

# CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

## Exemptions from Environmental Law for the Department of Defense: An Overview of Congressional Action

David M. Bearden  
Analyst in Environmental Policy  
Resources, Science, and Industry Division

### Summary

Several environmental statutes contain national security exemptions, which the Department of Defense (DOD) can obtain on a case-by-case basis. Since FY2003, DOD has sought broader exemptions that it argues are needed to preserve training capabilities and ensure military readiness. There has been disagreement in Congress over the need for broader exemptions in the absence of data on the overall impact of environmental requirements on training and readiness. There also has been disagreement over the potential impacts of broader exemptions on environmental quality. After considerable debate, the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted an exemption that DOD requested from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted exemptions from the Marine Mammal Protection Act and certain parts of the Endangered Species Act. These exemptions were contentious to some because of concern about the weakening of protections for animals and plants. In the first session of the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, DOD again requested exemptions from the Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. These exemptions prompted opposition from some states and communities concerned about possible risks to human health from potential exposure to air pollution and hazardous substances. As enacted, none of the FY2006 defense authorization or appropriations bills (H.R. 1815, H.R. 2528, and H.R. 2863) included these exemptions. This report will be updated as warranted.

### Introduction

Over time, Congress has included exemptions in several environmental statutes to ensure that requirements of those statutes would not restrict military training needs to the extent that national security would be compromised. These exemptions provide authority for suspending compliance requirements for actions at federal facilities, including military installations, on a case-by-case basis. Most of these exemptions may be granted for activities that would be in the “paramount interest of the United States,” whereas others

are specifically for national security.<sup>1</sup> Most of these exemptions are limited to one year, but they can be renewed.<sup>2</sup> The extent to which broader exemptions from environmental requirements are needed for military readiness activities has become a prominent issue.

DOD argues that obtaining exemptions on a case-by-case basis is onerous and time-consuming because of the number of training exercises that it conducts on hundreds of military installations. DOD also argues that the time limits placed on most exemptions are not compatible with ongoing or recurring training activities. Instead, DOD has sought broader exemptions from certain environmental requirements that it argues restrict or delay training necessary for readiness. As part of its FY2003 defense authorization proposal, DOD issued a Readiness and Range Preservation Initiative, requesting certain exemptions from six environmental laws: Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Disposal Act,<sup>3</sup> and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

DOD's request for broader exemptions has been contentious in Congress. Some Members assert that such exemptions are necessary to provide greater flexibility for conducting combat training and other readiness activities without restriction or delay. However, other Members, states, environmental organizations, and communities have opposed broader exemptions, pointing to the lack of data to demonstrate the extent to which environmental requirements have restricted training exercises and compromised readiness overall. They argue that expanding exemption authority without justification for its need would unnecessarily weaken environmental protection.

After considerable debate, the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted the exemption DOD requested from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted exemptions from the Marine Mammal Protection Act and certain parts of the Endangered Species Act. Although these exemptions were contentious among those concerned about the weakening of protections for animals and plants, there has been greater opposition to exemptions that DOD requested from the Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Disposal Act, and CERCLA. Opponents to exemptions from these three statutes have expressed concern about risks to human health from the potential exposure to air pollution and hazardous substances. Neither the 107<sup>th</sup> nor the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted these exemptions. DOD proposed them again in the first session of the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, as part of its FY2006 defense authorization

---

<sup>1</sup> The following environmental statutes authorize the President to grant exemptions for federal facilities, including military installations, on a case-by-case basis. Exemptions for activities in the "paramount interest of the United States," including national security, are provided in the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7418(b)), Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1323(a)), Noise Control Act (42 U.S.C. 4903), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6961(a)), and Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300(j)(6)). An exemption specifically for national security is provided in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9620(j)). The Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1536(j)) also authorizes a special committee to grant an exemption if the Secretary of Defense finds it necessary for national security. See CRS Report RS21217, *Exemptions for Military Activities in Federal Environmental Laws*.

<sup>2</sup> The Safe Drinking Water Act does not impose time limits on exemptions. Although the Endangered Species Act allows time limits, the law does not require it.

<sup>3</sup> The Solid Waste Disposal Act is popularly referred to as "RCRA," the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, which amended the Solid Waste Disposal Act in that year.

proposal, arguing again that critical training could be restricted otherwise. As enacted, none of the FY2006 defense authorization or appropriations bills (H.R. 1815, H.R. 2528, and H.R. 2863) included these exemptions.

The following sections of this report discuss the difficulty of assessing the impact of environmental requirements on military readiness, broader exemptions for military activities that Congress has enacted, and DOD's request for additional exemptions.

## **Impact of Environmental Requirements on Readiness**

There has been ongoing disagreement as to whether existing authorities for case-by-case exemptions from environmental requirements are sufficient to preserve military readiness. Assessing the need for broader exemptions is difficult because of the lack of data on the cumulative impact of environmental requirements on readiness. Although DOD has cited some examples of training restrictions or delays at certain installations and has used these as the basis for seeking legislative remedies, DOD does not have a system in place to comprehensively track these cases and determine their impact on readiness.

In 2002, the General Accounting Office (GAO, now renamed the Government Accountability Office) found that DOD's readiness reports did not indicate the extent to which environmental requirements restrict combat training activities, and that such reports indicate a high level of readiness overall.<sup>4</sup> However, GAO noted individual instances of environmental restrictions at some military installations and recommended that DOD's reporting system be improved to more accurately identify problems for training that might be attributed to restrictions imposed by environmental requirements. A 2003 GAO report found that environmental restrictions are only one of several factors, including urban growth, that affect DOD's ability to carry out training activities, but that DOD continues to be unable to broadly measure the impact of encroachment on readiness.<sup>5</sup>

The lack of comprehensive data to assess the need for DOD's request for exemptions from the Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Disposal Act, and CERCLA prompted the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress to include a reporting requirement in Section 320 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2004 (P.L. 108-136). This section requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on how compliance with these three statutes affects military operations and to report the findings to Congress. DOD completed an interim report in 2004 and expects to complete the final report in 2006.

## **Exemptions Enacted in the 107<sup>th</sup> and 108<sup>th</sup> Congress**

As noted above, the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted an interim exemption for military readiness activities from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the 108<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted a broad exemption from the Marine Mammal Protection Act and a narrower one from certain parts of the Endangered Species Act. Throughout the congressional debate over

---

<sup>4</sup> General Accounting Office, *Military Training: DOD Needs a Comprehensive Plan to Manage Encroachment on Training Ranges*, GAO-02-727T, May 2002.

<sup>5</sup> General Accounting Office, *Military Training: DOD Approach to Managing Encroachment on Training Ranges Still Evolving*, GAO-03-621T, April 2003.

these exemptions, there was significant disagreement among Members of Congress regarding the military need for them in light of the lack of data on the effect of these statutes on readiness overall, and the potential impact of the exemptions on animal and plant species. A summary of each exemption is discussed below.<sup>6</sup>

**Migratory Bird Treaty Act.** Section 315 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2003 (P.L. 107-314) directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop regulations for the issuance of permits for the “incidental takings” of migratory birds during military training exercises, and provided an interim exemption from the Migratory Bird Treaty Act while these regulations are being drafted. A U.S. district court had ruled that federal agencies, including DOD, are required to obtain permits for incidental takings,<sup>7</sup> and DOD argued that an exemption was needed to prevent the delay of training activities while regulations are developed. In June 2004, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service proposed regulations for issuing incidental takings permits to DOD<sup>8</sup>; the draft of the final regulations is in interagency review.

**Endangered Species Act.** Section 318(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2004 (P.L. 108-136) granted the Secretary of the Interior the authority to exempt military lands from designation as critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act, if the Secretary determines “in writing” that an Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan for such lands provides a “benefit” to the species for which critical habitat is proposed for designation. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had been allowing these plans to substitute for critical habitat designation in recent years. DOD argued that clarification of the authority for this practice was needed to avoid future designations that in its view could restrict the use of military lands for training. Section 318(b) also directs the Secretary of the Interior to consider impacts on national security when deciding whether to designate critical habitat. Although these provisions affect the applicability of critical habitat requirements on military lands, DOD continues to be subject to all other protections provided under the Endangered Species Act, including consultation requirements and prohibitions on the “taking”<sup>9</sup> of endangered and threatened species.

**Marine Mammal Protection Act.** Section 319 of P.L. 108-136 provided a broad exemption from the Marine Mammal Protection Act for “national defense.” Section 319 also amended the definition of “harassment” of marine mammals, as it applies to military readiness activities, to require greater scientific evidence of harm, and required the consideration of impacts on military readiness in the issuance of permits for incidental

---

<sup>6</sup> For further discussion of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act exemption, see CRS Report RL31456, *Defense Cleanup and Environmental Programs: Authorization and Appropriations for FY2003*. For further discussion of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act exemptions, see CRS Report RL32183, *Defense Cleanup and Environmental Programs: Authorization and Appropriations for FY2004*. Also see CRS Report RL31415, *The Endangered Species Act (ESA), Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and Department of Defense (DOD) Readiness Activities: Background and Current Law*.

<sup>7</sup> 26 191 F. Supp. 2d 161 (D. D.C. 2002).

<sup>8</sup> 69 *Federal Register* 31074.

<sup>9</sup> As defined in federal statute, “taking” means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct (16 U.S.C. 1532(19)).

takings. DOD had argued that these amendments were necessary primarily to prevent restrictions on the testing of the Navy's low-frequency "active" sonar system. Environmental organizations had legally challenged the use of the sonar system, arguing that it harmed marine mammals and was therefore a violation of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as well as other environmental statutes.<sup>10</sup>

## Exemptions Proposed by DOD in the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress

DOD submitted its FY2006 defense authorization proposal in the first session of the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress on April 7, 2005.<sup>11</sup> Similar to past proposals since FY2003, it included exemptions from certain requirements of the Clean Air Act, Solid Waste Disposal Act, and CERCLA. DOD and some Members argued that these exemptions were needed to preserve training capabilities critical to military readiness, and that they would have a minimal impact on environmental quality. Other Members, states, communities, and environmental organizations countered that the impacts reach beyond DOD's stated intent. As noted earlier, none of the enacted FY2006 defense authorization or appropriations bills (H.R. 1815, H.R. 2528, and H.R. 2863) included these exemptions. Each exemption, as proposed by DOD, is discussed below.

**Clean Air Act.** Section 313 of DOD's legislative proposal would have exempted emissions generated by military readiness activities from requirements to "conform" to State Implementation Plans (SIP) for achieving federal air quality standards. Under current law, sources of emissions, including activities of federal agencies, that would increase emissions beyond limitations established in a state's SIP are prohibited, unless offsetting reductions from other sources are made in the same area. DOD argued that its proposed exemption would have provided greater flexibility for transferring training operations to areas with poor air quality, without the possibility of restrictions on these operations due to the emissions that they would produce.

DOD has argued that the activities in question (many of which involve the reassignment of aircraft from one installation to another) have a small impact on air quality. In most areas, the threshold for imposition of the conformity requirement is a net increase of 100 tons of emissions annually, a threshold that translates to a net increase of more than 72,000 military aircraft takeoffs and landings annually. Whether such an increase is, in fact, "small" is one issue raised by opponents, including state and local air pollution control program officials, state environmental commissioners, state attorneys general, county and municipal governments, and environmental organizations.

The proposal also would have altered Clean Air Act requirements for nonattainment areas in which DOD conducts nonconforming readiness activities. These areas would have been allowed to demonstrate that they would have met the standard except for emissions from readiness activities. In addition, the proposal would have removed the consequences of failure to attain the standards in such areas — that is, an area could not have been forced to impose more stringent pollution control requirements if its failure to meet air quality standards was the result of emissions from military readiness activities.

---

<sup>10</sup> NRDC v. Evans, 232 F.Supp. 2d. 1003, 1055 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

<sup>11</sup> The full text of the proposal and supporting documents are available on DOD's Office of Legislative Counsel's website at [<http://www.defenselink.mil/dodgc/olc/legispro.html>].

**Solid Waste Disposal Act and CERCLA.** Section 314 of DOD’s legislative proposal would have amended the definition of “solid waste” in the Solid Waste Disposal Act and “release” (or threatened release) in CERCLA, to exclude military munitions on an operational range. The proposed exemption used the current definition of operational range,<sup>12</sup> under which DOD has the discretion to designate practically any lands under its jurisdiction as operational, regardless of whether the land is currently being used for training. Opponents argued that, in effect, this exemption would have placed military munitions on operational ranges entirely beyond the reach of these two statutes, and could have allowed munitions and any resulting contamination to remain indefinitely on any military lands designated as operational. As the exemption would no longer have applied once a range ceased to be operational, it therefore would not have applied to ranges on closed bases after the land is transferred out of the jurisdiction of DOD.<sup>13</sup>

DOD argued that its proposal would have codified existing federal regulations under the Military Munitions Rule, promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency in 1997.<sup>14</sup> Under this rule, “used or fired” munitions on a range are considered a solid waste only when they are removed from their landing spot.<sup>15</sup> Until DOD removes them and they “become” solid waste, they are not subject to disposal requirements. Munitions left to accumulate on a range can leach hazardous constituents into the soil and groundwater over time, possibly requiring cleanup. DOD stated that it sought to codify the munitions rule in order to eliminate the possibility of legal challenges to existing regulations, which might result in an active range being closed to require the removal of accumulating munitions and cleanup of related contamination. DOD asserted that such challenges could restrict training.

However, excluding military munitions from the definitions of “solid waste” and “release” in federal statute could have broader implications for cleanup than in existing regulation. Those opposed to these statutory changes included some state attorneys general, state waste management officials, municipal water utilities, environmental organizations, and community groups. They argued that the exemption would have narrowed the waiver of federal sovereign immunity in states, resulting in the removal of state authority to monitor groundwater on an operational range to determine if a substance presents a health hazard, or to file citizen suits under the Solid Waste Disposal Act or CERCLA to compel cleanup of that substance. If this were the case, they argued, groundwater contamination could not be investigated until it migrated off-range, potentially resulting in greater contamination and higher cleanup costs than if the contamination were identified and responded to earlier. Opponents also asserted that the potential threat of litigation was not a sufficient basis for a broad change to cleanup laws.

---

<sup>12</sup> 10 U.S.C. 101(e)(3). Operational range is “a range that is under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the Secretary of Defense and that is used for range activities, or although *not currently being used* [emphasis added] for range activities, is still considered by the Secretary to be a range and has not been put to a new use that is incompatible with range activities.”

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of cleanup requirements on closed bases, see CRS Report RS22065, *Military Base Closures: Role and Costs of Environmental Cleanup*.

<sup>14</sup> 40 C.F.R. Part 266, Subpart M.

<sup>15</sup> 40 C.F.R. 266.202(c).