

**AMENDMENT TO THE RULES COMMITTEE PRINT
FOR H.R. 399
OFFERED BY MR. O’ROURKE OF TEXAS**

After section 7, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections, conform any cross references to such subsequent sections, and conform the table of contents in section 1(b), accordingly):

1 **SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE DEPLOYMENT OF**
2 **DRONES ON THE BORDER.**

3 (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

4 (1) On December 24, 2014, the Department of
5 Homeland Security Office of Inspector General
6 (OIG) released a report entitled “U.S. Customs and
7 Border Protection’s Unmanned Aircraft System Pro-
8 gram Does Not Achieve Intended Results or Recogn-
9 ize All Costs of Operations”.

10 (2) The December 24, 2014 report represents
11 the OIG’s second audit of the program since 2012.

12 (3) The December 24, 2014 report found
13 that—

14 (A) the effort by U.S Customs and Border
15 Protection’s Office of Air and Marine (OAM)

1 still has no reliable method of measuring its
2 drone performance; and

3 (B) the effort's impact in stemming illegal
4 immigration has been minimal.

5 (4) The OIG found that during fiscal year 2013
6 OAM calculated that it costs \$2,468 per hour to op-
7 erate a drone. OIG found the actual price tag to be
8 \$12,255 per hour.

9 (5) The OIG found that flight time fell short of
10 OAM's goal of 16 hours per day, 365 days per year.
11 OIG found the drones, which were often grounded
12 by weather, were airborne for only 22 percent of
13 those goal hours.

14 (6) The majority of deployment was limited to
15 a 100-mile stretch in Arizona and a 70-mile segment
16 in Texas.

17 (7) Drone surveillance was credited with assist-
18 ing in less than 2 percent of U.S. Customs and Bor-
19 der Protection's apprehensions of illegal border
20 crossers.

21 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress—

22 (1) agrees with the findings of the Department
23 of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General
24 in the report released on December 24, 2014, enti-
25 tled "U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Un-

1 manned Aircraft System Program Does Not Achieve
2 Intended Results or Recognize All Costs of Oper-
3 ations”;

4 (2) sees no evidence that U.S. Customs and
5 Border Protection’s use of drones contributes to a
6 more secure border; and

7 (3) sees no reason to continue investing addi-
8 tional taxpayer dollars on the procurement of more
9 drones at this time; and

10 (4) recommends that U.S. Customs and Border
11 Protection abandon its plans to spend \$443 million
12 more on additional aircraft.

