U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**Year-End Information Quality Report Format**

I. Cover Sheet: Requests for Correction Received FY 2005

- **Department Name:** U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- **Period Covered:** 01 Oct 04 – 30 Sep 05 (FY 2005)
- **Web page location of agency information quality correspondence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Number of Requests Received</th>
<th>Number Designated as Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total       | 1                          | 1                               |

II. If you received correction requests or appeals and did not provide a final response in FY03 or FY04, please list those correction requests below and provide a detailed summary in section III of this template.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Number of Requests Received in FY03 or FY04 which were responded to in FY05 or which are still incomplete.</th>
<th>Number of Appeals Received in FY03 or FY04 which were responded to in FY05 or which are still incomplete.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total       | 2                                                                                                          | Total 0                                                                                                    |
Agency Receiving Correction Request: Department of the Army
Corps of Engineers, Headquarters

- Requestor: Edward J. Heisel
  Executive Director
  Missouri Coalition for the Environment Foundation (MCEF)
  6267 Delmar Blvd. 2-E
  St. Louis, MO 63130
  Represents a public interest group.

- Date Received: 6 April 2005, Mail/Fax
  6 April 2005, log

- Summary of Request: MCEF (“The Coalition”) challenges the information, data, analyses, findings and conclusions drawn in the document entitled *Upper Mississippi River System Flow Frequency Study: Final Report*, published February 2004 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Rock Island District on the World Wide Web at http://www.mvr.usace.army.mil/pdw/pdf/FlowFrequency/flowfreq.htm. This study had the goal of recalculating flood risks on the entire Upper Mississippi, Lower Missouri and Illinois rivers, approximately 1,900 miles of river channel. The Coalition is concerned that the predictions in the study seriously underestimate actual flood risk and will lead to increased flood damages in the future.

- Description of Requested Correction: The Coalition seeks a withdrawal of the Study’s results, a statement that the Study should not be relied on for public or private decision-making, and the undertaking of a new effort to establish more accurate flood profiles for the Midwest’s large rivers.

- Influential: __X__ Yes ____ No ____ Undetermined

- First Agency Response: __X__ in progress ____ completed

- Resolution: Pending.

- Judicial Review: __X__ none ____ yes _____ in progress\(^3\)

- Appeal Request: ___NA______ none ___NA___ in progress ___NA__ completed

- Summary of Request for Reconsideration: NA

- Type of Appeal Process Used: NA

- Appeal Resolution: NA

\(^3\) Ibid.
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- **Agency Receiving Correction Request:** Department of the Army
  Corps of Engineers, Headquarters

- **Requestor:** Madeleine Fortin
  21801 SW 152 Street
  Miami, FL  33187
  Private citizen.

- **Date Received:** 9 Aug 2004, Federal Express
  11 Aug 2004, log

- **Summary of Request:** Ms. Fortin challenges the information, data, analyses, and conclusions drawn in the document entitled “Supplemental EIS for the Central and Southern Florida Project, Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park, Florida, 8.5 Square Mile Area,” published July 2000 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville District. The report was prepared as part of the Federal effort to restore a more natural hydrologic regime in the Everglades National Park. She is concerned that the report will result in her property not receiving flood protection and being condemned.

- **Description of Requested Correction:** Ms. Fortin claims that the computer model used by the Corps lacks transparency, that the data presented in the report is incomplete and asks that the report be corrected.

- **Influential:** ____Yes  ____X  No  ____ Undetermined

- **First Agency Response:**  ____X  in progress  ____ completed

- **Resolution:** Pending.

- **Judicial Review:**  ____X  none  ____yes  ____ in progress

- **Appeal Request:**  ____NA  none  ____NA  in progress  ____NA  completed

- **Summary of Request for Reconsideration:** NA

- **Type of Appeal Process Used:** NA

- **Appeal Resolution:** NA

__________________________

4 Ibid.
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Agency Receiving Correction Request: Department of the Army Corps of Engineers, Headquarters

Requestor: Martin Becker
600 Peachtree Street
Suite 3740
Atlanta, GA 30308-2214
Represents a Public Interest Group.

Date Received: 2 March 2004, E-Mail
5 March 2004, log

Summary of Request: Mr. Becker challenges the 100-yr flow calculation for Day Creek in San Bernardino County, California found in the November 29, 1999 US Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District report entitled “Review of Debris Production and Level-of-Protection Deer Creek Debris Basin.”

Description of Requested Correction: Mr. Becker claims that the Los Angeles District 100-yr flow computation in the “Review of Debris Production and Level-of-Protection Deer Creek Debris Basin” report used a skew coefficient that was not computed in accordance with the “Guidelines for Determining Flood Flow Frequency, Bulletin 17b,” even though the District Report represented that it followed the Guidelines.

Influential: ___Yes ___X__ No _____ Undetermined

First Agency Response: ___X__ in progress _____ completed

Resolution: Pending.

Judicial Review: ___X__ none _____yes ______ in progress\(^5\)

Appeal Request: ___NA__ none ___NA__ in progress ___NA__ completed

Summary of Request for Reconsideration: NA

Type of Appeal Process Used: NA

Appeal Resolution: NA

\(^5\) Ibid.