



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
441 G STREET NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20314-1000

S: 7 MAY 04

CECI (25-1)

02 APR 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMANDER, SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

SUBJECT: Information Quality Act Request for Correction from Mr. Martin Becker


1. Enclosed please find a Request for Correction (RFC) from Mr. Martin Becker concerning the 100-year flow computation for Day Creek in San Bernardino County, California. The computation appears in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report entitled, *Review of Debris Production and Level-of-Protection Deer Creek Debris Basin, 29 Nov 1999*, prepared by the Los Angeles District. Mr. Becker requests that the computation in this report be corrected under the Information Quality Act.
2. The Information Quality Act (the Act) requires agencies to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information they disseminate to the public, and allows the public to question the information. Under the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Department of Defense (DoD) regulations, affected persons can seek and obtain correction of information that does not comply with OMB, Federal Register: 22 February 2002 (Volume 67, Number 36, page 8452) (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/reproducible2.pdf>), and DoD information quality guidelines (http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/infoereg/agency_quality-dod.pdf).
3. The information proponent should review the information being challenged to determine whether it meets the information quality guideline (IQG) requirements of quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity as defined by OMB and DoD. Specifically, the information must be accurate, clear, complete, reliable and unbiased. In reviewing the challenged information you will need to identify the course of the information, any supporting data and models used, whether there is existing literature or other documentation supporting the data, whether the data was generated and the analytic results developed using sound engineering, statistical and research methods, how the quality of information was assured (whether it was peer reviewed), etc. You should also determine whether the quality is appropriate to the nature, use, type, importance and timeliness of the information.
4. Please provide us with a draft response indicating whether you agree or disagree with the RFC and whether the requester has adequately supported his claim. If you agree with the RFC, please provide a summary of your analysis and the steps to be taken to correct the information. If you disagree with the RFC, please explain how the information challenged meets the guidelines, based on your substantive review of the information quality (discussed in paragraph 3) or procedural arguments. The draft response should be coordinated with your Counsel Office.
5. Headquarters will review the draft response, add a paragraph describing the appellate procedures, and coordinate with OMB. The Headquarters Office responsible for the information requested to be corrected will sign the response.

CECI (25-1)

SUBJECT: Information Quality Guidelines (continued)

6. If you have any questions concerning this process, or anticipate that you will not meet the suspense date, please contact Ms. Linda Genovese, Corporate Information Directorate (CECI-CA) at 202-761-7115 or Mr. Richard Frank, Office of Chief Counsel (CECC-G) at 202-761-8557.

FOR THE COMMANDER:



WILBERT BERRIOS
Director of Corporate Information

3 Encls

1. E-mail, Becker to HQUSACE
(Genovese), 2 MAR 04, 2:51 PM
2. E-mail, Becker to HQUSACE
(Genovese), 2 MAR 04, 12:08 PM (w/2atch)
3. E-mail, Becker to HQUSACE
(Genovese), 1 MAR 04, 5:08 PM (w/2atch)

CF:

CECI-CA

CECC-G

CESPD-OC

CECW-SPD RIT