

## **USACE Planning Decision Document Errata Sheet Tips**

**Updated: October 2020**

**Background:** Based on the review of the feasibility study decision documents, there may be a need for Districts and MSCs to submit language additions, revisions, or deletions via an errata sheet. For example, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works (ASA(CW)) may request changes to the final feasibility report; public comments from the review of the final environmental impact statement/feasibility report may require changes; or changes to cost estimates, and therefore BCRs, may be required if changes in price levels occur while draft Chief's Reports are out for review. The below tips and best practices should be considered by PDTs needing to develop errata sheets, and the attached document provides an example format and content for an errata sheet for use by PDTs.

### **Tips and Best Practices for Errata Sheets:**

1. Always confirm changes submitted via an errata sheet with your local Office of Counsel.
2. As needed, also confirm language additions, revisions, and deletions with your Regional Integration Team Planner and/or Office of Water Project Review point of contact.
3. Use the exact title of the document, followed by "ERRATA" and the Month Year of the errata.
4. Create a new numbered paragraph for each change and specify the page number and section number within which the change should occur. If two or more changes occur within the same section, denote them in separate paragraphs on the errata sheet.
5. Be as specific and clear as possible when denoting changes (i.e., "The following new paragraph is added below the first three lines of Section 1.1.1 on page 1" vs. "The following new paragraph is added to the middle of page 1.").
6. The changes detailed in the Errata should not include the reasons for the changes.
7. The errata sheet should be inserted into the final feasibility report behind the cover page and posted to the public-facing website. It is important to follow up with the relevant District to ensure the revised file is posted.

**Middle Rio Grande Flood Protection Bernalillo to Belen, New Mexico  
Integrated General Reevaluation Report and  
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

**ERRATA**

**July 2020**

1. Section 3.4.2, page 32, the following new paragraph is added below the first four lines on page 32:

WRDA 1986 Section 103(f) and Engineer Regulation 1105-2-100, Appendix E, Paragraph E-3, Section c (2) define separable element as “any part of a project which has separately assigned benefits and costs, and which can be implemented as a separate action (at a later date or as a separate project). Separable elements so considered are similar to the planning concept of last added increments, with the added idea of separation or detachment of the increment from the whole.” Hydraulic analyses indicate that the Mountain View Unit and Isleta Units are separable from each other and the Belen Units because they can be constructed independently and achieve the benefits of reduced flood risk in their respective locations. The Belen units are not separable from each other since they are adjacent to each other on opposite sides of the river, therefore, there is a hydraulic influence between them. These levee units would be constructed concurrently so that one is not more than a couple miles longer (reaching farther south) than the other.

2. Section 1.1.2, page 11, the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 11 is deleted and replaced with the following sentence:

After the North Diversion Channel was completed the local sponsor, the Albuquerque Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA), commenced operation and maintenance on February 14, 1969.

3. Section 4.1.11, page 79, the first sentence of Section 4.1.11 is deleted and replaced with the following sentence:

Upon written notification by USACE to the MRGCD that the project, or a functional portion of the project, is complete, the MRGCD will operate, maintain, repair rehabilitate, and replace the project at no cost to the Government.

4. Section 4.1.11, page 80, the first two sentences on page 80 are deleted.
5. Section 4.1.12, page 80, the last sentence of Section 4.1.12 is deleted.
6. Section 4.2.4, page 90, the second sentence of Federal Responsibilities beginning with “After the sponsor” is deleted.

7. Section 4.2.4, page 91, the words “and other assurances” at end of the first paragraph are deleted.

8. Section 11, page 173, paragraph i, the words “For so long as the project remains authorized, operate” are deleted and replaced with the word “Operate”.

9. Executive Summary, page ES-5, last paragraph, the first sentence revised to delete the words “based on results of public review, internal policy review, Agency Technical Review, and Independent External Peer Review of this draft GRR/SEIS, and if warranted,” and replace with the word “and” to read: “The preliminary recommendation of the District Engineer of the Albuquerque District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is that the report be finalized and, recommended for authorization for implementation as a federal project.”

10. Section 4.2.2 Report Approval, Page 90, First paragraph, replace the words “will be” with “has been” in the first two sentences, replace the words “is being” with “has been”, and delete the last sentence. The second paragraph in the section is deleted and the following sentence added to the end of the first paragraph, “The recommended project detailed in this GRR/SEIS is summarized in the Chief of Engineers' Report and submitted to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) who, in turn, has submitted the report to Congress.”

11. Section 4.2.3 Project Authorization and Construction, Page 90, the words “final Chief’s Report is approved by the Chief of Engineers and the” are deleted from the first sentence.