

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
INDIVIDUAL BUREAU REQUESTS FOR CORRECTIONS
(August 2005)**

Agency Receiving Correction Request	United States Mint
Requestor	Eric Buchanan, private citizen
Date Received	E-mail to webmaster account on 07/28/04
Summary of Request	Error in a calculation on The United States Mint's H.I.P. Pocket Change website.
Description of Requested Correction	"You have a web page that claims that there are 294 ways to make change for a dollar ("Can you make change for a dollar?" < http://www.usmint.gov/kids/index.cfm?FileContents=/kids/teachers/LessonView.cfm&LessonPlanId=39 >). There are 293 combinations to make change for a dollar. Combination 16 and 31 are identical giving you one extra combination.
Influential	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Undetermined
First Agency Response	<input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> completed 07/28/04
Resolution	Changed the text on the website to read "293."
Judicial Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> in progress
Appeal Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input type="checkbox"/> completed
Summary of Request for Reconsideration	n.a.
Type of Appeal Process Used	n.a.
Appeal Resolution	n.a.

Agency Receiving Correction Request	United States Mint
Requestor	Steve Kelem, private citizen
Date Received	E-mail to webmaster account on 07/07/04
Summary of Request	Spelling error
Description of Requested Correction	"Your web page, http://www.usmint.gov/index.cfm?flash=no contains a misspelling Inspector Colector checks out a rare bird. "Collector" should have two "l"s."
Influential	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Undetermined
First Agency Response	<input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> completed 07/07/04
Resolution	Changed the spelling to "Collector."
Judicial Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> in progress
Appeal Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input type="checkbox"/> completed [date of response]
Summary of Request for Reconsideration	n.a.
Type of Appeal Process Used	n.a.
Appeal Resolution	n.a.

Agency Receiving Correction Request	United States Mint
Requestor	Matt Reidel, private citizen
Date Received	E-mail to webmaster account on 02/12/04
Summary of Request	New Hampshire quarter content change.
Description of Requested Correction	"You may want to update your web page regarding the New Hampshire quarter. The Old Man on the quarter has fallen off (as of last year).."
Influential	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Undetermined
First Agency Response	<input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> completed 02/19/04
Resolution	Changed the page to read in the past tense. (e.g., "The Old Man of the Mountain" was a distinctive rock formation on Mt. Cannon in the Franconia Notch gateway to northern New Hampshire."
Judicial Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> in progress
Appeal Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input type="checkbox"/> completed
Summary of Request for Reconsideration	n.a.
Type of Appeal Process Used	n.a.
Appeal Resolution	n.a.

Agency Receiving Correction Request	Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Office of External Relations
Requestor	Derek Moffitt
Date Received	September 7, 2004; received via internet
Summary of Request	The requestor wanted clarification on the August 2004 monthly production figures that are posted on our public website. The serial number ranges in the August figures didn't continue where the July 2004 monthly production figures left off.
Description of Requested Correction	"It looks like there may be a problem with the August 2004 monthly production figures that you recently posted. There are eight or nine serial number ranges listed there that don't pick up where the previous production left off-it looks like there are a whole lot of missing print runs. Has the BEP really started to skip serial numbers, or did something go wrong with the August report? Thanks for looking into this!"
Influential	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Undetermined
First Agency Response	<input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> completed September 8, 2004
Resolution	We responded by thanking the requestor for visiting the website and letting him know that we would look into the matter. It was determined that our office received an incorrect production report for August 2004. We acquired the correct production report and posted it on the website.
Judicial Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> in progress
Appeal Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input type="checkbox"/> completed [date of response]
Summary of Request for Reconsideration	N/A
Type of Appeal Process Used	N/A
Appeal Resolution	N/A

Agency Receiving Correction Request	Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Office of External Relations
Requestor	Paper Money Col Thiel, PMCM
Date Received	September 8, 2004; received via internet
Summary of Request	The requestor wanted clarification on the August 2004 monthly production figures that are posted on our public website. The serial number ranges in the August figures didn't continue where the July 2004 monthly production figures left off.
Description of Requested Correction	"The BEP report for August no numbers continue on from the July report, the block are different."
Influential	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Undetermined
First Agency Response	<input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> completed September 8, 2004
Resolution	We responded by thanking the requestor for visiting the website and letting him know that we would look into the matter. It was determined that our office received an incorrect production report for August 2004. We acquired the correct production report and posted it on the website.
Judicial Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> in progress
Appeal Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> in progress <input type="checkbox"/> completed
Summary of Request for Reconsideration	N/A
Type of Appeal Process Used	N/A
Appeal Resolution	N/A

Agency Receiving Correction Request	Treasury, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB)
Requestor	Marc E. Sorini, Esquire; McDermott, Will & Emery Partnership Including Professional Corporations
Date Received	October 21, 2003 ; Via hand delivery
Summary of Request	The law firm of McDermott, Will & Emery represents Diageo North America, Inc., a manufacturer of flavored malt beverages. According to Mr. Sorini of that firm, TTB Notice of Proposed Rulemaking No. 4, Flavored Malt Beverages and Related Proposals, "asserts that current labels on flavored malt beverages ('FMBs') confuse consumers with respect to both the source and amount of alcohol in the beverages" but "does not adequately ensure the quality of its assertions of consumer confusion and does not provide any supporting data for those assertions."
Description of Requested Correction	Diageo asks that TTB "(1) publish the data supporting Notice 4's assertions of consumer confusion, if any, and permit Diageo and the public the opportunity to submit comments on the data, or (2) withdraw those assertions."
Influential	___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No ___ Undetermined
First Agency Response	___ in progress <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> completed TTB responded by letter to Mr. Sorini on December 23, 2003
Resolution	The issues Diageo raises are "inextricably linked to our ongoing rulemaking process with respect to flavored malt beverages." Therefore, we will address Diageo's concerns through the mechanisms of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 553, rather than the procedures the Information Quality Act provides. Accordingly, we consider Diageo's letter to be "a comment to our proposed rule on flavored malt beverages, and will respond to the issues ... in the preamble to any final rule on this matter." The final rule is under review at Main Treasury.
Judicial Review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none ___ yes ___ in progress.
Appeal Request	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none ___ in progress ___ completed. However, according to a McDermott, Will & Emery letter dated January 27, 2004, Diageo "reserves all its rights under the FDQA [Federal Data Quality Act], including the right to challenge a final rule as inconsistent with FDQA requirements" and "to seek a reconsideration" under certain circumstances.
Summary of Request for Reconsideration	N/A.
Type of Appeal Process Used	N/A
Appeal Resolution	N/A