reductions than now planned would risk destroying the force's high quality. Accordingly, we will program base force levels as follows:

**Nuclear Forces:** 1B-52 and B-1 bombers; 550 ICBMs; and 18 SSBNs

**Conventional Forces:**
- **Army:** 12 active, 6 reserve, and 2 cadre divisions
- **Navy:** 12 aircraft carrier battle groups with 11 active and 2 reserve air wings; approximately 450 total ships
- **Marine Corps:** 3 active Marine Expeditionary Forces and one reserve Marine division and wing
- **Air Force:** 15.25 active and 11.25 reserve fighter wings, plus conventional bomber capability including 20 B-2s

(U) These forces can and will be provided with not greater than the following military end strengths:

- **Army:** 536,000 active; 567,400 reserve
- **Navy:** 501,200 active; 117,800 reserve
- **Marine Corps:** 159,100 active; 34,900 reserve
- **Air Force:** 430,300 active; 200,000 reserve

(U) Required military personnel will be maintained in that component of the Total Force -- active or reserve -- in which they can effectively accomplish required missions, quickly, with minimum casualties; and at the least cost. This generally requires forces for forward presence (including an associated CONUS rotation advisors)." Air Force too would delete as "unnecessary. Given the debate over defense budget levels, the key point here centers on faster reductions".

1 Joint Staff, Acquisition and ASD/PA&E would cite B-2 here. Air Force no comment. See also note 2 on p. 35

2 PA&E would change to read "3 (-)" MEFs and "one (-)" division/ wing Rationale: "to avoid the impression that the reductions caused no loss in capability". This is a valid point, but USMC and Joint Staff would likely object, and the change would constitute an OSD redefinition of the base force to be avoided here. Also, only one of the MEFs is being substantially reduced in strength. PA&E also proposed adding the training carrier to the list -- rejected.

3 PDASO (SO/LIC) proposes inserting here 7 lines of text detailing SOF levels. Might satisfy them to replace the brief SOF cite of earlier drafts, in the Crisis Response section.

4 ASD/RA would delete "quickly, with..." Rationale: "It may not be necessary for units to accomplish their missions quickly, but rather according to the appropriate deployment schedules. Furthermore, if units are mission-ready,..." Response: we could substitute "within appropriate deployment times" for "quickly" but the real point -- the ability to end hostilities quickly -- would be lost (and indeed could be clarified by replacing "accomplish required missions" with "end hostilities").