



# U.S. Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General

---

## Report to Congress on Implementation of Section 1001 of the USA PATRIOT Act

*(as required by Section 1001(3) of Public Law 107-56)*

August 2013

Section 1001 of the USA PATRIOT Act (Patriot Act), Public Law 107-56, directs the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ or Department) to undertake a series of actions related to claims of civil rights or civil liberties violations allegedly committed by DOJ employees. It also requires the OIG to provide semiannual reports to Congress on the implementation of the OIG's responsibilities under Section 1001. This report, the 23rd since enactment of the legislation in October 2001, summarizes the OIG's Section 1001-related activities from January 1, 2013, through June 30, 2013.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The OIG is an independent entity within the DOJ that reports to both the Attorney General and Congress. The OIG's mission is to investigate allegations of waste, fraud, and abuse in DOJ programs and personnel and to promote economy and efficiency in DOJ operations.

The OIG has jurisdiction to review programs and personnel in all DOJ components, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS), and the U.S. Attorneys' Offices.<sup>1</sup>

The OIG consists of the Immediate Office of the Inspector General and the following divisions and offices:

- **Audit Division** conducts independent audits of Department programs, computer systems, and financial statements.
- **Evaluation and Inspections Division** conducts program and management reviews that involve on-site inspection, statistical analysis, and other techniques to review Department programs and activities and make recommendations for improvement.
- **Investigations Division** investigates allegations of bribery, fraud, abuse, civil rights violations, and violations of other criminal laws and administrative procedures that govern Department employees, contractors, and grantees.

---

<sup>1</sup> The OIG has authority to investigate allegations of criminal wrongdoing or administrative misconduct by any Department employee, except for "allegations of misconduct involving Department attorneys, investigators, or law enforcement personnel, where the allegations relate to the exercise of the authority of an attorney to investigate, litigate, or provide legal advice." 5 U.S.C. App. 3 § 8E(b)(2)-(3).

- **Oversight and Review Division** blends the skills of attorneys, investigators, and program analysts to investigate or review high profile or sensitive matters involving Department programs or employees.
- **Management and Planning Division** provides planning, budget, finance, personnel, training, procurement, automated data processing, computer network communications, and general support services for the OIG.
- **Office of General Counsel** provides legal advice to OIG management and staff. In addition, the office drafts memoranda on issues of law; prepares administrative subpoenas; represents the OIG in personnel, contractual, and legal matters; and responds to Freedom of Information Act requests.

The OIG has a staff of approximately 420 employees, about half of whom are based in Washington, D.C., while the rest work from 16 Investigations Division field and area offices and 6 Audit Division regional offices located throughout the country.

## **II. SECTION 1001 OF THE PATRIOT ACT**

Section 1001 of the Patriot Act provides the following:

The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall designate one official who shall —

- (1) review information and receive complaints alleging abuses of civil rights and civil liberties by employees and officials of the Department of Justice;
- (2) make public through the Internet, radio, television, and newspaper advertisements information on the responsibilities and functions of, and how to contact, the official; and
- (3) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on a semi-annual basis a report on the implementation of this subsection and detailing any abuses described in paragraph (1), including a description of the use of funds appropriations used to carry out this subsection.

### III. CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES COMPLAINTS

Section 1001 requires the OIG to “review information and receive complaints alleging abuses of civil rights and civil liberties by employees and officials of the Department of Justice.”

The OIG’s Investigations Division manages the OIG’s Section 1001 investigative responsibilities. The two units with primary responsibility for coordinating these activities are Operations Branch I and Operations Branch II, each of which is directed by a Special Agent in Charge and two Assistant Special Agents in Charge (ASAC).<sup>2</sup> In addition, these units are supported by Investigative Specialists and other staff assigned to the Investigative Support Branch, who divide their time between Section 1001 and other responsibilities.

The Investigations Division receives civil rights and civil liberties complaints via mail, e-mail, telephone, and facsimile. Upon receipt, Division ASACs review the complaints and assign an initial disposition to each matter, and Investigative Specialists enter the complaints alleging a violation within the investigative jurisdiction of the OIG or another federal agency into an OIG database. Serious civil rights and civil liberties allegations relating to actions of DOJ employees or contractors are typically assigned to an OIG Investigations Division field office, where special agents conduct investigations of criminal violations and administrative misconduct.<sup>3</sup> Occasionally, complaints are assigned to the OIG’s Oversight and Review Division for investigation.

Given the number of complaints OIG receives compared to its limited resources, the OIG does not investigate all allegations of misconduct against DOJ employees. The OIG refers many complaints involving DOJ employees to internal affairs offices in DOJ components such as the FBI Inspection Division, the DEA Office of Professional Responsibility, and the BOP Office of Internal Affairs. In certain referrals, the OIG requires the components to report the results of their investigations to the OIG. In most cases, the OIG notifies the complainant of the referral.

Many complaints the OIG receives involve matters outside its jurisdiction, and when those matters identify a specific issue for investigation,

---

<sup>2</sup> These units also coordinate the OIG’s review of allegations of misconduct by Department employees: the Operations Branch I has primary responsibility for matters involving the BOP, USMS, and the U.S. Attorney’s Offices; the Operations Branch II has primary responsibility for matters involving the FBI, DEA, and ATF.

<sup>3</sup> The OIG can pursue an allegation either criminally or administratively. Many OIG investigations begin with allegations of criminal activity but, as is the case for any law enforcement agency, do not result in prosecution. When this occurs, the OIG may continue the investigation and treat the matter as a case for potential administrative discipline. The OIG’s ability to handle matters criminally or administratively helps to ensure that a matter can be pursued administratively even if a prosecutor declines to prosecute a matter.

the OIG forwards them to the appropriate investigative entity. For example, complaints of mistreatment by airport security staff or by the Border Patrol are sent to the Department of Homeland Security OIG. The DOJ OIG also has forwarded complaints to the Offices of Inspectors General at the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Education. Allegations related to the authority of a DOJ attorney to litigate, investigate, or provide legal advice are referred to the DOJ Office of Professional Responsibility. Allegations related solely to state and local law enforcement or government officials that raise a federal civil rights concern are forwarded to the DOJ Civil Rights Division.

When an allegation received from any source involves a potential violation of federal civil rights statutes by a DOJ employee, the OIG discusses the complaint with the DOJ Civil Rights Division for possible prosecution. In some cases, the Civil Rights Division accepts the case and requests additional investigation by either the OIG or the FBI. In other cases, the Civil Rights Division declines prosecution and either the OIG or the appropriate DOJ internal affairs office reviews the case for possible administrative misconduct.

#### **A. Complaints Processed During This Reporting Period**

Between January 1, 2013 and June 30, 2013, the period covered by this report, the OIG processed **515** new civil rights or civil liberties complaints.<sup>4</sup>

Of these complaints, **444** did not fall within the OIG's jurisdiction or did not warrant further investigation. The vast majority (386) of these complaints involved allegations against agencies or entities outside the DOJ, including other federal agencies, local governments, or private businesses. When possible, the OIG referred those complaints to the appropriate entity or advised complainants of the entity with jurisdiction over their allegations. Some complaints (58) raised allegations that were not suitable for investigation by the OIG and could not be referred to another agency for investigation, generally because the complaints failed to identify a subject or agency.

The OIG found that the remaining **71** of the 515 complaints it received involved DOJ employees or DOJ components and included allegations that required further review. The OIG determined that **64** of these complaints raised management issues generally unrelated to the OIG's Section 1001 duties and, consequently, referred these complaints to DOJ components for appropriate handling. Examples of complaints in this category included allegations by federal prisoners about the general prison conditions and by others that the FBI did not initiate an investigation into particular allegations.

---

<sup>4</sup> These complaints include all matters in which the complainant made any mention of a civil rights or civil liberties violation, even if the allegation was not within the OIG's jurisdiction.

The OIG identified a total of **7** complaints warranting further investigation to determine whether Section 1001-related abuses occurred. The OIG investigated **1** of the complaints and referred the other **6** complaints to the BOP for further investigation. The next section of this report describes the substance of these 7 complaints. Notably, none of the complaints processed during this reporting period specifically alleged misconduct by DOJ employees relating to the use of authorities contained in the Patriot Act.

The following is a synopsis of the new complaints processed during this reporting period involving DOJ employees or components, including allegations requiring further review:

Complaints processed	<b>515</b>
Complaints not within OIG’s jurisdiction or not warranting further review	<b>444</b>
Total complaints within OIG’s jurisdiction warranting review	<b>71</b>
Management issues referred to DOJ components for handling	<b>64</b>
Possible Section 1001 complaints warranting investigation by OIG	<b>1</b>
Possible Section 1001 complaints warranting investigation by DOJ components	<b>6</b>

## **B. Section 1001 Complaints**

### **1. Investigations Opened During This Reporting Period**

During this reporting period, the OIG opened **1** Section 1001-related investigation, which remains pending, and referred **6** Section 1001-related complaints to the BOP for investigation. BOP completed investigations of 1 of the complaints opened during this period; its investigations of the remaining 5 complaints remain pending. The OIG has requested that, upon completion of the investigation of each referred complaint, BOP provide the OIG a copy of its investigative report.

**a. *OIG Investigation***

- A BOP inmate alleged that correctional officers told him he would be denied work privileges unless he shaved off his beard and denounced Islam, warned him that correctional officers could harm him and other “terrorist” inmates in the prison chapel, and expressed their desire for “terrorists” at the facility to be killed.

**b. *Continuing BOP Investigations***

- A BOP inmate alleged that a BOP Intelligence Research Specialist discriminated against him based on his religion. The inmate alleged that the employee referred to a Muslim prayer in a derogatory manner, mocked the traditional Muslim greeting, and referred to Muslim inmates as “terrorists” and “fundamentalists.” The inmate also alleged that the employee has repeatedly called him “Osama bin Laden” and mocked him for wearing a beard.
- A BOP inmate alleged that several correctional officers referred to him using a racial and ethnic slur, and threatened to kill him because he asked why his food tray was not delivered on time.
- A BOP inmate alleged that a BOP chaplain was “anti-Muslim” and that the chaplain directed him to leave the chapel in the middle of Muslim services, denied him access to the Muslim service for three weeks, denied him lunch during Ramadan, and denied him a religious diet. According to the inmate, he conducted a hunger strike for 18 days until he was transferred to another facility, but was transferred back to the same facility 19 days later, where he alleged the chaplain’s discrimination continued.
- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer openly mocked the Islamic faith and interfered with Muslim inmates practicing their religion. The inmate alleged that the correctional officer threatened to take disciplinary action against him if he performed the Muslim call to prayers, or prayed with or at the same time as other Muslims.
- A BOP inmate alleged that, after he and other Muslim inmates completed their prayers, a correctional officer told him that the inmates would receive incident reports because “terrorists” were not allowed to pray and lacked rights. The correctional officer

allegedly also characterized the inmates as “future Taliban members.”

**c. Closed BOP Investigation**

- A BOP inmate alleged that following a search of his cell, he discovered that his prescription eyeglasses were missing, his photo album was destroyed, and pages had been torn out of his Koran. When interviewed by the BOP, the correctional officer identified by the inmate as having conducted the search stated that he did not recall searching the inmate’s cell and denied destroying any inmate’s Koran, personal photographs, or prescription eyeglasses. Another correctional officer interviewed by the BOP recalled the search but stated that he removed unauthorized magazine photographs from the walls of the cell and confiscated an item of altered clothing, but denied that any correctional officer destroyed the inmate’s Koran, personal photographs, or prescription eyeglasses. The investigation also found that the inmate falsely claimed to have submitted certain documentation to the Warden prior to reporting these allegations. The inmate refused to make a statement to BOP investigators and provided no further physical evidence to support his allegations. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.

**2. Pending Investigations Opened During Previous Reporting Periods**

**a. Complaints Referred to BOP**

The OIG referred the following **4** complaints to the BOP for investigation during a prior reporting period; the investigations remain open. The OIG has requested that BOP provide a copy of its investigative report upon completion of the investigation of each referred complaint.

- A BOP inmate alleged that after he filed a grievance against a BOP chaplain for allegedly interfering with his right to practice the Islamic faith, the chaplain then accused the inmate of “starting a terrorist cell,” resulting in the inmate being placed in segregated housing. The inmate also alleged that after filing another grievance alleging retaliation, he was again sent to segregated housing. Additionally, the inmate alleged that after an internal investigation at the prison determined that the allegations against him were false, the BOP took no action



against the staff and instead transferred the inmate twice, leaving him thousands of miles from his family.

- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer used profanity towards inmates and treated black Muslim inmates harshly because of their religious beliefs. The inmate also alleged that BOP staff intentionally destroyed his written correspondence.
- An inmate alleged that a BOP correctional officer harassed Muslim inmates and interfered with their attendance at religious services. The inmate further alleged that the correctional officer made hostile and harassing sexual comments to the inmates and touched them in an inappropriate manner.
- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer was passing out Ramadan meals without bread. When several inmates asked the correctional officer to call food service for the bread, he responded by expressing unwillingness to accommodate the religious needs of the Muslim inmates. The inmate also alleged that the correctional officer refused to give him his mail.

### **3. Previously Opened Investigations Closed During This Reporting Period**

The OIG completed its investigations of **1** Section 1001-related matter opened in a prior period. Additionally, the BOP completed investigations of **6** Section 1001-related complaints previously referred by the OIG in prior periods. Upon completion of the investigation of each referred complaint, the BOP provided the OIG a copy of its investigative report.

#### **a. Closed OIG Investigation**

- A BOP inmate alleged that a cook supervisor and a correctional officer harassed inmates who were practicing religious observances during Ramadan. The inmate alleged that the employees approached him and other Muslim inmates and threw their religious meals into the garbage while uttering racial slurs. The inmate alleged that the cook supervisor has racist attitudes towards black and Muslim inmates and has openly expressed them. During an interview with the OIG, the inmate repeated his allegations and added that several other Muslim inmates were attempting to remove contraband food items from the kitchen when his food items were confiscated. The inmate stated that he had heard the cook supervisor make racist remarks in the past but could not provide the OIG with specific

examples. He also stated that the correctional officer was not directly involved in the food confiscation and that he did not recall the correctional officer making any specific racial remarks during the confiscation. The OIG interviewed the cook supervisor and correctional officer, both of whom acknowledged that unauthorized food items had been confiscated but denied discriminating against any inmates, making discriminatory remarks to inmates, or hearing other employees make such remarks. The OIG determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.

**b. Closed BOP Investigations**

- A BOP inmate alleged that the inmate's correctional institution discriminates against Muslim inmates. The inmate alleged that the institution does not employ a Muslim chaplain and has not attempted to find one; that Muslim inmates are prohibited from studying together, from studying outside of their assigned cells, and from praying at work; and that other religious groups are permitted to receive religious materials from volunteers and guests but Muslim inmates are not. The inmate further alleged that Muslims face a hostile environment at the institution and noted that other inmates have previously filed similar complaints alleging harassment, retaliation, and discrimination against the same institution. In an interview with the BOP, the inmate added that prayer time and programming for Muslims had not increased even though the institution had hired an additional chaplain. The BOP interviewed the Supervisory Chaplain, who denied discriminating against the inmate or any faith group and stated that the institution's policies regarding group prayer for all religious denominations were consistent with recommendations contained in the BOP Inmate Beliefs and Practice Reference Manual. In a memorandum to the Warden responding to the inmate's allegations, the Supervisory Chaplain additionally stated that, consistent with BOP directives, he would consider adding additional religious programming after the newly-hired chaplain had completed the standard training period. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.
- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer exhibits a pattern of racist and discriminatory behavior toward him and other Muslim inmates by harassing them, "trashing" their cells, and repeatedly singling them out for cell searches, yet treats non-Muslim inmates with respect. BOP investigators reviewed the cell search log for the time period identified and found no

evidence to suggest or confirm that the correctional officer had searched Muslim inmates' cells more often than other inmates' cells. Nor did BOP find evidence to corroborate the allegations that the correctional officer had left the complainant's cell in disarray. The correctional officer denied the allegations in a sworn affidavit. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.

- Three BOP inmates alleged that two correctional officers acted unprofessionally while they were escorting the inmates from religious services to their housing units during Ramadan. Allegedly, one of the correctional officers made comments about killing Muslims when he was overseas, and the other correctional officer compared Muslims to dogs and stated that he hated dogs. All three inmates refused to complete a sworn affidavit and one inmate refused to be interviewed. During interviews with BOP, the correctional officers each stated that one or more inmates engaged them in a conversation about differences among individuals of the Muslim faith, but denied acting unprofessionally, specifically denied the allegations made against them, and denied seeing or hearing the other officer do or say anything unprofessional. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.
- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer insulted him and his religion by making harsh and derogatory statements to him about his headdress, deliberately mispronouncing the name "Allah," and boasting of military action taken by the United States in the Middle East. During an interview with BOP, the correctional officer denied the allegations and stated that he does not engage in religious conversations with inmates. An inmate identified by the complainant as a witness recalled the correctional officer talking to a Muslim inmate about a smell coming from his *kufi* and saying that the inmate would not make it in the Middle East. However, two other inmates identified by the complainant as witnesses refused to be interviewed or provide sworn affidavits, and a correctional officer who allegedly witnessed the incident stated that he did not recall the conversation described by the inmate and had never witnessed the subject correctional officer saying anything unprofessional toward any Muslim inmate. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.
- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer used a racial slur, confiscated his *kufi* for no reason, and referred to the *kufi*

as a “terrorist cap.” The inmate further alleged that two other correctional officers witnessed the correctional officer threaten and approach the inmate in an aggressive manner. During an interview with BOP, the subject correctional officer denied the allegations, stating that he is typically assigned elsewhere at the time of day when the incident allegedly took place and that he did not recall any incidents with an inmate in the room the complainant identified. Neither of the two correctional officer witnesses recalled the alleged incident. BOP concluded the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.

- A Muslim inmate alleged that: his religious diet was suspended; he was placed in “racial segregation” because of lies fabricated by the BOP chaplain and his assistant; BOP staff tampered with his legal mail and obstructed calls to his attorneys; BOP staff censured his participation during Islamic services and studies; the BOP inappropriately classified him as an international terrorist; and a BOP lieutenant told him that the prison staff hated him. The BOP investigation found that: (1) the inmate’s participation in Religious Diet Program had been suspended for 30 days due to violations of program rules but was subsequently reinstated; (2) the inmate had been designated a Security Threat Group assignment of International Terrorist assigned to the Special Housing Unit based on his conviction for conspiracy to kill, kidnap, maim, and injure persons outside of the United States and distribute information about explosives, and based on his having received training for violent Jihad in Iraq; (3) the inmate had been transferred to a Communications Management Unit because he continuously attempted to circumvent standard procedures, based on his Security Threat Group assignment, to monitor his communications and correspondence; (4) the inmate had successfully mailed outgoing legal mail on numerous occasions, had 16 attorneys listed on his approved phone list, and had access to attorneys consistent with policy; (5) the inmate’s 28 requests for administrative remedies had all been logged and processed; and (6) the inmate had been allowed to continue to practice his faith, although he had been restricted from actively teaching or demonstrating religious authority to other inmates due to his “radical behavior” during religious studies. The BOP lieutenant denied making the alleged comments about the prison staff hating the inmate. BOP concluded the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.

#### **IV. OTHER ACTIVITIES RELATED TO POTENTIAL CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES ISSUES**

The OIG conducts other reviews that go beyond the explicit requirements of Section 1001 in order to implement more fully its civil rights and civil liberties oversight responsibilities. The OIG has completed or is conducting several such reviews that relate to the OIG's duties under Section 1001. These reviews are discussed in this section of the report.

##### **A. Audit of the FBI's Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force**

In March 2013, the OIG issued an audit report of the FBI's Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force (FTTTF). The objectives of this audit were to determine whether the FBI: (1) had implemented a viable FTTTF strategy to locate and track suspected terrorists and their supporters, including coordination with FBI headquarters and field offices to enhance national security investigations; and (2) was following Department privacy policies in its management of information.

The OIG's audit found that the FTTTF provides significant value to the FBI by proactively identifying national security threats. However, the OIG determined that prior to FY 2011 limited coordination existed between the FTTTF and the FBI's National Security Branch operational divisions, such as the Counterterrorism Division and the Counterintelligence Division. The FTTTF improved its coordination since FY 2011, particularly through the assignment of FTTTF personnel to the Counterterrorism Division.

The audit also found that the FTTTF did not always provide FBI field offices with timely, relevant, and valuable information, and that many field office Special Agents and Intelligence Analysts were not fully aware of the FTTTF's capabilities. Without such an understanding, FBI field personnel may not use the FTTTF's valuable analytical capabilities to the fullest extent possible to best further the FBI's national security mission.

Additionally, the audit found that while the FTTTF had implemented many privacy-related policies and procedures for handling national security information and other sensitive information, the FTTTF had not completely satisfied Department requirements related to the transparency of its information systems under the Privacy Act and E-Government Act. Specifically, between 2008 and 2012, the FTTTF did not submit an updated System of Records Notice or Privacy Impact Assessment to the Department's Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties. During the review, the FBI submitted a System of Records Notice, which received final approval in July 2012.

The OIG made seven recommendations to the FBI to improve the FTTTF's operations, and the FBI agreed with all seven recommendations.

## **B. Review of the Department's Use of Material Witness Warrants**

The OIG is reviewing the Department's use of the material witness warrant statute, 18 U.S.C. § 3144. Pursuant to the OIG's responsibility under Section 1001 of the Patriot Act, the OIG is investigating whether the Department's post-9/11 use of the statute in national security cases violated civil rights and civil liberties. The OIG is also examining the Department's controls over the use of material witness warrants and trends in the use of material witness warrants over time, as well as issues such as length of detention, conditions of confinement, and access to counsel.

## **C. Review of the FBI's Use of National Security Letters, Section 215 Orders, and Pen Register and Trap-and-Trace Authorities under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act from 2007 through 2009**

The OIG is again examining the FBI's use of national security letters (NSL) and Section 215 orders for business records. Among other issues, this review is assessing the FBI's progress in responding to the OIG's recommendations in its 2007 and 2008 reports on the FBI's use of NSLs, and in its 2010 report on the FBI's use of exigent letters and other informal requests for telephone records. A focus of this review is the NSL subsystem, an automated workflow system for NSLs that all FBI field offices and Headquarters divisions have been required to use since January 1, 2008, and the effectiveness of the subsystem in reducing or eliminating noncompliance with applicable authorities. The current review is also examining the number of NSLs issued and Section 215 applications filed by the FBI between 2007 and 2009, and any improper or illegal uses of these authorities. In addition, the review is examining the FBI's use of its pen register and trap-and-trace authority under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

## **D. Audit of the FBI's Management of Terrorist Watchlist Nominations and Encounters with Watchlisted Subjects**

The OIG is continuing its audit of the FBI's management of terrorist watchlist nominations. In fiscal years 2008 and 2009, the OIG conducted two audits related to the FBI terrorist watchlist nomination processes and practices. In these audits, the OIG found that the FBI's procedures for processing international terrorist nominations were, at times, inconsistent and insufficient, causing watchlist data used by screening agencies to be incomplete and outdated. The OIG found that the FBI failed to nominate for watchlisting many subjects of its terrorism investigations, did not nominate many others in a timely manner, and did not update or remove watchlist records as required. As a result of these reviews, the FBI reported that it had undertaken several initiatives and implemented new processes and guidelines to enhance its watchlisting system.

The objectives of the current audit are to assess the impact on the FBI's watchlisting system of the attempted terrorist attack on an airplane on December 25, 2009, and to evaluate the effectiveness of initiatives implemented by the FBI over the last 3 years to ensure the accuracy, timeliness, and completeness of the FBI's watchlisting practices, including watchlist nominations and removals.

#### **E. Audit of the Department's Use of and Support for Unmanned Aircraft Systems**

The OIG is conducting an audit of the Department's domestic use of and support for unmanned aircraft systems (UAS). The audit will assess the Department's direct use of or grant support for UAVs, including any research and deployment efforts by the Department's law enforcement components. It will also evaluate any applicable Department policies, guidelines, controls, or restrictions relating to UAVs, including those that relate to privacy rights and civil liberties.

#### **V. EXPENSE OF IMPLEMENTING SECTION 1001**

Section 1001 requires the OIG to include in this report "a description of the use of funds appropriations used to carry out this subsection."

During this reporting period, the OIG spent approximately \$736,648 in personnel costs, \$874 in travel costs, and \$100 in miscellaneous costs, for a total of \$737,622 to implement its responsibilities under Section 1001. The total personnel and miscellaneous costs reflect the time and funds spent by OIG special agents, attorneys, auditors, inspectors, program analysts, and paralegals who have worked directly on investigating Section 1001-related complaints, conducting special reviews, implementing the OIG's responsibilities under Section 1001, and overseeing such activities.