

## § 326.4

## 33 CFR Ch. II (7-1-06 Edition)

331.10. Moreover, the recipient of an approved JD associated with an unauthorized activity or an application for an after-the-fact permit must also memorialize that agreement to toll the statute of limitations, by signing an agreement to that effect, in exchange for the Corps acceptance of the after-the-fact permit application, and/or any administrative appeal. Such agreement will state that, in exchange for the Corps acceptance of any after-the-fact permit application and/or any administrative appeal associated with the unauthorized activity, the responsible party agrees that the statute of limitations will be suspended (*i.e.*, tolled) until one year after the final Corps decision on the after-the-fact permit application or, if there is an administrative appeal, one year after the final Corps decision as defined at 33 CFR 331.10, whichever date is later.

(2) Upon completion of his review in accordance with 33 CFR parts 320 through 325, the district engineer will determine if a permit should be issued, with special conditions if appropriate, or denied. In reaching a decision to issue, he must determine that the work involved is not contrary to the public interest, and if section 404 is applicable, that the work also complies with the Environmental Protection Agency's section 404(b)(1) guidelines. If he determines that a denial is warranted, his notification of denial should prescribe any final corrective actions required. His notification should also establish a reasonable period of time for the applicant to complete such actions unless he determines that further information is required before the corrective measures can be specified. If further information is required, the final corrective measures may be specified at a later date. If an applicant refuses to undertake prescribed corrective actions ordered subsequent to permit denial or refuses to accept a conditioned permit, the district engineer may initiate legal action in accordance with § 326.5.

(f) *Combining steps.* The procedural steps in this section are in the normal sequence. However, these regulations do not prohibit the streamlining of the enforcement process through the combining of steps.

(g) *Coordination with EPA.* In all cases where the district engineer is aware that EPA is considering enforcement action, he should coordinate with EPA to attempt to avoid conflict or duplication. Such coordination applies to interim protective measures and after-the-fact permitting, as well as to appropriate legal enforcement actions.

51 FR 41246, Nov. 13, 1986, as amended at 64 FR 11714, Mar. 9, 1999; 65 FR 16493, Mar. 28, 2000]

### § 326.4 Supervision of authorized activities.

(a) *Inspections.* District engineers will, at their discretion, take reasonable measures to inspect permitted activities, as required, to ensure that these activities comply with specified terms and conditions. To supplement inspections by their enforcement personnel, district engineers should encourage their other personnel; members of the public; and interested state, local, and other Federal agency representatives to report suspected violations of Corps permits. To facilitate inspections, district engineers will, in appropriate cases, require that copies of ENG Form 4336 be posted conspicuously at the sites of authorized activities and will make available to all interested persons information on the terms and conditions of issued permits. The U.S. Coast Guard will inspect permitted ocean dumping activities pursuant to section 107(c) of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended.

(b) *Inspection limitations.* Section 326.4 does not establish a non-discretionary duty to inspect permitted activities for safety, sound engineering practices, or interference with other permitted or unpermitted structures or uses in the area. Further, the regulations implementing the Corps regulatory program do not establish a non-discretionary duty to inspect permitted activities for any other purpose.

(c) *Inspection expenses.* The expenses incurred in connection with the inspection of permitted activities will normally be paid by the Federal Government unless daily supervision or other unusual expenses are involved. In such unusual cases, the district engineer

may condition permits to require permittees to pay inspection expenses pursuant to the authority contained in section 9701 of Pub L. 97-258 (33 U.S.C. 9701). The collection and disposition of inspection expense funds obtained from applicants will be administered in accordance with the relevant Corps regulations governing such funds.

(d) *Non-compliance.* If a district engineer determines that a permittee has violated the terms or conditions of the permit and that the violation is sufficiently serious to require an enforcement action, then he should, unless at his discretion he deems it inappropriate: (1) First contact the permittee;

(2) Request corrected plans reflecting actual work, if needed; and

(3) Attempt to resolve the violation. Resolution of the violation may take the form of the permitted project being voluntarily brought into compliance or of a permit modification (33 CFR 325.7(b)). If a mutually agreeable solution cannot be reached, a written order requiring compliance should normally be issued and delivered by personal service. Issuance of an order is not, however, a prerequisite to legal action. If an order is issued, it will specify a time period of not more than 30 days for bringing the permitted project into compliance, and a copy will be sent to the appropriate state official pursuant to section 404(s)(2) of the Clean Water Act. If the permittee fails to comply with the order within the specified period of time, the district engineer may consider using the suspension/revocation procedures in 33 CFR 325.7(c) and/or he may recommend legal action in accordance with § 326.5.

#### § 326.5 Legal action.

(a) *General.* For cases the district engineer determines to be appropriate, he will recommend criminal or civil actions to obtain penalties for violations, compliance with the orders and directives he has issued pursuant to §§ 326.3 and 326.4, or other relief as appropriate. Appropriate cases for criminal or civil action include, but are not limited to, violations which, in the district engineer's opinion, are willful, repeated, flagrant, or of substantial impact.

(b) *Preparation of case.* If the district engineer determines that legal action

is appropriate, he will prepare a litigation report or such other documentation that he and the local U.S. Attorney have mutually agreed to, which contains an analysis of the information obtained during his investigation of the violation or during the processing of a permit application and a recommendation of appropriate legal action. The litigation report or alternative documentation will also recommend what, if any, restoration or mitigative measures are required and will provide the rationale for any such recommendation.

(c) *Referral to the local U.S. Attorney.* Except as provided in paragraph (d) of this section, district engineers are authorized to refer cases directly to the U.S. Attorney. Because of the unique legal system in the Trust Territories, all cases over which the Department of Justice has no authority will be referred to the Attorney General for the trust Territories. Information copies of all letters of referral shall be forwarded to the appropriate division counsel, the Office, Chief of Engineers, ATTN: DAEN-CCK, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), and the Chief of the Environmental Defense Section, Lands and Natural Resources Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

(d) *Referral to the Office, Chief of Engineers.* District engineers will forward litigation reports with recommendations through division offices to the Office, Chief of Engineers, ATTN: DAEN-CCK, for all cases that qualify under the following criteria:

(1) Significant precedential or controversial questions of law or fact;

(2) Requests for elevation to the Washington level by the Department of Justice;

(3) Violations of section 9 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899;

(4) Violations of section 103 the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972;

(5) All cases involving violations by American Indians (original of litigation report to DAEN-CCI with copy to DAEN-CCK) on reservation lands or in pursuit of specific treaty rights;

(6) All cases involving violations by officials acting on behalf of foreign governments; and