

Integrity Committee

Council of the Inspectors General for Integrity and Efficiency

935 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Room 3973
Washington, D.C. 20535-0001

February 22, 2011

Commander John G. Hammerstrom, USN (Ret.)
P.O. Box 860
Tavernier, FL 33070-0860

IC# 629

Dear Commander Hammerstrom:

On November 13, 2010, you wrote Mark Jones, Executive Director, Council of the Inspectors General for Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), seeking further review of the issues presented with your earlier complaint about wrongdoing within the Department of Defense (DOD) Office of Inspector General (OIG). Mr. Jones referred your letter for response by the Integrity Committee.(IC).

As background, the IC initially reviewed your complaint about misconduct on the part of the DOD OIG in October, 2009. The IC concluded that the complaint did not meet its threshold standard for further review and referred the complaint to the DOD Inspector General (IG) for his information and any action he deemed appropriate. In doing so, the IC saw the decisions made by the DOG OIG in the substantive matter as being within the discretion of an Inspector General (IG).

The IC is established as a component of the CIGIE under Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-409 of October 14, 2008, 122 Stat 4302). The IC's purpose is to receive and review complaints of wrongdoing that concern an Inspector General (IG) who is a member of the CIGIE or designated staff members of that IG's staff. Under its Policies and Procedures, as a threshold standard, the IC will review each complaint within its purview and determine whether the allegation substantially involves administrative misconduct (defined as a violation of law, rule, or regulation; gross mismanagement; gross waste of funds; or abuse of authority in the exercise of official duties or while acting under color of office) or potentially involves conduct so serious that it may undermine the independence or integrity reasonably expected of an IG or OIG senior staff member.

In your recent letter to Mr. Jones, you assert that the DOD IG and the Department of the Navy may have conspired in a cover-up involving the *2003 Environmental Assessment for Fleet Support and Infrastructure Improvements at NAS Key West*. The IC did not find support for your assertion that there may have been a conspiracy between the DOD IG and the Department of Navy when it reviewed your complaint. A proper course action for the IC under its Policies and Procedures is to refer the complaint to the IG for the IG's further review if the complaint does not meet the IC's threshold standard. The IC chose that option in an effort to resolve your complaint.

Commander John G. Hammerstrom, USN (Ret.)

The IC determined that based on available information the DOD IG was not precluded from conducting a further objective review of the matters you allege.

The IC regrets your dissatisfaction with its handling of your complaint, but believes your complaint was handled appropriately.

Sincerely,



Kevin L. Perkins

Chair, Integrity Committee