

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-3304

March 26, 2026

Brigadier General Maurice O. Barnett
Commanding General
United States Army Cadet Command and Fort Knox
204 1st Cavalry Regiment Road, Bldg 1002
Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121

Dear Brigadier General Barnett,

Thank you for your December 15, 2025, response regarding the reclassification of the Bull City Battalion.

As these changes directly affect our district, with all three impacted institutions located within its boundaries, the office seeks a clearer understanding of the justification and implementation of this decision.

We appreciate your explanation that the Army is reclassifying 52 ROTC host units due to workforce reductions, budget constraints, and declining officer production, and that this decision followed what was described as a “comprehensive review” considering program production, proximity to host units, and enrollment trends. We also acknowledge your assurance that cadets will remain eligible for scholarships and commissioning through the extension unit model.

In your response, you note that “the DRP employees began administrative leave in March 2025, and the associated civilian pay was removed from USACC’s budget,” and that officer production has declined “17 percent since 2020 with associated reductions in program funding and assigned military personnel.” While this provides important context regarding broader fiscal and personnel pressures, it does not explain why reclassification of this specific battalion was required, nor how this action represents the least disruptive or most cost-effective option for programs within our district. As such, the connection between these system-wide trends and the district-level implementation decision remains unclear.

Several issues raised in our November 24, 2025, letter therefore remain unaddressed.

First, the justification for this reclassification remains incomplete.

While your response cites reductions in civilian workforce and overall officer production, it does not provide the underlying analysis demonstrating why reclassification of Duke is the least disruptive or most cost-effective option. Specifically, the response does not identify funding offsets, cost comparisons, or alternatives considered, nor does it explain how secondary impacts such as increased travel burden, administrative complexity, or recruiting effects were evaluated.

Second, lawful implementation safeguards have not been demonstrated.

Although your letter states that students may continue participating “in the same manner” and notes the historical use of host and extension models, it does not address how the loss of Duke’s on-site Professor of Military Science and civilian support positions will be mitigated in practice. The response does not assess retention or attrition risk, potential training degradation, or the specific impact on NCCU cadets facing increased travel time and reduced local support. Additionally, no safeguards, transition plan, or accountability measures were identified to ensure officer development outcomes are preserved during implementation.

Finally, while your response references a “comprehensive review,” no data, metrics, or documentation were provided to substantiate that review or to demonstrate how stakeholder feedback and program performance outcomes informed the final decision.

To complete the record, we respectfully request additional information addressing:

1. The cost and funding analysis supporting the reclassification, including alternatives considered.
2. Any assessment conducted regarding retention, attrition, or training impacts on affected cadets.
3. The safeguards or mitigation measures that will be implemented to preserve program quality during the transition.

Our intent is not to question Cadet Command’s authority, but to ensure that a decision with direct district-level impact is supported by a complete justification and a clearly articulated implementation framework.

We would appreciate receiving this information within 30 days to allow the office to assess potential impacts on cadets and district institutions prior to further implementation. We would also appreciate an acknowledgment confirming receipt of this letter.

Thank you for your continued engagement. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,



Valerie P. Foushee
Member of Congress