



INSPECTOR GENERAL  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-4704

August 8, 2008

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
(COMPTROLLER/CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER)  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (FINANCIAL  
MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (FINANCIAL  
MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE  
(FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)  
DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (ADVANCED  
SYSTEMS AND CONCEPTS)  
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH  
PROJECTS AGENCY  
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT  
DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE

SUBJECT: Inspector General of the Department of Defense Report No. D-2008-110,  
"The Cost, Oversight, and Impact of Congressional Earmarks Less Than  
\$15 Million," July 11, 2008


We are revising the report to address the Army Ultra High Illumination System earmark. In March 2008 Army officials told us that there was no requirement for the Night Hunter/Night Hunter II. In addition, the Army officials indicated the earmark funding was on Army withhold and funding had not been obligated to date. Since the issuance of the report on July 11, 2008, Army officials have provided new information to our office. The FY 2007 Army Ultra High Illumination System earmark was used to procure the Night Hunter/Night Hunter II in a November 2007 contract action. Because of the new information, we are incorporating the following updates to the subject report that is located on our Internet site at <http://www.dodig.mil/Audit/reports/index.html>.

We are revising the last bullet "Specifically, we identified 5 earmarks..." on the Results in Brief page. The "5" earmarks are now "4." We are revising the last paragraph on page 4 to delete the sentence "DoD respondents answered that only 1 of the earmarks selected did not support the DoD mission." We are also revising the next sentence, "We identified through audit analysis..." The sentence now reads, "We did identify through analysis four earmarks that did not support the DoD mission." In Table 1 "Earmarks Not Supporting DoD Mission" on page 5, we are removing "Army-Ultra High Illumination System." The total value amount of sampled earmarks not supporting the DoD mission has changed from \$18.1 million to \$16.1 million. We are also removing on page 5 the paragraph titled "1. Army-Ultra High Illumination System." We are renumbering the subsequent four paragraphs.

We are revising the Summary paragraph “However, we did identify five earmarks that did not support DoD mission...” on page 7. The five earmarks are now four.

We are revising Appendix B “Summary of Earmarks Reviewed by Military Department and Agency.” We are changing the Army response of “Does Earmark Advance the DoD Mission?” from “1” to “0.”

If you have any questions on the changes, please contact me at (703) 601-5868 or Ms. Amy J. Frontz at (303) 676-7392.



Patricia A. Marsh, CPA

Assistant Inspector General

Defense Financial Auditing Service