSF Appropriations
☐ Sources of Research Support: Nuclear Regulatory Commission

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE SLASHES FULBRIGHT APPROPRIATION

On August 12 the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies reduced the appropriation for the United States Information Agency's educational and cultural exchange programs from a post-Gramm-Rudman-Hollings (GRH) level of $149 million (including carry-over funds from FY 1985) to $120 million. On August 14 the full Senate Appropriations Committee ratified the Subcommittee action.

The educational and cultural exchange programs include: Fulbright Scholarships, academic and visitor exchanges, the Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowships (one year of graduate training for promising mid-career professionals from Third World countries), the Congress-Bundestag Exchanges (mutual full scholarships for year-long academic mainstay programs between Germany and the United States), and private sector exchanges.

The full Committee defeated on a 10-10 vote an amendment by Sen. Dale Bumpers (D-AR) to restore approximately one-half of the cut by shifting funds from the National Endowment for Democracy. Sen. David Pryor (D-AR) sent a letter to all his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee urging them to restore the funding. Pryor called the educational and exchange programs "one of the most effective foreign policy tools we have. We can try to impose democracy through force, diplomacy or propaganda, but the most effective way is through example.... Educational exchange programs allow students from other countries to come to the U.S.
and observe first-hand what democracy is all about. Both Bumpers and Pryor have vowed to carry their fight for these programs to the Senate floor.

The Fulbright Program, which is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year, has provided 155,000 people the opportunity to study, teach, and conduct research in 120 participating countries. Among the distinguished Americans who have won Fulbright Scholarships are the presidents of Harvard University and the University of Chicago, Derek Bok and Hanna Gray; economists Martin Feldstein and Milton Friedman; Nobel laureate scientists Hans Bethe, James Watson, and Joshua Lederberg; Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY); and Michael Armacost, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

The House has appropriated $144 million for these programs in FY 1987. The Administration requested $166.6 million. The action by the Senate Committee represents a determination by Congress that international affairs programs are prime candidates for reductions to meet GRH targets. Senator Rudman (R-NH) is Chairman of the Subcommittee that cut the USIA programs. Social scientists should urge their Senators to support the effort to restore exchange program funding during full Senate consideration of the appropriations.

MORE FUNDS FOR AIDS: MORE INVOLVEMENT FOR SOCIAL SCIENTISTS?

Congressional alarm over grim forecasts for the acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) epidemic, heightened by unusually candid remarks by Public Health Service officials on the urgent need for higher funding than the amounts in the administration's FY 1987 request, is highlighted by appropriations for the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Regardless of the final reconciliation adjustments, federal spending on AIDS prevention education, public education, and all areas of research will increase dramatically in FY 1987. Earlier this year COSSA, along with other groups, testified before Congress advocating greater support for AIDS research and prevention education. (See Update, May 9, 1986.) The chart below shows the distribution of AIDS funds at HHS (shown in millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current FY 1986</th>
<th>Voted by House</th>
<th>Senate Approp/Cmte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Resources &amp; Services Admin.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers for Disease Control</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>134.7</td>
<td>198.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Mental Health</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Drug Abuse</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute on Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Alcoholism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Coordinator</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Department Management</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$224.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$336.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In many instances the legislators overruled or ignored the plans and budgets submitted by the administration for FY 1987. The administration's proposal of $45.4 million for the Center for Disease Control's (CDC) AIDS effort was virtually doubled by the legislators. The refusal for the second year to centralize federal AIDS programs in HHS' Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health seems to reflect a concern that the office might not concentrate on areas the Congress has deemed as high priorities.

The reports of both appropriations committees carry report language pushing for increased efforts on the prevention education and public information front. Importantly, from COSSA's point of view, social and behavioral science research, which should strengthen the educational and intervention efforts, is also emphasized. For example, the Senate on NIMH: 'Expanded efforts are particularly needed in fiscal year 1987 in the mental health area that focus specifically on the psychological, social, behavioral, and neuropsychological aspects of AIDS and HTLV-III infections, certain high-risk ethnic minority populations, and pediatric AIDS.'

The House report also specifically prods the CDC to make its educational efforts more effective through increased use of community-based organizations rather than official state and local agencies. Many expert analysts suggest that educational efforts, particularly for intravenous drug users, are largely ineffective because state and local health agencies cannot successfully reach those at risk, and do not have credible means or strategies for changing risk-taking behaviors.

In an August 22 Science editorial, "Scientists' Roles in AIDS Control", COSSA Executive Director David Jenness pressed the contention of the Consortium and others that the knowledge and expertise of social and behavioral scientists are not being fully utilized in the nation's response to AIDS. Jenness wrote: "Social scientists have a crucial role, both preparing for societal stresses of major proportions and in devising effective means for intervention and prevention of illness. They know how to elicit reliable reports of personal behavior, knowledge, and attitudes; how to reach special cultural groups; how social networks, peer interactions, and voluntary associations function within the general society; how political processes work at the local level; and how to effect attitude change. They have studied risk-seeking and addictive patterns and the basis for cooperative rather than selfish behavior." The editorial continues: "Coordinated intervention projects on a demonstration basis must be undertaken in communities across the country, without delay. However, as demands on public health professionals and social scientists increase, it will be essential to have designed already ways to evaluate what is done in the field. An effort by the National Research Council or similar organization will be needed for sound scientific evaluation of health promotion and disease prevention projects by government or by private groups....

"It is also important that a program of directed applied research be started, covering, for example, how to reach
particular segments of the population, how to protect the medical care system from intolerable strain, and how to deal with persons who may be infectious for the rest of their lives. The National Institutes of Health's system of investigator-initiated research proposals is not efficient for this purpose; a central coordinating mechanism is needed. It is also crucial, however, that NIH and other agencies fund longer range basic research. Ironically, the AIDS crisis may stimulate work on fundamental research topics where little is known: the malleability of sexual behavior in adult life, psychobiological aspects of risk-seeking, or community organization and cultural change as a response to external threat."

[COSSA's recommendation is that someone with appropriate social science skills coordinate in HHS the research being done in different places, thus interrelating fundamental and applied research for the sake of effective intervention and prevention. COSSA takes no position on whether or not AIDS funding should be routed through one office, and then disbursed.]

Last April, an intensive assessment of national strategies to combat AIDS was launched by the National Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Medicine. Two high-level panels of experts were appointed, one is reviewing the research response (adequacy of resources and participation of appropriate researchers, etc); the second is looking at public health aspects (comparative costs of various treatment programs, impact of educational efforts, etc.). Several social scientists and medical and public health specialists are serving on the panels. Knowledgeable observers as well as policy officials are intently awaiting the release of the report as an impetus and benchmark for planning further steps in the federal response to AIDS. Roy Widdus, staff director of the study, indicated that the final report, tentatively entitled "Confronting AIDS: Directions for Public Health, Health Care, and Research," prepared by a 12-member steering committee, is expected to be released at the end next month by the National Academy Press.

Following the Science editorial, health and science writers from national newspapers contacted COSSA, and calls have been received from university-based social scientists who are prepared to work on the community level as well as to study long-range consequences of the epidemic. Now that Congress has increased funding, much will depend on agenda such as that expected from the IOM report.

CONGRESS RETURNS: IS GRAMM-RUDMAN-HOLLINGS DEAD?

Congress returns from its August district work period on September 8. Since it left Washington on August 15, a number of events have occurred that raise questions concerning the future of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings (GRH) deficit reduction act. In this election year Congress has set an adjournment target of October 3. Members will probably once again face the annual flirtation with a 'stopping-the-government crisis' as the fiscal year ends on September 30 without the passage of annual appropriations bills.
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On August 15 the snapshot of the FY 1987 deficit required by GRH was made by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). CBO projected a deficit of $170.6 billion while OMB estimated $156.2 billion. Averaging the two leaves $163.4 billion, about $19 billion above the target of $144 billion in GRH. However, since GRH includes a $10 billion leeway, it appears that Congress needs to find only $9.4 billion in budget reductions or revenue increases or a combination thereof to meet the target. [The Supreme Court cut the General Accounting Office (GAO) out of the picture as the final arbiter of the projected deficit, but Rep. Jack Brooks (D-TX), Chairman of the Government Operations Committee, has asked GAO to compute its own estimate of the deficit.]

If an automatic reduction sequester was triggered under the $163.4 billion projection, it would require a 5.6% across-the-board reduction in defense programs and a 7.6% across-the-board reduction for non-defense programs. (The difference occurs because more defense funding is exempt from GRH reductions than non-defense funding.) Under this formula, for example, budget authority in FY 1987 for the National Science Foundation's Research and Related Activities would be reduced by $98 million, research at the National Institute on Aging would lose $22 million, and the National Endowment for the Humanities would have $10 million less to spend.

Despite all these projections a consensus seems to be emerging that the automatic sequestration provision of GRH will not be triggered. At a panel at the American Political Science Association convention in Washington four people who have lived with GRH, Tom Polgar, Legislative Director for Sen. Warren Rudman (R-NH), Wendell Primus, Budget Analyst for the House Ways and Means Committee, Harry Havens, Assistant Comptroller General in the General Accounting Office, and Robert Reischauer, former Deputy Director of CBO and now at the Brookings Institution, all agreed that Congress is likely to avoid sequestration by a variety of measures referred to as 'smoke and mirrors. Reischauer noted: "It is in nobody's interest to have automatic cuts to save a small amount of money [$9.4 billion]." The methods available to Congress include: using the $11 billion revenue windfall predicted for the first year of tax reform; changing Medicare formulas; assuming the sale of Conrail; selling assets of the federal government; and assuming limited pay raises for federal workers. Yet there is a complication here. The $163.4 billion deficit estimate is based on FY 1986 appropriations. So far, those FY 1987 appropriations bills that have cleared Congress or its Committees, include, in general, increases over FY 1986 appropriations. If deficit projections based on FY 1987 appropriations are used sequestration may be triggered.

The weakness of the economy provides another method to escape from GRH. The Act includes a provision stating: if the Department of Commerce reports actual real growth in the economy to be less than 1% for two consecutive quarters, the automatic sequestration
procedure is voided. Growth for the second quarter of 1986 was under 1% and there are economists who think this may occur again in the third quarter. According to Reischauer, Herbert Stein, Murray Weidenbaum, and Alan Greenspan (all former chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers) all agreed that meeting the $144 billion target in FY 1987 would require too radical a contraction of the economy from an expected FY 1986 deficit of over $220 billion. Therefore, it may now be politically acceptable for Members of Congress to use the weakness of the economy as an excuse not to reach the GRH deficit reduction targets.

In addition, the attempt by Sens. Phil Gramm (R-TX), Rudman, and Ernest Hollings (D-SC) to remedy the Supreme Court's objection to GAO's role by giving OMB the power to make the final estimate of the deficit projection remains bogged down because of what Wendell Primus described as the House Democratic leadership's huge distrust of OMB. Before Congress left, House Speaker Thomas O'Neill (D-MA) did indicate he might accept an enhanced role for OMB, if specific restrictions were spelled out. The Senate has complied to some extent in its version of the legislation raising the debt ceiling. The House leadership wants more restrictions.

Further complicating matters are reports, including one from the Congressional Research Service (CRS), claiming that CBO and OMB have used overly optimistic economic forecasts in the past. CRS noted: "If CBO and OMB systematically understate federal deficit projections due to overly optimistic economic forecasts, Congress could approve policies that would later breach the GRH deficit targets, requiring still larger reduction steps in subsequent years." OMB is predicting real economic growth of 4.2% in FY 1987 while CBO predicts 3.6%. These potentially optimistic assumptions could indeed get us over the FY 1987 sequestration hump, but create problems further down the road.

Help Needed on NSF Appropriations

Congress will have less than one month to appropriate funds to run the government in FY 1987. All indications are that once again legislation known as a Continuing Resolution (CR) will become the vehicle to solve this problem. Of the 13 total appropriations bills, the full House has passed 10 and the remaining 3 have passed the Appropriations Committee. The full Senate has passed only 2 bills, 7 have passed the Appropriations Committee, and 4 have not even been marked-up at the subcommittee level.

The HUD-Independent Agencies appropriation, which includes funds for the National Science Foundation (NSF), has had its budget request reduced by the House Committee by $136 million. The Senate Subcommittee has yet to markup. Social scientists are urged to write or call Senators Jake Garn (R-UT), Chairman of the appropriations subcommittee, and Patrick Leahy (D-VT), Ranking Member, advocating funding of NSF at the administration's requested level. (See Update, August 22, 1986.)
SOURCES OF RESEARCH SUPPORT: NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

COSSA provides this information as a service and encourages readers to contact the agency rather than COSSA for more information.

Human Factors Program

The Human Factors Program of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) supports research relating to the public understanding of nuclear safety, practical knowledge and technical information concerning nuclear technology, and the protection of public safety. The program includes, but is not limited to, support of professional meetings, symposia, and conferences, as well as research projects. Projects are usually quite technical in nature.

Areas of research which may be of interest to social and behavioral scientists include behavioral observation/control, personnel evaluation and performance, psychological testing, value-impact analysis, and economic incentives. In recent years few awards have been made for social and behavioral science topics. However, research proposals in these areas are welcome. Prospective applicants are encouraged to contact the Human Factors Office with proposal ideas.

Budget: The FY 1986 budget is approximately $1.2 million. Of this amount, 20% to 25% goes to unsolicited proposals.

Application/Review Process: Most proposals are unsolicited. It is important to contact the program manager to discuss prospective proposals. The Division of Contracts of the NRC routes proposals to the proper offices; often more than one office reviews incoming proposals. The review process is conducted by NRC staff and takes approximately 60 to 90 days. Final funding decisions are made by the branch chiefs.

Funding Mechanisms: Any individual or organization is eligible to receive funding through this program. Most funds are awarded through contracts, although some grants are awarded as well.

Contact: Daniel Jones
Human Factors Issues Branch
Division of Human Factors Technology, AR-5200
Washington, DC 20555
301/492-4879
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