

suspension, modification, and revocation procedures contained in 33 CFR 325.7 or enforcement procedures such as those contained in 33 CFR 326.4 and 326.5. The referenced enforcement procedures provide for the issuance of an administrative order requiring you to comply with the terms and conditions of your permit and for the initiation of legal action where appropriate. You will be required to pay for any corrective measures ordered by this office, and if you fail to comply with such directive, this office may in certain situations (such as those specified in 33 CFR 209.170) accomplish the corrective measures by contract or otherwise and bill you for the cost.

6. Extensions. General condition 1 establishes a time limit for the completion of the activity authorized by this permit. Unless there are circumstances requiring either a prompt completion of the authorized activity or a reevaluation of the public interest decision, the Corps will normally give favorable consideration to a request for an extension of this time limit.

Your signature below, as permittee, indicates that you accept and agree to comply with the terms and conditions of this permit.

(Permittee)

(Date)

This permit becomes effective when the Federal official, designated to act for the Secretary of the Army, has signed below.

(District Engineer)

(Date)

When the structures or work authorized by this permit are still in existence at the time the property is transferred, the terms and conditions of this permit will continue to be binding on the new owner(s) of the property. To validate the transfer of this permit and the associated liabilities associated with compliance with its terms and conditions, have the transferee sign and date below.

(Transferee)

(Date)

B. Special Conditions. No special conditions will be preprinted on the permit form. The following and other special conditions should be added, as appropriate, in the space provided after the general conditions or on a referenced continuation sheet:

1. Your use of the permitted activity must not interfere with the public's right to free navigation on all navigable waters of the United States.

2. You must have a copy of this permit available on the vessel used for the authorized transportation and disposal of dredged material.

3. You must advise this office in writing, at least two weeks before you start maintenance dredging activities under the authority of this permit.

4. You must install and maintain, at your expense, any safety lights and signals prescribed by the United States Coast Guard (USCG), through regulations or otherwise, on your authorized facilities. The USCG may be reached at the following address and telephone number:

5. The condition below will be used when a Corps permit authorizes an artificial reef, an aerial transmission line, a submerged cable or pipeline, or a structure on the outer continental shelf.

National Ocean Service (NOS) has been notified of this authorization. You must notify NOS and this office in writing, at least two weeks before you begin work and upon completion of the activity authorized by this permit. Your notification of completion must include a drawing which certifies the location and configuration of the completed activity (a certified permit drawing may be used). Notifications to NOS will be sent to the following address: National Ocean Service, Office of Coast Survey, N/CS261, 1315 East West Highway, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3282.

6. The following condition should be used for every permit where legal recordation of the permit would be reasonably practicable and recordation could put a subsequent purchaser or owner of property on notice of permit conditions.

You must take the actions required to record this permit with the Registrar of Deeds or other appropriate official charged with the responsibility for maintaining records of title to or interest in real property.

[51 FR 41236, Nov. 13, 1986, as amended at 62 FR 26230, May 13, 1997]

APPENDIX B TO PART 325—NEPA IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES FOR THE REGULATORY PROGRAM

1. Introduction
2. General
3. Development of Information and Data
4. Elimination of Duplication with State and Local Procedures
5. Public Involvement
6. Categorical Exclusions

7. EA/FONSI Document
8. Environmental Impact Statement—General
9. Organization and Content of Draft EISs
10. Notice of Intent
11. Public Hearing
12. Organization and Content of Final EIS
13. Comments Received on the Final EIS
14. EIS Supplement
15. Filing Requirements
16. Timing
17. Expedited Filing
18. Record of Decision
19. Predecision Referrals by Other Agencies
20. Review of Other Agencies' EISs
21. Monitoring

1. *Introduction.* In keeping with Executive Order 12291 and 40 CFR 1500.2, where interpretive problems arise in implementing this regulation, and consideration of all other factors do not give a clear indication of a reasonable interpretation, the interpretation (consistent with the spirit and intent of NEPA) which results in the least paperwork and delay will be used. Specific examples of ways to reduce paperwork in the NEPA process are found at 40 CFR 1500.4. Maximum advantage of these recommendations should be taken.

2. *General.* This Appendix sets forth implementing procedures for the Corps regulatory program. For additional guidance, see the Corps NEPA regulation 33 CFR part 230 and for general policy guidance, see the CEQ regulations 40 CFR 1500–1508.

3. *Development of Information and Data.* See 40 CFR 1506.5. The district engineer may require the applicant to furnish appropriate information that the district engineer considers necessary for the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). See also 40 CFR 1502.22 regarding incomplete or unavailable information.

4. *Elimination of Duplication with State and Local Procedures.* See 40 CFR 1506.2.

5. *Public Involvement.* Several paragraphs of this appendix (paragraphs 7, 8, 11, 13, and 19) provide information on the requirements for district engineers to make available to the public certain environmental documents in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.6.

6. *Categorical Exclusions—*a. *General.* Even though an EA or EIS is not legally mandated for any Federal action falling within one of the “categorical exclusions,” that fact does not exempt any Federal action from procedural or substantive compliance with any other Federal law. For example, compliance with the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, etc., is always mandatory, even for actions not requiring an EA or EIS. The following activities are not considered to be major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment and are therefore categorically excluded from NEPA documentation:

(1) Fixed or floating small private piers, small docks, boat hoists and boathouses.

(2) Minor utility distribution and collection lines including irrigation;

(3) Minor maintenance dredging using existing disposal sites;

(4) Boat launching ramps;

(5) All applications which qualify as letters of permission (as described at 33 CFR 325.5(b)(2)).

b. *Extraordinary Circumstances.* District engineers should be alert for extraordinary circumstances where normally excluded actions could have substantial environmental effects and thus require an EA or EIS. For a period of one year from the effective date of these regulations, district engineers should maintain an information list on the type and number of categorical exclusion actions which, due to extraordinary circumstances, triggered the need for an EA/FONSI or EIS. If a district engineer determines that a categorical exclusion should be modified, the information will be furnished to the division engineer who will review and analyze the actions and circumstances to determine if there is a basis for recommending a modification to the list of categorical exclusions. HQUSACE (CECW-OR) will review recommended changes for Corps-wide consistency and revise the list accordingly.

7. *EA/FONSI Document.* (See 40 CFR 1508.9 and 1508.13 for definitions)—a. *Environmental Assessment (EA) and Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI).* The EA should normally be combined with other required documents (EA/404(b)(1)/SOF/FONSI). “EA” as used throughout this Appendix normally refers to this combined document. The district engineer should complete an EA as soon as practicable after all relevant information is available (*i.e.*, after the comment period for the public notice of the permit application has expired) and when the EA is a separate document it must be completed prior to completion of the statement of finding (SOF). When the EA confirms that the impact of the applicant’s proposal is not significant and there are no “unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources * * *” (section 102(2)(E) of NEPA), and the proposed activity is a “water dependent” activity as defined in 40 CFR 230.10(a)(3), the EA need not include a discussion on alternatives. In all other cases where the district engineer determines that there are unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources, the EA shall include a discussion of the reasonable alternatives which are to be considered by the ultimate decision-maker. The decision options available to the Corps, which embrace all of the applicant’s alternatives, are issue the permit, issue with modifications or deny the permit. Modifications are limited to those project modifications within the

scope of established permit conditioning policy (See 33 CFR 325.4). The decision option to deny the permit results in the "no action" alternative (*i.e.*, no activity requiring a Corps permit). The combined document normally should not exceed 15 pages and shall conclude with a FONSI (See 40 CFR 1508.13) or a determination that an EIS is required. The district engineer may delegate the signing of the NEPA document. Should the EA demonstrate that an EIS is necessary, the district engineer shall follow the procedures outlined in paragraph 8 of this Appendix. In those cases where it is obvious an EIS is required, an EA is not required. However, the district engineer should document his reasons for requiring an EIS.

b. *Scope of Analysis.* (1) In some situations, a permit applicant may propose to conduct a specific activity requiring a Department of the Army (DA) permit (e.g., construction of a pier in a navigable water of the United States) which is merely one component of a larger project (e.g., construction of an oil refinery on an upland area). The district engineer should establish the scope of the NEPA document (e.g., the EA or EIS) to address the impacts of the specific activity requiring a DA permit and those portions of the entire project over which the district engineer has sufficient control and responsibility to warrant Federal review.

(2) The district engineer is considered to have control and responsibility for portions of the project beyond the limits of Corps jurisdiction where the Federal involvement is sufficient to turn an essentially private action into a Federal action. These are cases where the environmental consequences of the larger project are essentially products of the Corps permit action.

Typical factors to be considered in determining whether sufficient "control and responsibility" exists include:

(i) Whether or not the regulated activity comprises "merely a link" in a corridor type project (e.g., a transportation or utility transmission project).

(ii) Whether there are aspects of the upland facility in the immediate vicinity of the regulated activity which affect the location and configuration of the regulated activity.

(iii) The extent to which the entire project will be within Corps jurisdiction.

(iv) The extent of cumulative Federal control and responsibility.

A. Federal control and responsibility will include the portions of the project beyond the limits of Corps jurisdiction where the cumulative Federal involvement of the Corps and other Federal agencies is sufficient to grant legal control over such additional portions of the project. These are cases where the environmental consequences of the additional portions of the projects are essentially products of Federal financing, assistance, direction, regulation, or approval (not includ-

ing funding assistance solely in the form of general revenue sharing funds, with no Federal agency control over the subsequent use of such funds, and not including judicial or administrative civil or criminal enforcement actions).

B. In determining whether sufficient cumulative Federal involvement exists to expand the scope of Federal action the district engineer should consider whether other Federal agencies are required to take Federal action under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 *et seq.*), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, (42 U.S.C. 4321 91977), and other environmental review laws and executive orders.

C. The district engineer should also refer to paragraphs 8(b) and 8(c) of this appendix for guidance on determining whether it should be the lead or a cooperating agency in these situations.

These factors will be added to or modified through guidance as additional field experience develops.

(3) *Examples:* If a non-Federal oil refinery, electric generating plant, or industrial facility is proposed to be built on an upland site and the only DA permit requirement relates to a connecting pipeline, supply loading terminal or fill road, that pipeline, terminal or fill road permit, in and of itself, normally would not constitute sufficient overall Federal involvement with the project to justify expanding the scope of a Corps NEPA document to cover upland portions of the facility beyond the structures in the immediate vicinity of the regulated activity that would effect the location and configuration of the regulated activity.

Similarly, if an applicant seeks a DA permit to fill waters or wetlands on which other construction or work is proposed, the control and responsibility of the Corps, as well as its overall Federal involvement would extend to the portions of the project to be located on the permitted fill. However, the NEPA review would be extended to the entire project, including portions outside waters of the United States, only if sufficient Federal control and responsibility over the entire project is determined to exist; that is, if the regulated activities, and those activities involving regulation, funding, etc. by other Federal agencies, comprise a substantial portion of the overall project. In any case, once the scope of analysis has been defined, the NEPA analysis for that action should include direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on all Federal interests within the purview of the NEPA statute. The district engineer should, whenever practicable, incorporate by reference and rely upon the reviews of other Federal and State agencies.

For those regulated activities that comprise merely a link in a transportation or utility transmission project, the scope of analysis should address the Federal action, *i.e.*, the specific activity requiring a DA permit and any other portion of the project that is within the control or responsibility of the Corps of Engineers (or other Federal agencies).

For example, a 50-mile electrical transmission cable crossing a 1 1/4 mile wide river that is a navigable water of the United States requires a DA permit. Neither the origin and destination of the cable nor its route to and from the navigable water, except as the route applies to the location and configuration of the crossing, are within the control or responsibility of the Corps of Engineers. Those matters would not be included in the scope of analysis which, in this case, would address the impacts of the specific cable crossing.

Conversely, for those activities that require a DA permit for a major portion of a transportation or utility transmission project, so that the Corps permit bears upon the origin and destination as well as the route of the project outside the Corps regulatory boundaries, the scope of analysis should include those portions of the project outside the boundaries of the Corps section 10/404 regulatory jurisdiction. To use the same example, if 30 miles of the 50-mile transmission line crossed wetlands or other "waters of the United States," the scope of analysis should reflect impacts of the whole 50-mile transmission line.

For those activities that require a DA permit for a major portion of a shoreside facility, the scope of analysis should extend to upland portions of the facility. For example, a shipping terminal normally requires dredging, wharves, bulkheads, berthing areas and disposal of dredged material in order to function. Permits for such activities are normally considered sufficient Federal control and responsibility to warrant extending the scope of analysis to include the upland portions of the facility.

In all cases, the scope of analysis used for analyzing both impacts and alternatives should be the same scope of analysis used for analyzing the benefits of a proposal.

8. *Environmental Impact Statement—General—*a. *Determination of Lead and Cooperating Agencies.* When the district engineer determines that an EIS is required, he will contact all appropriate Federal agencies to determine their respective role(s), *i.e.*, that of lead agency or cooperating agency.

b. *Corps as Lead Agency.* When the Corps is lead agency, it will be responsible for managing the EIS process, including those portions which come under the jurisdiction of other Federal agencies. The district engineer is authorized to require the applicant to furnish appropriate information as discussed in

paragraph 3 of this appendix. It is permissible for the Corps to reimburse, under agreement, staff support from other Federal agencies beyond the immediate jurisdiction of those agencies.

c. *Corps as Cooperating Agency.* If another agency is the lead agency as set forth by the CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1501.5 and 1501.6(a) and 1508.16), the district engineer will coordinate with that agency as a cooperating agency under 40 CFR 1501.6(b) and 1508.5 to insure that agency's resulting EIS may be adopted by the Corps for purposes of exercising its regulatory authority. As a cooperating agency the Corps will be responsible to the lead agency for providing environmental information which is directly related to the regulatory matter involved and which is required for the preparation of an EIS. This in no way shall be construed as lessening the district engineer's ability to request the applicant to furnish appropriate information as discussed in paragraph 3 of this appendix.

When the Corps is a cooperating agency because of a regulatory responsibility, the district engineer should, in accordance with 40 CFR 1501.6(b)(4), "make available staff support at the lead agency's request" to enhance the latter's interdisciplinary capability provided the request pertains to the Corps regulatory action covered by the EIS, to the extent this is practicable. Beyond this, Corps staff support will generally be made available to the lead agency to the extent practicable within its own responsibility and available resources. Any assistance to a lead agency beyond this will normally be by written agreement with the lead agency providing for the Corps expenses on a cost reimbursable basis. If the district engineer believes a public hearing should be held and another agency is lead agency, the district engineer should request such a hearing and provide his reasoning for the request. The district engineer should suggest a joint hearing and offer to take an active part in the hearing and ensure coverage of the Corps concerns.

d. *Scope of Analysis.* See paragraph 7b.

e. *Scoping Process.* Refer to 40 CFR 1501.7 and 33 CFR 230.12.

f. *Contracting.* See 40 CFR 1506.5.

(1) The district engineer may prepare an EIS, or may obtain information needed to prepare an EIS, either with his own staff or by contract. In choosing a contractor who reports directly to the district engineer, the procedures of 40 CFR 1506.5(c) will be followed.

(2) Information required for an EIS also may be furnished by the applicant or a consultant employed by the applicant. Where this approach is followed, the district engineer will (i) advise the applicant and/or his consultant of the Corps information requirements, and (ii) meet with the applicant and/

or his consultant from time to time and provide him with the district engineer's views regarding adequacy of the data that are being developed (including how the district engineer will view such data in light of any possible conflicts of interest).

The applicant and/or his consultant may accept or reject the district engineer's guidance. The district engineer, however, may after specifying the information in contention, require the applicant to resubmit any previously submitted data which the district engineer considers inadequate or inaccurate. In all cases, the district engineer should document in the record the Corps independent evaluation of the information and its accuracy, as required by 40 CFR 1506.5(a).

g. Change in EIS Determination. If it is determined that an EIS is not required after a notice of intent has been published, the district engineer shall terminate the EIS preparation and withdraw the notice of intent. The district engineer shall notify in writing the appropriate division engineer; HQUSACE (CECW-OR); the appropriate EPA regional administrator, the Director, Office of Federal Activities (A-104), EPA, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460 and the public of the determination.

h. Time Limits. For regulatory actions, the district engineer will follow 33 CFR 230.17(a) unless unusual delays caused by applicant inaction or compliance with other statutes require longer time frames for EIS preparation. At the outset of the EIS effort, schedule milestones will be developed and made available to the applicant and the public. If the milestone dates are not met the district engineer will notify the applicant and explain the reason for delay.

9. Organization and Content of Draft EISs—
a. General. This section gives detailed information for preparing draft EISs. When the Corps is the lead agency, this draft EIS format and these procedures will be followed. When the Corps is one of the joint lead agencies, the joint lead agencies will mutually decide which agency's format and procedures will be followed.

b. Format—(1) Cover Sheet. (a) Ref. 40 CFR 1502.11.

(b) The "person at the agency who can supply further information" (40 CFR 1502.11(c)) is the project manager handling that permit application.

(c) The cover sheet should identify the EIS as a Corps permit action and state the authorities (sections 9, 10, 404, 103, etc.) under which the Corps is exerting its jurisdiction.

(2) *Summary.* In addition to the requirements of 40 CFR 1502.12, this section should identify the proposed action as a Corps permit action stating the authorities (sections 9, 10, 404, 103, etc.) under which the Corps is exerting its jurisdiction. It shall also summarize the purpose and need for the proposed

action and shall briefly state the beneficial/adverse impacts of the proposed action.

(3) *Table of Contents.*

(4) *Purpose and Need.* See 40 CFR 1502.13. If the scope of analysis for the NEPA document (see paragraph 7b) covers only the proposed specific activity requiring a Department of the Army permit, then the underlying purpose and need for that specific activity should be stated. (For example, "The purpose and need for the pipe is to obtain cooling water from the river for the electric generating plant.") If the scope of analysis covers a more extensive project, only part of which may require a DA permit, then the underlying purpose and need for the entire project should be stated. (For example, "The purpose and need for the electric generating plant is to provide increased supplies of electricity to the (named) geographic area.") Normally, the applicant should be encouraged to provide a statement of his proposed activity's purpose and need from his perspective (for example, "to construct an electric generating plant"). However, whenever the NEPA document's scope of analysis renders it appropriate, the Corps also should consider and express that activity's underlying purpose and need from a public interest perspective (to use that same example, "to meet the public's need for electric energy"). Also, while generally focusing on the applicant's statement, the Corps, will in all cases, exercise independent judgment in defining the purpose and need for the project from both the applicant's and the public's perspective.

(5) *Alternatives.* See 40 CFR 1502.14. The Corps is neither an opponent nor a proponent of the applicant's proposal; therefore, the applicant's final proposal will be identified as the "applicant's preferred alternative" in the final EIS. Decision options available to the district engineer, which embrace all of the applicant's alternatives, are issue the permit, issue with modifications or conditions or deny the permit.

(a) Only reasonable alternatives need be considered in detail, as specified in 40 CFR 1502.14(a). Reasonable alternatives must be those that are feasible and such feasibility must focus on the accomplishment of the underlying purpose and need (of the applicant or the public) that would be satisfied by the proposed Federal action (permit issuance). The alternatives analysis should be thorough enough to use for both the public interest review and the 404(b)(1) guidelines (40 CFR part 230) where applicable. Those alternatives that are unavailable to the applicant, whether or not they require Federal action (permits), should normally be included in the analysis of the no-Federal-action (denial) alternative. Such alternatives should be evaluated only to the extent necessary to allow a complete and objective evaluation of the public interest and a fully informed decision regarding the permit application.

(b) The “no-action” alternative is one which results in no construction requiring a Corps permit. It may be brought by (1) the applicant electing to modify his proposal to eliminate work under the jurisdiction of the Corps or (2) by the denial of the permit. District engineers, when evaluating this alternative, should discuss, when appropriate, the consequences of other likely uses of a project site, should the permit be denied.

(c) The EIS should discuss geographic alternatives, e.g., changes in location and other site specific variables, and functional alternatives, e.g., project substitutes and design modifications.

(d) The Corps shall not prepare a cost-benefit analysis for projects requiring a Corps permit. 40 CFR 1502.23 states that the weighing of the various alternatives need not be displayed in a cost-benefit analysis and “* * * should not be when there are important qualitative considerations.” The EIS should, however, indicate any cost considerations that are likely to be relevant to a decision.

(e) Mitigation is defined in 40 CFR 1508.20, and Federal action agencies are directed in 40 CFR 1502.14 to include appropriate mitigation measures. Guidance on the conditioning of permits to require mitigation is in 33 CFR 320.4(r) and 325.4. The nature and extent of mitigation conditions are dependent on the results of the public interest review in 33 CFR 320.4.

(6) *Affected Environment.* See Ref. 40 CFR 1502.15.

(7) *Environmental Consequences.* See Ref. 40 CFR 1502.16.

(8) *List of Preparers.* See Ref. 40 CFR 1502.17.

(9) *Public Involvement.* This section should list the dates and nature of all public notices, scoping meetings and public hearings and include a list of all parties notified.

(10) *Appendices.* See 40 CFR 1502.18. Appendices should be used to the maximum extent practicable to minimize the length of the main text of the EIS. Appendices normally should not be circulated with every copy of the EIS, but appropriate appendices should be provided routinely to parties with special interest and expertise in the particular subject.

(11) *Index.* The Index of an EIS, at the end of the document, should be designed to provide for easy reference to items discussed in the main text of the EIS.

10. *Notice of Intent.* The district engineer shall follow the guidance in 33 CFR part 230, Appendix C in preparing a notice of intent to prepare a draft EIS for publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

11. *Public Hearing.* If a public hearing is to be held pursuant to 33 CFR part 327 for a permit application requiring an EIS, the actions analyzed by the draft EIS should be considered at the public hearing. The district engineer should make the draft EIS available to

the public at least 15 days in advance of the hearing. If a hearing request is received from another agency having jurisdiction as provided in 40 CFR 1506.6(c)(2), the district engineer should coordinate a joint hearing with that agency whenever appropriate.

12. *Organization and Content of Final EIS.* The organization and content of the final EIS including the abbreviated final EIS procedures shall follow the guidance in 33 CFR 230.14(a).

13. *Comments Received on the Final EIS.* For permit cases to be decided at the district level, the district engineer should consider all incoming comments and provide responses when substantive issues are raised which have not been addressed in the final EIS. For permit cases decided at higher authority, the district engineer shall forward the final EIS comment letters together with appropriate responses to higher authority along with the case. In the case of a letter recommending a referral under 40 CFR part 1504, the district engineer will follow the guidance in paragraph 19 of this appendix.

14. *EIS Supplement.* See 33 CFR 230.13(b).

15. *Filing Requirements.* See 40 CFR 1506.9. Five (5) copies of EISs shall be sent to Director, Office of Federal Activities (A-104), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. The official review periods commence with EPA’s publication of a notice of availability of the draft or final EISs in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Generally, this notice appears on Friday of each week. At the same time they are mailed to EPA for filing, one copy of each draft or final EIS, or EIS supplement should be mailed to HQUSACE (CECW-OR) WASH DC 20314-1000.

16. *Timing.* 40 CFR 1506.10 describes the timing of an agency action when an EIS is involved.

17. *Expedited Filing.* 40 CFR 1506.10 provides information on allowable time reductions and time extensions associated with the EIS process. The district engineer will provide the necessary information and facts to HQUSACE (CECW-RE) WASH DC 20314-1000 (with copy to CECW-OR) for consultation with EPA for a reduction in the prescribed review periods.

18. *Record of Decision.* In those cases involving an EIS, the statement of findings will be called the record of decision and shall incorporate the requirements of 40 CFR 1505.2. The record of decision is not to be included when filing a final EIS and may not be signed until 30 days after the notice of availability of the final EIS is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. To avoid duplication, the record of decision may reference the EIS.

19. *Predecision Referrals by Other Agencies.* See 40 CFR part 1504. The decisionmaker should notify any potential referring Federal agency and CEQ of a final decision if it is contrary to the announced position of a potential referring agency. (This pertains to a

NEPA referral, not a 404(q) referral under the Clean Water Act. The procedures for a 404(q) referral are outlined in the 404(q) Memoranda of Agreement. The potential referring agency will then have 25 calendar days to refer the case to CEQ under 40 CFR part 1504. Referrals will be transmitted through division to CECW-RE for further guidance with an information copy to CECW-OR.

20. *Review of Other Agencies' EISs.* District engineers should provide comments directly to the requesting agency specifically related to the Corps jurisdiction by law or special expertise as defined in 40 CFR 1508.15 and 1508.26 and identified in Appendix II of CEQ regulations (49 FR 49750, December 21, 1984). If the district engineer determines that another agency's draft EIS which involves a Corps permit action is inadequate with respect to the Corps permit action, the district engineer should attempt to resolve the differences concerning the Corps permit action prior to the filing of the final EIS by the other agency. If the district engineer finds that the final EIS is inadequate with respect to the Corps permit action, the district engineer should incorporate the other agency's final EIS or a portion thereof and prepare an appropriate and adequate NEPA document to address the Corps involvement with the proposed action. See 33 CFR 230.21 for guidance. The agency which prepared the original EIS should be given the opportunity to provide additional information to that contained in the EIS in order for the Corps to have all relevant information available for a sound decision on the permit.

21. *Monitoring.* Monitoring compliance with permit requirements should be carried out in accordance with 33 CFR 230.15 and with 33 CFR part 325.

[53 FR 3134, Feb. 3, 1988]

APPENDIX C TO PART 325—PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

1. Definitions
2. General Policy
3. Initial Review
4. Public Notice
5. Investigations
6. Eligibility Determinations
7. Assessing Effects
8. Consultation
9. ACHP Review and Comment
10. District Engineer Decision
11. Historic Properties Discovered During Construction
12. Regional General Permits
13. Nationwide General Permits
14. Emergency Procedures
15. Criteria of Effect and Adverse Effect

1. Definitions

a. *Designated historic property* is a historic property listed in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) or which has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register pursuant to 36 CFR part 63. A historic property that, in both the opinion of the SHPO and the district engineer, appears to meet the criteria for inclusion in the National Register will be treated as a "designated historic property."

b. *Historic property* is a property which has historical importance to any person or group. This term includes the types of districts, sites, buildings, structures or objects eligible for inclusion, but not necessarily listed, on the National Register.

c. *Certified local government* is a local government certified in accordance with section 101(c)(1) of the NHPA (See 36 CFR part 61).

d. The term "criteria for inclusion in the National Register" refers to the criteria published by the Department of Interior at 36 CFR 60.4.

e. An "effect" on a "designated historic property" occurs when the undertaking may alter the characteristics of the property that qualified the property for inclusion in the National Register. Consideration of effects on "designated historic properties" includes indirect effects of the undertaking. The criteria for effect and adverse effect are described in Paragraph 15 of this appendix.

f. The term "undertaking" as used in this appendix means the work, structure or discharge that requires a Department of the Army permit pursuant to the Corps regulations at 33 CFR 320-334.

g. Permit area.

(1) The term "permit area" as used in this appendix means those areas comprising the waters of the United States that will be directly affected by the proposed work or structures and uplands directly affected as a result of authorizing the work or structures. The following three tests must all be satisfied for an activity undertaken outside the waters of the United States to be included within the "permit area":

(i) Such activity would not occur but for the authorization of the work or structures within the waters of the United States;

(ii) Such activity must be integrally related to the work or structures to be authorized within waters of the United States. Or, conversely, the work or structures to be authorized must be essential to the completeness of the overall project or program; and

(iii) Such activity must be directly associated (first order impact) with the work or structures to be authorized.

(2) For example, consider an application for a permit to construct a pier and dredge an access channel so that an industry may be established and operated on an upland area.