

POR Number: 172-07
Contract Number: W5830-080016/001/CY
Award Date: 2007/10/01
Fieldwork Completion Date: 2007/12/12

FINAL REPORT
Army Environmental Program (AEP) Stakeholder Research

Prepared for the Department of National Defence

por-rop@forces.gc.ca

Ce rapport est également disponible en français.

January 2008



Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.
1678 Bank Street, Ste. 2, Ottawa, Ontario K1V 7Y6
Tel: (613) 260-1700 Fax: (613) 260-1300 Email: info@phoenixspi.ca
www.phoenixspi.ca

This report is formatted for double-sided printing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Sommaire	v
Introduction	1
Background	3
Awareness, Knowledge & Concern Regarding Army’s Environmental Impact	4
Awareness & Knowledge of Army Environmental Practices.....	9
Perceptions of Army Environmental Program (AEP).....	10

Appendices (English and French):

- Background letter
- Interview guide
- Test materials.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Phoenix SPI was commissioned by the Department of National Defence to conduct qualitative research related to the awareness, knowledge and attitudes of stakeholders in terms of current Army environmental practices and the Army Environmental Program (AEP). This included reviewing and commenting on a short document that provides basic information about the Army Environmental Program. A set of 10 in-depth telephone interviews was conducted between October 30th and December 12th, 2007 with senior executives of environmental organizations in Canada.

This research was qualitative in nature, not quantitative. As such, the results provide an indication of participants' views about the issues explored, but cannot be generalized to the full population of environmental organizations in Canada.

Awareness, Knowledge & Concerns about Army's Environmental Impact

Stakeholders knew little about the environmental impact of Army activities, and knowledge of this issue tended to be both second-hand and limited. In terms of sources, information was most often acquired through the news media.

Despite limited knowledge about the environmental impact of Army activities, participants were readily able to identify *types* of Army activities that they think have an impact on the environment. These included training and operational exercises, storage/management of toxic materials and substances, use of vehicles (i.e. the sheer number of vehicles owned and operated by the Army and its contribution to air pollution, smog and GHG emissions), and facilities management/maintenance, including day-to-day waste disposal, the efficiency of heating and cooling systems, the maintenance/management of closed or abandoned bases, and even the type of paint used on buildings.

Most participants characterized the impact of such activities on the environment as significant, and these impacts were seen to range from the immediate to the long-term. Participants expressed a variety of concerns related to the impact of Army activities on the environment, but the most frequently-identified concern was the possible impact of chemicals and toxic substances on human health and non-human species. Other concerns routinely identified included habitat destruction, altered ecosystems, displacement of species, and lack of clean-up/retrieval after exercises.

Asked where they would go if they wanted information about the impact of Army activities on the environment, most said they would at least begin with the Army itself or the Department of National Defence, as well as other federal government sources. Some said they would consult ENGOs that might have such information or even be involved in monitoring or tracking Army activities. These included the Suzuki Foundation, the Sierra Club, Environmental Defence, and peace-focused NGOs in general.

Generally speaking, participants were more likely to trust organizations independent of the Armed Forces (both governmental and non-governmental) to provide information on the impact of the Army's environmental activities, though some added that they would begin by approaching the Army itself. There was a general sense that arm's length organizations

are more likely to be objective. Federal government sources included the Office of the Auditor General, Environment Canada, and the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development. Non-government sources included ENGOs tracking or monitoring Army activities, universities doing the same, or the independent scientific community studying these issues.

While none of the participants said they would distrust information provided by the Army, most said they would like to double-check it by going to other sources as well (e.g. Office of the Auditor General, ENGOs tracking Army activities). Some, however, were more suspicious, suggesting that the Army would have an interest in minimizing public exposure of its environmental record for fear of legal or financial implications, or would not be forthcoming with information because of the sensitive nature of its activities in general.

None of the participants felt that the Army could conduct training operations to maintain operational readiness that would not have some impact on the environment. Having said that, there was also a consensus that the environmental impact of such activities could be minimized or lessened. Underscoring the consensus that the environmental impact of such activities could be minimized was a near-consensus that the Army's need to carry out its defence-related objectives, including operational readiness, is compatible with environmental sustainability.

Awareness & Knowledge of Army Environmental Practices

Most participants assumed that the Army has some programs and/or practices in place to manage the environmental impact of its activities. A few said they knew that the Army has such programs and practices in place because every department of the federal government must have a sustainable development strategy. A couple said they simply did not know.

Knowledge of Army environmental practices and programs was mostly limited, general, and sometimes based on hearsay. Some assumed that there were practices in place regarding such things as recycling, storage of hazardous materials, and waste disposal. Some assumed that there might be a sustainable development plan in place since they had heard something about this through the environmental grapevine. Lack of awareness of Army environmental practices and programs was underscored by the limited awareness of the Army Environmental Program. Only a few had heard of the AEP before this research, and it was only an expression to them. In others words, they knew nothing about it.

Perceptions of Army Environmental Program

Most participants reacted positively to the content of the document as a directional piece or vision outlining the Army's goals and objectives as they relate to the environment, describing it as clear, interesting and informative. However, many of these participants added that the document is limited when it comes to providing concrete and specific details. A few participants whose overall reaction to the document was critical also pointed to its lack of detail to explain their impression. Most said that the main thing they learned from reading this document is that the Army has an environmental program in place.

Asked if the document does a good job informing them about the Army's environmental program, participants tended to re-iterate what they said when asked about their general impressions of the document (i.e. it provides a good overview of the Army's goals and objectives, but is weak on specifics). A few were more critical, saying that the document paints with broad brush strokes and begs questions in the information it does provide.

Nearly all participants identified additional information they would want to know about the AEP, including the following: concrete achievements made to date regarding the environment, details about mechanisms designed to measure, monitor, and oversee progress towards goals/objectives, specific targets and timelines, plans regarding environmental stewardship, accountability measures that will ensure that the Army is carrying out its program effectively, budgetary information, and information about the ability to access information about the Army's environmental activities in order to monitor its progress.

Most expressed positive impressions of the AEP, using language such as 'reasonable', 'a good start', and 'a good framework or overview to work from' to describe it. That said, almost all said they would need more information about the program in order to provide more than a general impression of its effectiveness. Such information fell into two general categories: details about the actions being taken, and details regarding measurement and accountability.

Based on the information contained in the AEP document, most stakeholders felt that environmental issues were being *addressed* by the Army, but they could not say with any degree of confidence that these issues were being *well-managed*. These participants explained that they would need more information about the AEP before they could comment on the extent to which these issues are well-managed.

The information provided in the AEP document improved most participants' perceptions of the Army when it comes to environmental issues. The improved perception was attributed mainly to learning that the Army is thinking about its environmental impact and ways to mitigate it. While encouraged by the existence of the AEP, some indicated that their perception could be further improved if they were given details about actions being taken and results.

Participants had difficulty expressing any degree of confidence in the Army implementing the practices outlined in its environmental program. For the most part, this was due the absence of any basis or foundation on which to base such an assessment. Most stakeholders expressed hope rather than confidence that the Army will implement the environmental practices outlined in its environmental program. A few were not confident that these practices would be implemented, citing the absence of an outside or external oversight mechanism, and perceived lack of specific commitment in the text of AEP document.

Conclusions & Implications

While there is a consensus that Army activities have a significant impact on the environment, and obvious concern about these impacts, participants admittedly know little-to-nothing about the actual environmental impact of Army activities or what, if anything the Army is doing to address these issues. Most assumed, without knowing, that the Army has certain practices in place regarding the environment, but there was no knowledge of the AEP specifically. In short, the existence of the AEP was new information to virtually all participants.

While participants tended to react positively to the AEP as described in the document they read, there is a clear desire for more detailed information. This not only reflects a definite and widespread interest in the issue, but also underscores the degree to which participants have limited knowledge of this issue.

While participants clearly regard the Army's impact on the environment as significant, and are concerned about these impacts, this did not translate into negative impressions of the Army, and there was little if any hostility or resentment expressed. Indeed, the opposite tended to be the case. Throughout the interviews, there was evidence of openness and receptivity towards the Army on this issue. This was evident through the following in particular:

- Participants recognized that the Army cannot conduct training operations without there being some impact on the environment.
- Underlying the near-consensus that the Army's need to carry out its defence-related objectives is compatible with environmental sustainability was a willingness to work with the Army to help it in this regard.
- Asked where they would go if they wanted information about the impact of Army activities on the environment, most said they would at least begin with the Army itself or the Department of National Defence.
- Many participants prefaced their comments about the AEP document by expressing pleasure that the Army has an environmental plan or program.
- Much of the criticism of the AEP document was based on a desire for more information.
- The information provided in the AEP document improved most participants' perceptions of the Army when it comes to environmental issues.

Clearly, there was a considerable degree of goodwill exhibited by stakeholders, and an openness to work with the Army as it strives to limit and mitigate its impact on the environment.

More Information:

Supplier Name: Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.
PWGSC Contract Number: W5830-080016/001/CY
Award Date: 2007/10/01

To obtain more information on this study, please email por-rop@forces.gc.ca.

SOMMAIRE

Le ministère de la Défense nationale a chargé Phoenix SPI de mener une recherche qualitative sur la sensibilisation, les connaissances et les attitudes des intéressés en ce qui concerne les pratiques environnementales actuelles et le Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre. Il s'agissait de lire et de commenter un bref document comportant des renseignements de base sur le Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre. Dix entrevues téléphoniques en profondeur ont été réalisées entre le 30 octobre et le 12 décembre 2007 avec des cadres supérieurs d'organisations environnementales au Canada.

Il est à signaler que la présente recherche était de nature qualitative et non quantitative. Par conséquent, les résultats donnent une indication de l'opinion des participants sur les questions à l'étude mais ne peuvent être généralisés à l'ensemble de la population des organisations environnementales au Canada.

Sensibilisation, connaissances et préoccupations relatives à l'impact de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement

Les intéressés étaient peu au courant de l'impact environnemental des activités de l'Armée de terre et leurs connaissances en la matière, plutôt faibles, s'apparentaient surtout à du ouï-dire. Leur information provenait le plus souvent des médias.

Malgré leurs connaissances restreintes quant à l'impact environnemental des activités de l'Armée de terre, les participants étaient facilement en mesure d'identifier les *genres* d'activités de l'Armée de terre qui leur semblent avoir une incidence sur l'environnement. Ce sont, notamment, l'entraînement et les opérations militaires, l'entreposage et la gestion de matériel et de substances toxiques, l'utilisation de véhicules (en raison du nombre même de véhicules que l'Armée de terre possède et fait fonctionner et de leur contribution à la pollution atmosphérique, au smog et aux émissions de GES) ainsi que la gestion et l'entretien des installations, y compris l'évacuation quotidienne des ordures, l'efficacité énergétique des systèmes de chauffage et de refroidissement, le maintien et la gestion des bases fermées ou abandonnées, voire le genre de peinture appliquée sur les murs des immeubles.

La plupart des participants estiment que ces activités ont sur l'environnement des effets importants qu'ils situent dans l'immédiat et le long terme. Les effets des activités de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement inspirent diverses préoccupations aux participants, dont la plus fréquemment exprimée est celle des conséquences éventuelles des produits chimiques et des substances toxiques sur la santé humaine et celle des autres espèces. Parmi les autres préoccupations souvent mentionnées, il y a la destruction de l'habitat, la modification des écosystèmes, le déplacement des espèces et l'absence de nettoyage ou de remise en état après la tenue des exercices.

Invités à dire où ils pourraient, le cas échéant, se procurer de l'information sur les effets des activités de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement, la plupart répondent qu'ils s'adresseraient tout au moins en premier lieu à l'Armée de terre elle-même ou au ministère de la Défense nationale, sans compter les autres sources au sein du gouvernement fédéral. Certains disent qu'ils consulteraient des ONG environnementales susceptibles de posséder

ce genre de renseignements ou même d'exercer un suivi ou une surveillance des activités de l'Armée de terre. Ce pourraient être la Fondation Suzuki, le Sierra Club, Défense environnementale et les ONG qui mènent en général une action pacifiste.

Dans l'ensemble, les participants étaient plus portés à faire confiance aux organisations indépendantes des forces armées (tant gouvernementales que non gouvernementales) pour ce qui est de renseigner les gens sur l'impact environnemental des activités de l'Armée de terre, bien que certains aient ajouté qu'ils commenceraient par s'adresser à l'Armée de terre elle-même. On était généralement d'avis que les organisations sans lien de dépendance sont plus susceptibles d'être objectives. Parmi les sources au sein du gouvernement fédéral, mentionnons le Bureau de la vérificatrice générale, Environnement Canada et le Commissaire à l'environnement et au développement durable. Les sources non gouvernementales comprennent les ONG environnementales qui suivent ou surveillent les activités de l'Armée de terre, les universités qui font de même ou les milieux scientifiques indépendants qui étudient ces questions.

Sans qu'aucun n'affirme qu'il se méfierait d'une information provenant de l'Armée de terre, les participants estiment en majorité qu'ils chercheraient une contre-vérification en consultant également d'autres sources (p. ex., le Bureau de la vérificatrice générale et des ONG environnementales qui surveillent les activités de l'Armée de terre). D'autres se montrent cependant plus méfiants et laissent entendre qu'il y va de l'intérêt de l'Armée de terre de mettre le moins possible le public au courant de son dossier environnemental par crainte des répercussions judiciaires ou financières, ou qu'elle hésiterait à divulguer certains renseignements en raison du caractère délicat de ses activités en général.

Aucun participant n'a jugé que l'Armée de terre serait à même d'exécuter des exercices d'entraînement en vue de maintenir sa capacité opérationnelle sans que cela n'ait une incidence quelconque sur l'environnement. Cela dit, il y avait également consensus sur la possibilité de réduire ou d'atténuer les effets environnementaux de ces activités. Comme corollaire au consensus touchant la possibilité de réduire les conséquences environnementales de ces activités, un autre consensus a presque été atteint, selon lequel la nécessité pour l'Armée de terre de réaliser ses objectifs de défense, y compris de se maintenir en état d'opération, est compatible avec la durabilité de l'environnement.

Sensibilisation et connaissances concernant les pratiques environnementales de l'Armée de terre

La plupart des participants tenaient pour acquis que l'Armée de terre a établi des programmes ou des mesures pour lui permettre de gérer l'impact environnemental de ses activités. Quelques-uns ont dit savoir que l'Armée de terre a prévu des programmes ou des mesures de ce genre parce que tous les ministères fédéraux sont tenus de se doter d'une stratégie du développement durable. Un petit nombre n'en savaient tout simplement rien.

La connaissance des mesures et des programmes environnementaux de l'Armée de terre est peu développée, de nature générale et fondée parfois sur le oui-dire. Des participants ont supposé qu'il y a des mesures de prévues en ce qui concerne, par exemple, le recyclage, l'entreposage des matières dangereuses et l'élimination des déchets. Certains pensent qu'il existe probablement un plan pour le développement durable parce qu'ils en ont entendu

parler dans les milieux environnementaux. Le peu de sensibilisation aux mesures et aux programmes environnementaux de l'Armée de terre est encore souligné du fait que le Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre est peu connu. Quelques répondants seulement en avaient entendu parler avant la présente recherche, et ce n'était pour eux qu'un nom. Autrement dit, ils n'en connaissaient pas du tout la teneur.

Perception du Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre

La plupart des participants ont réagi de manière positive au contenu du document en tant que pièce d'orientation ou d'énoncé des buts et objectifs de l'Armée de terre en matière d'environnement, et ils l'ont qualifié de clair, d'intéressant et d'instructif. Toutefois, beaucoup de ces participants ont déploré l'imprécision du document lorsqu'il s'agit d'apporter des détails concrets et précis. Certains participants qui ont perçu d'un œil critique le document dans son ensemble ont aussi attribué leur impression à son manque de détails. La plupart affirment que ce qu'ils ont surtout appris en lisant ce document c'est que l'Armée de terre possède un programme environnemental.

Interrogés quant à savoir si le document parvient à les informer au sujet du PEAT, les participants ont eu tendance à reprendre les propos qu'ils ont tenus quand on leur a demandé leurs impressions générales du document (c.-à-d. qu'il donne un bon aperçu des buts et objectifs de l'Armée de terre mais qu'il est avare de détails). Quelques participants se sont montrés plus critiques en disant que le document brosse une information à grands coups de pinceau mais laisse bien des questions en suspens.

Presque tous les participants ont mentionné le genre d'information qu'ils souhaitent au sujet du programme. Ils voudraient, notamment, qu'on leur présente des réalisations concrètes obtenues jusqu'ici dans le domaine de l'environnement, des détails sur les mécanismes destinés à mesurer, à surveiller et à superviser les progrès accomplis vers l'atteinte des buts et objectifs, des cibles et des échéances, des plans d'intendance environnementale, les comptes à rendre pour montrer que l'Armée de terre exécute son programme à la lettre, des données budgétaires ainsi que de l'information sur l'accessibilité aux renseignements concernant les activités environnementales de l'Armée de terre, afin d'en suivre la progression.

La plupart ont exprimé des impressions positives du programme et employé pour le décrire des termes comme « raisonnable », « un bon début » et « un bon schéma ou cadre de travail ». Presque tous ont néanmoins mentionné qu'il leur faudrait en savoir davantage sur le programme pour donner plus qu'une impression générale sur son efficacité. Les renseignements souhaités se rangent dans deux grandes catégories : des détails sur les mesures prises et des précisions touchant l'évaluation et la responsabilisation.

D'après l'information contenue dans le document sur le programme de l'Armée de terre, la plupart des intéressés estiment que l'Armée de terre *s'intéresse* aux enjeux environnementaux, mais sans pouvoir affirmer avec une quelconque certitude que ces enjeux sont *gérés comme il se doit*. Ces participants ont expliqué qu'ils auraient besoin de plus d'information sur le programme avant de pouvoir se prononcer sur la mesure avec laquelle ces enjeux sont gérés comme il se doit.

L'information offerte dans le document a procuré à la plupart des participants une meilleure perception de l'Armée de terre en ce qui a trait aux enjeux environnementaux. Cette amélioration est surtout attribuée au fait de savoir que l'Armée de terre se préoccupe de son impact environnemental et cherche des moyens pour l'atténuer. Tout en se disant encouragés par l'existence du Programme, certains participants affirment que leur perception pourrait être meilleure encore si on voulait bien les renseigner plus en détails sur les mesures prises par l'Armée de terre et les résultats obtenus.

Les participants ont eu de la difficulté à exprimer le moindrement de confiance dans la mise en application par l'Armée de terre des pratiques énoncées dans son programme environnemental. Cette réticence découle de l'absence d'une base ou d'un fondement pour asseoir leur évaluation. Sans en être assurés, la plupart des intéressés ont exprimé l'espoir que l'Armée de terre mette en œuvre les mesures environnementales prévues dans son programme. Quelques-uns doutent de la mise en œuvre de ces mesures parce qu'il n'existe pas de mécanisme de surveillance externe et qu'on estime que le document de l'Armée de terre ne comporte pas d'engagements suffisamment précis.

Conclusion et incidence

Malgré le consensus à propos des effets importants des activités de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement et l'inquiétude évidente qui en découle, les participants avouent en savoir peu ou ne rien savoir du tout sur le véritable impact environnemental des activités de l'Armée de terre ou sur ce que fait, le cas échéant, l'Armée de terre pour résoudre le problème. La plupart supposent, sans preuve à l'appui, que l'Armée de terre a adopté des mesures en matière d'environnement, mais on ne connaît pas son Programme environnemental. Bref, l'existence du programme était quelque chose de nouveau pour presque tous les participants.

Bien que les participants aient été enclins à voir d'un bon œil le programme tel que décrit dans le document de l'Armée de terre qu'ils ont pu lire, ils souhaitent de toute évidence en apprendre davantage. Non seulement cela reflète un intérêt certain et répandu dans ce domaine, mais cela témoigne aussi d'un degré de connaissance restreint en la matière.

Même si les participants jugent importants les effets de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement et s'en inquiètent, ils n'en retirent pas d'impressions négatives au sujet de l'Armée de terre et sont peu nombreux à exprimer de l'hostilité ou du ressentiment. C'est plutôt le contraire. Tout au long des entrevues, on a pu constater une ouverture d'esprit et de la réceptivité à l'égard de l'Armée de terre sur cette question, comme en témoignent en particulier les observations ci-dessous :

- Les participants admettent que l'Armée de terre ne peut pas effectuer d'entraînement sans aucune incidence sur l'environnement.
- Sous-jacente au quasi-consensus selon lequel la nécessité pour l'Armée de terre de remplir ses objectifs de défense est compatible avec la durabilité de l'environnement, il y a la volonté de collaborer avec l'Armée de terre dans ce domaine.
- Invités à dire où ils iraient, le cas échéant, chercher de l'information touchant l'impact des activités de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement, la plupart ont

répondu qu'ils commenceraient tout au moins par s'adresser à l'Armée de terre elle-même ou au ministère de la Défense nationale.

- Beaucoup de participants se sont, avant de commenter le document, dits heureux de constater que l'Armée de terre avait un plan ou un programme environnemental.
- Une bonne partie des critiques concernant le document sur le PEAT avaient trait au souhait d'être mieux renseigné.
- L'information contenue dans le document à l'étude a amélioré la perception que la plupart des participants avaient de l'Armée de terre lorsqu'il est question des enjeux environnementaux.

Les intéressés ont assurément fait preuve de bonne volonté et d'ouverture d'esprit afin de collaborer avec l'Armée de terre dans ses efforts pour restreindre et atténuer ses effets sur l'environnement.

Renseignements additionnels :

Nom du fournisseur : Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc.

Numéro du contrat avec TPSGC : W5830-080016/001/CY

Date d'attribution : 2007/10/01

On peut obtenir de plus amples renseignements sur cette étude en en faisant la demande par courriel à por-rop@forces.gc.ca.

INTRODUCTION

Phoenix SPI was commissioned by the Department of National Defence to conduct qualitative research related to the awareness, knowledge and attitudes of stakeholders in terms of Army environmental practices and the Army Environmental Program (AEP).

Background and Objectives

The Army is the largest institutional landowner in Canada, with an environmental footprint stretching from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast. As it practices with heavy military equipment within and nearby sensitive lands and waterways, the Army's troops and machinery have an enormous impact on the environment.

For that reason, the Army put in place the Army Environmental Program, a robust, \$25 million per year environmental program designed to manage environmental impacts. While the AEP is a mature program (15 years in existence), it has not yet attracted the attention of the environmental lobby industry. With the increasing prominence of environmental issues on the national public agenda, it may only be a matter of time before the AEP becomes the focus of increased attention and scrutiny.

With the foregoing in mind, the Army recognizes that it is essential to properly communicate the AEP to environmental stakeholders and to assess the impact of such communications. Given that the media is increasingly calling on environmental stakeholders, such as lobby groups, watchdogs and commentators, to comment on environmental issues, ensuring that the communications program is well tailored for these stakeholders is a key consideration.

Accordingly, the objectives of this research were to gauge the awareness, knowledge and attitudes of environmental stakeholders in terms of current Army environmental practices, including awareness of the AEP.

More specifically, the research objectives included assessing:

- Awareness and knowledge of the Army's environmental impact (e.g. do stakeholders think the Army is a major polluter? How much of an impact do they believe the Army has on the environment?).
- Views regarding the necessity of the Army to conduct training operations that have an impact on the environment.
- Levels of trust in the Army when it comes to environmental practices.
- Perceptions of the Army in terms of environmental practices (e.g. do stakeholders know that the Army has environmental programs in place? Do they think that the Army "cleans up" after itself?).
- Awareness of the Army's environmental practices, including the AEP.
- Perceptions of the AEP.
- Knowledge and attitudes towards the Army's ISO 14000 Environmental Management System certification.
- Whether or not stakeholders distinguish between the Army and other parts of the Canadian Forces, when it comes to environmentalism.

- Whether knowledge and attitudes regarding the Army's environmental practices have changed.

Research Design

To address the research objectives, a set of 10 in-depth interviews was conducted between October 30th and December 12th, 2007 with senior executives of top environmental organizations in Canada.

The following specifications applied to this research:

- In total, 10 in-depth interviews were conducted with presidents and senior executives of Environmental Non-governmental Organizations across Canada. Phoenix was responsible for obtaining contact information for all participants.
- All interviews were conducted by phone by professional research staff (i.e. not hourly-paid telephone interviewers).
- The interviews averaged 40 minutes, and were semi-structured in nature, designed to obtain robust, qualitative feedback. Respondents were given the choice of being interviewed in English or French.
- Phoenix contacted potential participants by phone to secure their agreement to participate and schedule the interviews. A background letter was prepared by Phoenix (for use on DND letterhead) that explained the purpose of the research, introduced Phoenix as the firm conducting it, offered assurances of confidentiality, and encouraged participation. This letter (PDF format) was attached to a short confirmation email sent to participants after the initial contact phone calls, and was accompanied by a copy of the interview guide so that participants could reflect on the issues in advance of the interview and offer more considered feedback.
- The interview guide was developed in close consultation with DND officials, and was designed to obtain participant feedback that effectively addressed the research objectives identified above.
- At the time of the interview, participants were sent an electronic copy of a short document providing basic information about the Army Environmental Program (AEP), which they were asked to read and comment on.
- The first three interviews served as a pre-test of the interview guide, where researchers were attentive to the functioning of the instrument to determine whether any adjustments were required. The results of which were retained and included in the analysis.

Appended to this report are copies of the following (in English and French):

- Background letter.
- Interview guide.
- Test materials.

BACKGROUND

This brief section provides information on stakeholders' roles and responsibilities within their organizations.

Participants Include Senior Representatives with Various Responsibilities

All of the stakeholders involved in this study occupy senior positions within their Environmental Non-governmental Organizations (ENGOS). Positions and titles included president and CEO, vice president, executive director, deputy executive director, director general, senior program coordinator/manager, and policy and campaign director.

Their responsibilities in these capacities included the following: coordinating daily operations, program and policy development and management, strategic planning and management, reporting to boards of directors, coordinating with other ENGOS, liaising with governments and other stakeholders, organizing campaigns and outreach activities, and fundraising.

AWARENESS, KNOWLEDGE & CONCERN REGARDING ARMY'S ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

This section explores stakeholders' awareness, knowledge, and concerns about Army activities and their perceived environmental impacts.

Limited Knowledge of the Army's Environmental Impact, Mostly Through Media

All stakeholders said they knew little or very little about the environmental impact of Army activities, with a couple adding that they have not thought about this at all. Awareness or knowledge of this issue tended to be both second-hand and limited. In terms of sources, information was most often acquired through the news media. Most stakeholders recalled sporadic news stories about a variety of environmentally-related issues (though they were not necessarily reported as environmental issues). This included stories about closed or abandoned Army stations, lack of maintenance/upgrading of older stations, disposal/storage of contaminated materials, the type of paint used on Army vehicles, and the use of chemicals, specifically use of Agent Orange in Gagetown, New Brunswick, and the issue of compensation for those exposed to it.

Information was also sometimes anecdotal and acquired through acquaintances or family either serving in the Army or through people acquainted with Army personnel. While information acquired through the media tended to be related to the negative impact of Army activities, information acquired anecdotally had more to do with measures taken by the Army to limit the environmental impact of its activities. For example, a few participants said they were told that the Army is very meticulous about what soldiers can and cannot do when on training activities in the field. This not only included rules and regulations about littering or garbage disposal, but even regulations concerning the disposal of urine. Another learned through an acquaintance that the Army has officers who are responsible for dealing with environmental issues.

Finally, a few had direct or personal knowledge related to this issue, although it was also general and/or limited knowledge. For example, a couple of participants had been to Army bases, specifically CFB Suffield and CFB Race Rocks, and were aware that the Army had some manner of environmental management plans in place there. Another said that his/her organization had been approached by the Army in 2000 for help in developing a plan for sustainable development but he/she knew no more than this. Finally, a couple said they were involved in the Dew Line cleanup project.

Range of Activities Seen to Have Impact on Environment

While participants knew very little about the actual environmental impact of Army activities, they had no difficulty identifying *types* of Army activities that they think have an impact on the environment. Moreover, most identified multiple ways in which they believe the Army has or can have an impact on the environment. These included:

- *Training and Operational-Type Exercises:* Nearly all participants identified such activities as having an impact on the environment by changing the physical landscape and potentially altering ecosystems and affecting habitats. These types of

activities included combat-related exercises involving the use of heavy vehicles, such as tanks and the firing and artillery ranges. It also included clean up or retrieval of materials, such as used shells following such exercises.

- *Storage/management of toxic materials and substances:* Most also felt that practices related to the storage and management of toxic or possibly toxic substances is a way that the Army has an impact on the environment. This included disposal of both used and unused or expired materials, such as bullets and shells, storage of oil and gasoline drums/barrels, and disposal of toxic or dangerous chemicals (e.g. Agent Orange). Some added that improper treatment/disposal of such materials in the past may have had an impact on the environment over time (e.g. leakage into soil or groundwater).
- *Use of vehicles:* Some participants felt that the sheer number of vehicles owned and operated by the Army has an impact on the environment by contributing to air pollution, smog and GHG emissions. It was suggested that fuel efficiency may not be a priority in the design of Army vehicles.
- *Facilities management/maintenance:* The way in which Army facilities (i.e. military bases in general and lodgings of military personnel) are managed and maintained was identified by some as something that has an impact on the environment. This included day-to-day waste disposal, the efficiency of heating and cooling systems, the maintenance/management of closed or abandoned bases, and even the type of paint used on buildings. A couple of participants added that some of the environmental issues the Army faces in this regard are akin to those faced by civilian operations, such as hotels.

Army activities affecting the environment identified by individuals or no more than a couple of participants included management of contaminated sites, use of pesticides, and possible spills/accidents.

Most Characterize Impact of Army Activities as Potentially Significant

Most participants characterized the impact of these activities on the environment as significant, pointing especially to the potential effects of Army activities on the land in some way or another. For instance, it was routinely suggested that the activities associated with training (i.e. explosions, use of tanks, etc.) likely have effects that include displacing species, damaging habitats, contributing to erosion, and contaminating the soil and water. Some felt that use of vehicles, storage of chemicals, and contaminated sites can have considerable impacts on the local environment.

These impacts were seen to range from the immediate to the long-term. For example, training activities have an immediate impact on the environment by altering landscapes through the use of artillery and heavy vehicles, such as tanks and light armoured vehicles. However, there are also medium and longer-term impacts of such activities on habitats and ecosystems. Storage and disposal of toxic or dangerous chemicals (including chemical weapons) were seen to have longer-term impacts if not managed properly.

A few participants said they could not comment on the impact of these activities because they have little-to-no information on the basis of which to make such an assessment.

Effects of Toxic Substances – Main Concern about Army Activities

Participants collectively expressed a variety of concerns related to the impact of Army activities on the environment, and most cited more than one. However, the most frequently identified concern was the possible impact of chemicals and toxic substances on human health and non-human species. A few pointed specifically to the effect of Agent Orange in Gagetown, New Brunswick; however, more generally there was concern over the impact of contaminated sites and dangerous/toxic chemicals, including their possible build-up over time. Other concerns that were routinely identified included habitat destruction, altered ecosystems, displacement of species, and lack of clean-up/retrieval after exercises.

Other concerns were expressed by no more than a few participants or individuals. A few expressed general concern about the contribution the Army makes to pollution in general because of its size and the nature of its activities. A few others expressed concerns related to energy efficiency, noting that they have no idea about whether the Army uses greener alternatives in any ways, such as hybrid engines, solar power, and wind power. Finally, a few were concerned that the environmental impact of Army activities is not something that seems to get much attention or that registers on the radar screen of the general public.

Most Unable to Comment on Other Branches of Armed Forces

Most stakeholders were unable to compare the Army, Navy, and Air Force in terms of the environmental impacts of their activities due to lack of knowledge regarding the activities of each. Moreover, most said they did not tend to distinguish between the three branches, but rather tended to think of the Armed Forces in general.

Those who did make distinctions between the environmental impact of each tended to be general in their comments, focusing mainly on the different areas where each one's activities has its main impact rather than comparing these impacts. In other words, they tended to focus on the fact that Army activities affected the land, Air Force activities affect the atmosphere, and Navy activities affect the sea.

Only a few participants made comments of a comparative nature. A couple were of the opinion that Air Force activities might make a greater contribution to climate change because of the emissions-intensive nature of its activities. In terms of environmental action, a few felt the Army has the greatest potential to have a positive effect on the environment because it has more potential to conduct its activities in a sustainable way (e.g., cleaning up after itself, protecting wildlife areas).

No Monitoring of Army's Environmental Impact, But Most Express Interest in Issue

None of the organizations involved in this study currently monitor or track the environmental impact of Army activities in any way. A small number of stakeholders added that monitoring does not fall under their organization's responsibilities or mandate and that their focus is on public engagement.

However, most expressed interest in this issue and some expressed interest in partnering with the Army to do this. A few participants said they have already been involved with the Armed Forces in the past. This included initiatives on specific Army bases and participation in the *Dew Line* cleanup project. A few others said their organization has been involved in informal discussions with the Army about implementing an environmental monitoring or certification program. One participant suggested that the Armed Forces in general could play a leadership role in Canada when it comes to the environment.

Most Would Start with Army/DND for Info on Army Environmental Activities

Only one participant has actively looked for information about the impact of Army activities on the environment, and this was related to the *Dew Line* clean up project. This information was sought and found in the Auditor General's report.

Asked where they would go if they wanted information about the impact of Army activities on the environment, most said they would at least begin with the Army itself or the Department of National Defence. Some were more specific, indicating that they would contact the department's Public Affairs Branch, consult the departmental website, contact the strategic or operational plans division, or even contact base commanders. A few identified federal government sources, including Natural Resources Canada, Environment Canada, and the Federal Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development. One participant indicated that he/she might submit an ATIP request for information.

Some said they would consult other ENGOs that might have such information or might even be involved in monitoring or tracking Army activities. These included the Suzuki Foundation, the Sierra Club, Environmental Defence, and peace-focused NGOs in general. That said, a few re-iterated that they would start with government sources and branch out from there, as needed.

Independent Government & Non-Government Bodies – Most Trusted Sources

Generally speaking, participants were more likely to trust organizations independent of the Armed Forces (both governmental and non-governmental) to provide information on the impact of the Army's environmental activities, though some added that they would begin by approaching the Army itself to see what they could get. There was a general sense that arm's length organizations are more likely to be objective. Federal government sources included the Office of the Auditor General, Environment Canada, and the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development. Reasons for trusting these sources included their mandates to collect environmental information and their capacity for doing so. Non-government sources included ENGOs tracking or monitoring Army activities, universities doing the same, or the independent scientific community studying these issues.

A few stakeholders said that they would rely on the Army to provide this information because it was the only organization in a position to collect it. Some felt that a collaborative approach in which ENGOs not only have access to such information but participate with the Armed Forces in developing a program for environmental sustainability would be a good idea. One participant felt that because of its size, no one

ENGO would have the budget to do an evaluation of the environmental impact of the Army's activities.

Most Would Confirm/Double-check Army's Information With Other Sources

While none of the participants said they would distrust information provided by the Army, most said they would want to double-check it by going to other sources as well (e.g. Office of the Auditor General, ENGOs tracking Army activities). Some added that they were not singling out the Army for special scrutiny and that they are sceptical about information from any organization related to monitoring its own activities.

Some, however, were more suspicious. A few suggested that the Army would have an interest in minimizing public exposure of its environmental record for fear of any legal or financial implications that might arise. A few others felt that the Army would not be forthcoming with all information because of the sensitive nature of its activities in general.

Consensus That Army Activities That Affect Environment Can be Minimized

None of the participants felt that the Army could conduct training operations to maintain operational readiness that would not have some impact on the environment. Having said that, there was also a consensus that the environmental impact of such activities could be minimized or lessened. At the very least, there was a sense that the impact of these activities should be monitored and tracked in order to be aware of them.

Near-Consensus on Compatibility of Operational Readiness & Sustainability

Underscoring the consensus that the environmental impact of such activities could be minimized was a near-consensus that the Army's need to carry out its defence-related objectives, including operational readiness, is compatible with environmental sustainability. Only one stakeholder felt this was not achievable due to the essential nature of Army activities. It was specified that while certain environmentally-friendly actions could be taken, Army training activities could never be described as *compatible* with environmental sustainability.

Examples of compatibility that were offered included taking efforts to better understand the environmental impact of Army training activities, developing a balance between acceptable and unacceptable damage relative to training, using water and fuel more efficiently, recycling and reusing materials, and cleaning up carefully after exercises. A few felt that the degree to which this is possible would be based on the scale and intensity of the Army's activities at any given time. For instance, during periods in which Canada is involved in conflicts, operational readiness activities are likely to be more intense and have a greater impact on the environment.

AWARENESS & KNOWLEDGE OF ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

This section reports on participants' awareness and knowledge of the Army's environmental practices and programs.

Virtually No One Aware That Army is Largest Institutional Landowner in Canada

Only one participant knew that the Army is the largest institutional landowner in Canada. While a few were surprised to learn this (one assumed it would be Parks Canada), most were not when told this information. A few added that this makes sense when one thinks about it because of the number of bases and training grounds that the Army must own.

Assumption That Army Has Environmental Programs, But No Details Known

Most participants assumed that the Army has some programs and/or practices in place to manage the environmental impact of its activities. A few said they knew for a fact that the Army has such programs and practices in place, and a couple said they simply did not know. Those who said they knew this explained that every department of the federal government must have a sustainable development strategy.

Knowledge of Army environmental practices and programs among those who knew or assumed their existence was mostly limited, general, and sometimes based on hearsay. Some assumed that there were practices in place regarding such things as recycling, storage of hazardous materials, and waste disposal. Some assumed that there might be a sustainable development plan in place since they had heard something about this through the environmental grapevine. Another pointed to a perceived partnership between the Army and Environment Canada to track Army activities on Canadian land. Only one participant was able to identify a specific measure, which was described as a sustainable management plan at CFB Suffield with implications for land use and wildlife protection.

Most participants volunteered that if the Army does indeed have such programs, it should be communicating them to the general public. It was also suggested that Army advertising include reference to its environmental programs.

Knowledge of environmental programs or practices put in place by the Air Force and Navy was even more limited. Indeed, only one participant was aware of any such program or practice. This was a program in which the Air Force had funded environmental consultants to explore the environmental impacts originating from its activities. This participant added that he/she suspects that the Army is more attentive to the impacts of its activities because it owns the land on which it operates.

Few Had Heard of AEP

Lack of awareness of Army environmental practices and programs was underscored by the limited awareness of the Army Environmental Program. Asked explicitly if they knew that since 1992, the Army has had in place a program called the Army Environmental Program (AEP), most said they did not. Only a few had heard of the AEP before this research and it was only an expression to them. In other words, they knew nothing about it.

PERCEPTIONS OF ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM (AEP)

This section reports on participant perceptions of a short document that provides basic information about the Army Environmental Program entitled *Restoring the Past, Protecting the Present, Sustaining the Future: A Strategic Environmental Direction for the Army of Tomorrow 2008-2013*.

Positive Reaction to Document as Directional Piece, But Desire for More Detail

Many participants prefaced their comments about the content of the document by expressing pleasure that the Army has an environmental program and that a document providing information about it is available. It was suggested that this shows that the Army is interested in reaching out to stakeholders in the environmental area.

Most participants reacted positively to the content of the document as a directional piece or vision outlining the Army's goals and objectives as they relate to the environment. On this level, the document was routinely described as clear, interesting and informative. Some said it provides a good overview of strategic goals and objectives over the next few years, and a few added that the Army is heading in the right direction. However, many who reacted positively to it as a directional document added that it is limited when it comes to providing concrete and specific details, with some describing it as weak as a policy or operational document.

A few participants whose overall reaction to the document was critical also pointed to its lack of detail to explain their impression. A couple of participants said the document resembles a public relations piece designed to show that the Army is doing something about the environment without providing details about what it is actually doing. As an example, one participant cited the following statement on page six of the document: "Since 1992, the Army Environmental Programme has made significant progress in implementing Environmental Management Systems". This was described as a self-congratulatory statement that provides no information. Another participant said the document resembles a political party flyer outlining its goals and objectives.

Army Has an Environmental Program – Most Important Information in Document

Most participants said the main thing they learned from reading this document is that the Army does have an environmental program in place and is thinking about sustainability. Additional and more specific information described as important included the following:

- The Army's four strategic goals and objectives over the next five years.
- The fact that the Army owns 20% of federal lands and buildings.
- The AEP's greater focus on compliance than stewardship.
- The existence of procedures for environmental audits and assessments.
- The plan to recruit and retain professional environmental personnel.
- The plan to explore opportunities for building partnerships with external organizations.
- The plan to enhance and expand external communications.

Document Good on Generalities, But Missing Important Details

Asked if the document does a good job informing them about the Army's environmental program, participants tended to re-iterate what they said when asked about their general impressions of the document. Most reiterated that the document provides a good overview of the Army's goals and objectives, but is weak in terms of providing specific details about the Army Environmental Program. A few were more critical, saying that the document paints with broad brush strokes and begs questions in the information it does provide.

Nearly all participants identified additional information they would want to know about the Army's environmental program. These included:

- *Achievements to date:* Most participants wanted to know more about concrete, measurable achievements the Army has made to date. It was noted that the program has been in place since 1992 but that the document provides very little in terms of details on what has been accomplished to date. Instead, it focuses on what the Army plans to do over the next few years.
- *Measurement mechanisms:* Some participants wanted more details about mechanisms designed to measure, monitor, and oversee progress towards goals and objectives. For example, what are the procedures for environmental assessments and audits?, what is the nature of the environmental management systems used by the Army?
- *Specific targets and timelines:* A few noted that specific targets and timelines are absent from the document.
- *Environmental stewardship:* A few observed that the focus of the AEP is more on legal compliance than stewardship. They wanted to know more about Army plans regarding environmental stewardship.
- *Accountability:* A few said they would like to know whether there are accountability measures that will ensure that the Army is carrying out its program effectively and whether the Army will monitor itself in this regard.
- *Budgetary information:* A couple of participants wanted information about the actual budget allocated to the AEP. It was suggested that this would provide some indication of the importance attributed to the program.
- *Transparency:* One participant noted that among the guiding elements of the AEP there is no mention of transparency as a value. This participant wanted more information about the ability for external organizations to access information about the Army's environmental activities in order to monitor its progress.

Information Seen as Clear & Easy to Understand

As noted already, the document was described as clearly and easy to understand. To the extent that there was any lack of clarity, this was almost entirely attributed to lack of detail, not unclear language. For example, at times participants described certain passages as vague or abstract, but this was because the information provided was pitched at a high level of generality instead of being specific. One participant was unclear about what the document meant by "restrictive Federal Government recruiting and hiring options and

procedures” in the section discussing challenges the Army faces in terms of human resources (p.7).

Most Hold Positive Impression of AEP, But Desire More Information

Most participants expressed positive impressions of the AEP as a program designed to manage the environmental impact of the Army’s activities. They used language such as ‘reasonable’, ‘a good start’, and ‘a good framework or overview to work from’ to describe it. A few added that the program includes fundamentals one can find in many organizations’ environmental plans. That said, almost all said they would need more information about the program in order to provide more than a general impression of its effectiveness. Such information fell into two general categories: details regarding actions, and details regarding measurement and accountability.

Most felt that the program needs to include concrete details about the actions being taken in order to be effective. Participants noted that there was an absence of concrete plans, solutions, and details of implementation that would be essential for them to assess the effectiveness of the program. Some added that if such details do not exist, the program is not likely to achieve its strategic goals. It was also widely accepted that the ability of the program to manage environmental impacts will inevitably be tied to the quality and degree of measurement and accountability mechanisms involved. Participants felt that to be a credible program, the AEP must have a monitoring mechanism that holds the Army accountable for reaching clearly outlined targets. Some specified further that this would have to be an independent monitor (i.e. external to the Army) in order to be effective.

A few participants were critical of the AEP’s emphasis on legal compliance, claiming that this provides limited scope as far as environmental action goes and sets the bar relatively low in terms of commitment. They suggested that the program focus more on environmental stewardship, and not simply compliance with legal requirements.

Moderate Familiarity with ISO 14000, Mixed Assessment of Effectiveness & Rigour

Nearly all participants had at least some familiarity with the International Standards Organization (ISO) 14000 standards for environmental management on which the Army’s environmental program is based. A few identified details of these standards, which included encouraging progressive improvements, and providing a process for tracking and due diligence, a rating system, and periodic updates.

Perceptions of the standards were mixed. Some held that having any standards was positive and that ISO 14000 standards were highly regarded and therefore a good accreditation to have. However, most participants were critical of these standards, without discounting them. The most frequent criticism was that the standards are voluntary and hence unenforceable. A few added that these standards were not widely accepted by the environmental community because they are minimal in nature and therefore not difficult to meet, and provide a false sense that significant actions are being taken.

Most Unable to Say Environmental Issues Are Being Well Managed Based on AEP

Based on the information contained in the AEP document, most stakeholders felt that environmental issues were being *addressed* by the Army, but they could not say with any degree of confidence that these issues were being *well-managed*. These participants explained that they would need more information about the AEP before they could comment on the extent to which these issues are well-managed. Some said they would need to know what has been implemented and achieved since 1992. Related to this, it was noted that the document they read relates to the next few years and focuses on what the Army plans to do, not what it has done. It was suggested that any assessment of the extent to which these issues are well managed would have to include what has been achieved to date, not only what is planned for the future.

Among the remaining participants, a few felt that, based on the AEP, environmental issues were being well managed by the Army. They explained that the document is directionally sound and instils confidence that the Army is addressing the appropriate issues. However, even these stakeholders qualified their assessment. It was suggested that significant resources in funding and personnel would have to be given to the AEP initiative, as well as senior level buy in and an aggressive communication plan. These participants also said that more information would be needed to truly evaluate whether or not they should have confidence in this plan.

Finally, a few were critical, indicating that they were not confident that these issues were being well-managed. Their reasons included a perceived lack of accountability mechanisms, a focus on compliance rather than more ambitious targets, and a lack of reference to concrete actions.

Monitoring & Demonstrating Progress – Most Important Info for Canadians

Beyond informing them that the Army has an environmental program, there was a near-consensus among stakeholders that the most important or relevant information in terms of informing Canadians about this issue relates to monitoring and demonstrating progress. Most felt that it was important for Canadians to be told about the environmental impacts the Army is trying to mitigate, how it is doing this, and then be provided with information on progress being made. It was suggested that this could involve publishing regular reports and making them available on the DND website.

Some also mentioned that communication should emphasize the Army's understanding of the impacts of its activities and its stewardship role. One participant suggested that, especially in light of the contamination of personnel by Agent Orange, it is important for the Army to acknowledge its responsibilities in this area.

AEP Information Improves Perceptions of Army for Most

The information provided in the AEP document improved most participants' perceptions of the Army when it comes to environmental issues, though some specified that they did not have any definite impressions of the Army to begin with. The improved perception was attributed mainly to learning that the Army is thinking about its environmental impact and

ways to mitigate it. A few added that they were pleased and encouraged by the reference to exploring opportunities for building partnerships and enhancing external communications. While encouraged by the existence of the AEP, some indicated that their perception could be further improved if they were given details about actions being taken and results.

A couple of participants said that the information did not change their perception of the Army in an appreciable way, though they were pleased to learn that it has a plan in place. Both added that only on the basis of clear evidence of commitment to reducing its impact on the environment and success in this area would their perceptions change.

Most Participants Express Hope Rather Than Confidence in Army Regarding AEP

Participants had difficulty expressing any degree of confidence in the Army implementing the practices outlined in its environmental program. This was not due to suspicion or lack of confidence in the Army. For the most part, it was due to the absence of any basis or foundation on which to base such an assessment. Most stakeholders expressed hope rather than confidence that the Army will implement the environmental practices outlined in its environmental program. A few were not confident that these practices would be implemented, citing the absence of an outside or external oversight mechanism, and perceived lack of specific commitment in the text of AEP document.

One participant expressed confidence that the Army would implement its program due to the fact that it has now publicized it and is thereby opening itself up to more scrutiny. More specifically, it was suggested that the fact that it has committed itself to exploring partnerships and expanding external communications will draw the attention of environmental organizations that would be happy to work with the Army to help it implement its program and refine it.

A few identified factors they felt were likely to affect the Army's ability to implement its program, including budgetary resources, buy-in at senior levels, military priorities at any given time, and bureaucratic obstacles.

APPENDIX

**Re: Department of National Defence Army Environmental Program
Stakeholder Interviews**

The Department of National Defence (DND) is conducting research among representatives of environmental organizations related to awareness, knowledge and perceptions of the environmental practices of the Army.

The Department has commissioned Phoenix Strategic Perspectives, an independent research firm, to undertake this research on its behalf. Your participation is completely voluntary, but would be greatly appreciated. Your feedback will help ensure that the Army properly communicates details of its environmental program to environmental stakeholders and the population in general.

Please be assured that all information will be kept strictly confidential – no individuals or organizations will be identified in any way.

If you would like more information about the study, please contact Christine Gauthier of the Department of National Defence by phone (613-992-2202) or by email at Gauthier.CL2@forces.gc.ca.

We hope that you will take part in this valuable research.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Trépanier
A/Director Land Environment
Ottawa

Sujet: Programme environnemental du ministère de la défense nationale
Entrevues avec intervenants

Le ministère de la Défense nationale réalise une étude auprès de représentants d'organisations environnementales concernant leur connaissance et leurs perceptions des pratiques environnementales de l'Armée.

Le ministère a retenu les services de Phoenix Strategic Perspectives, une maison de recherche indépendante, pour réaliser cette étude. Bien que votre participation à cette étude soit entièrement volontaire, nous vous serions très reconnaissants d'y prendre part. Votre rétroaction aidera à assurer que l'Armée communique les détails de son programme environnemental de façon appropriée aux intervenants dans le domaine de l'environnement et à la population en général.

Soyez assuré(e) que tous les renseignements obtenus seront traités de manière strictement confidentielle et qu'aucune personne ni organisation ne sera identifiée.

Pour en savoir davantage au sujet de cette étude, veuillez communiquer avec Christine Gauthier du ministère de la Défense nationale par téléphone (613-992-2202) ou par courriel à Gauthier.CL2@forces.gc.ca.

Nous espérons que vous accepterez de contribuer à cette étude importante.

Merci.

Recevez, Madame, Monsieur, l'expression de mes sentiments distingués.

Eric Trépanier
A/Director Land Environment
Ottawa

**Department of National Defence:
Army Environmental Program Study
Interview Guide**

Final Version: October 11, 2007

Initial contact:

- Explain purpose of research and ask if the person is willing to take part in an interview. Send background letter from DND if more information about study is requested.
- Inform them that the interview will take approximately 30-40 minutes.
- Note that responses are confidential.
- Schedule a time for the interview.
- Inform them that they will be sent an email with a copy of the interview guide, and a short document to be read only at the time of the interview.
- Confirm email address.

Subsequent contact:

- Determine if the person is available for the interview. If not available, re-schedule for another time.
- Record name, position, organization, phone number, length of the interview, and date of completion.
- Request permission to include their name, title and organization on participant list (optional, but encourage; information not linked to interview responses).

Awareness, Knowledge, Concern About Army's Environmental Impact

1. First, could you please briefly describe your role or responsibilities within your organization? KEEP BRIEF
2. In general, how knowledgeable would you say you are about the environmental impact of army activities? FOCUS IS ON THE ARMY SPECIFICALLY, NOT THE CANADIAN FORCES IN GENERAL WHICH INCLUDES AIR FORCE AND NAVY.
3. In your opinion, what types of army activities have an impact on the environment? FOCUS IS ON IMPACT OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO MAINTAINING OPERATIONAL READINESS, NOT ACTIVITIES IN AN ACTIVE THEATRE OF OPERATIONS.

Probe:

- use of heavy military equipment/machinery for training
- lack of clean up/retrieval (e.g. shells in artillery ranges)
- storage/management of materials/waste
- use of hazardous materials/chemicals (e.g. agent orange)

4. How much of an impact do you think these activities have on the environment? How would you characterise their impact?

Probe:

- small, moderate, major
- short-term, medium-term, long-term

5. When you think about the environmental impact of these activities, what are the types of things that concern you, if any? Any others?

Probe:

- pollution
- poor waste storage/management
- health effects (e.g. exposure to agent orange in Gagetown)
- build-up of contaminants over time

6. How would you compare the environmental impact of army activities to those of the air force and the navy? Do you distinguish between the three branches of the Canadian forces when it comes to the environmental impact of their activities? If so, how?

7. Is the environmental impact of army activities something your organization currently monitors or tracks in any way? If so, what do you track/monitor?

Probe:

- tracking of Canadian forces in general vs. army in particular

8. Have you ever actively looked for information about the impact of army activities on the environment?

IF YES:

9. What type of information did you look for? Where did you look for this information? Did you find what you were looking for? If not, why not?

Probe: - if Internet, where? – probe for specific sites
 - sites vs. search engines
 - term(s) use for searches

IF NO:

10. If you were looking for information about this issue, where would you go to find it? Anywhere else?

Probe: - if Internet, ask where

11. Thinking about this issue in general, who would you trust the most to provide you with information about it? That is, what group or organization would you find most credible or trustworthy on this issue? Why? Anyone else?
12. To what extent would you trust information provided by the army itself? Would you consider it credible or trustworthy on this issue? If not, why not?
13. Do you think it is necessary for the army to conduct training operations which have an impact on the environment? In other words, do you think it is possible for the army to conduct training operations which do not have an impact on the environment?
14. To what extent do you think it is possible for the army to carry out its defence-related objectives, including operational readiness, in a way that is compatible with environmental sustainability?

Awareness & Knowledge of Army Environmental Practices

15. Did you know that the army is the largest institutional landowner in Canada?
16. To the best of your knowledge, does the army have any programs or practices in place to manage or monitor the environmental impact of its activities? If so, what if anything do you know about this? NOTE SPECIFIC REFERENCES TO AEP
17. Are you aware of any programs or practices put in place by the navy or the air force to manage or monitor the environmental impact of their activities? If so, what?

IF PARTICIPANT IS AWARE OF ARMY AND NAVY/AIR FORCE PROGRAMS:

18. As far as you know, is the army is any more or less attentive to the environmental impact of its activities than the [navy and/or the air force]? Please explain.

Since 1992, the army has had in place an environmental program designed to manage the environmental impact of its activities. The program is called the Army Environmental Program (AEP)?

19. Have you heard of this program before? If so, how did you learn about it and what do you know about it? NOTE SPECIFICS

Perceptions of Army Environmental Program (AEP)

I'd now like you to read the short document I just sent you by email which presents basic information about this program. I'm going to give you a few minutes to read it and then call you back to discuss it.

GIVE PARTICIPANT 5-10 MINUTES TO READ DOCUMENT, THEN CALL BACK AND CONTINUE:

20. What is your overall reaction to the information contained in this document? Why?

Probe: - positive, neutral, negative

21. What are the main things you learned from reading this document? That is, what is the most important information you took away from it? Anything else?

Probe: - main message(s) communicated through document

22. Does the document do a good job of informing you about the army's environmental program? Why/why not? Does it tell you the main thing(s) you would want to know? If not, what is missing?

Probe: - strengths/weaknesses

23. Is the information clear and easy to understand? If not, what parts or sections are not clear?

24. What is your impression of the AEP as a program designed to manage the environmental impact of the army's activities? Why?

25. How familiar are you with the International Standards Organization (ISO) 14000 standards for environmental management on which the army's environmental program is based? What do you think of these standards? Why?

26. Does this information instil confidence that this issue is being well managed by the army? Why do you say that?

Probe: - reassuring/alarming elements
- level of trust in army re environmental practices

27. What information do you consider to be most important or relevant in terms of informing Canadians about this issue? Why? Anything else?
28. To what extent, if at all, does this information alter your perception of the army when it comes to environmental issues?
29. To what extent do you have confidence in the army implementing the environmental practices outlined in its environmental program? Please explain.
30. The army also has a longer, more detailed document (16 pages) explaining its environmental management system. Would you be interested in reading it and commenting on it? If so, we can send it to you by email. You can provide your feedback on it by email or through a brief phone conversation that we could schedule at your convenience.

Conclusion

31. Do you have any final comments about anything we have discussed?

THANK PARTICIPANT.

IF PARTICIPANT AGREES TO REVIEW LONGER REPORT, CONFIRM HOW THEY PREFER TO PROVIDE COMMENTS (I.E. BY EMAIL OR PHONE). IF THE LATTER, SCHEDULE CALL-BACK TIME.

EXPLAIN THAT FEEDBACK SHOULD FOCUS ON OVERALL IMPRESSIONS, CLARITY, MAIN THINGS LEARNED, AND MISSING INFORMATION.

EMPHASIZE THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THEIR FEEDBACK WITHIN THE NEXT FEW DAYS (IF POSSIBLE).

Ministère de la Défense nationale :
Étude sur le Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre
Guide d'entrevue

[Version finale : 11 octobre 2007](#)

Première communication :

- Expliquer l'objet de l'étude et vérifier si la personne souhaite participer à une entrevue. Si elle souhaite obtenir de plus amples renseignements au sujet de l'étude, lui faire parvenir la lettre d'information du MDN.
- Indiquer qu'il faudra environ 30 à 40 minutes pour mener à bien l'entrevue.
- Signaler que les réponses sont tenues confidentielles.
- Convenir d'un moment pour l'entrevue.
- Préciser que nous lui ferons parvenir un message électronique comprenant une copie du guide d'entrevue, de même qu'un bref document que la personne devra lire au moment de la tenue de l'entrevue seulement.
- Confirmer son adresse électronique.

Communication subséquente :

- Établir si la personne est disponible pour l'entrevue. Dans la négative, convenir d'un autre moment.
- Consigner le nom de la personne, son poste, le nom de l'organisation, le numéro de téléphone, la durée de l'entrevue et la date à laquelle elle a été réalisée.
- Demander la permission de verser le nom de la personne, son titre et le nom de l'organisation au sein de laquelle elle œuvre dans la liste des participants (encourager la personne dans cette voie même si ce n'est pas obligatoire; signaler que ces renseignements ne seront pas reliés aux réponses d'entrevue).

Répercussions des activités de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement – notoriété, connaissances et préoccupations

1. Dans un premier temps, pourriez-vous s.v.p décrire rapidement votre rôle ou vos fonctions au sein de votre organisation? VEILLER À CE QUE LA RÉPONSE SOIT BRÈVE
2. En général, selon vous, dans quelle mesure êtes-vous bien renseigné(e) au sujet des répercussions des activités de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement? METTRE L'ACCENT SUR L'ARMÉE DE TERRE EN PARTICULIER PLUTÔT QUE SUR LES FORCES CANADIENNES EN GÉNÉRAL, QUI COMPRENNENT AUSSI LA FORCE AÉRIENNE ET LA MARINE.
3. À votre avis, quels genres d'activités militaires ont des répercussions sur l'environnement? METTRE L'ACCENT SUR LES ACTIVITÉS SUBORDONNÉES AU MAINTIEN DE L'ÉTAT DE PRÉPARATION OPÉRATIONNELLE PLUTÔT QUE SUR LES ACTIVITÉS D'UN THÉÂTRE D'OPÉRATIONS.

Pistes de réponses : - recours à de l'équipement lourd/de la machinerie militaires dans le cadre de l'entraînement
- lacunes sur le plan du nettoyage/de la récupération (p. ex., cartouches dans les champs de tir)
- entreposage/gestion des matériaux/déchets
- utilisation de matières dangereuses/produits chimiques dangereux (p. ex., agent orange)

4. Selon vous, dans quelle mesure les répercussions de ces activités sont-elles importantes dans l'environnement? Comment qualifieriez-vous leurs effets?

Pistes de réponses : - effets légers, modérés, majeurs
- à courte échéance, à moyenne échéance et à longue échéance

5. Pour ce qui concerne les répercussions de ces activités sur l'environnement, quelles sont les choses en particulier qui vous préoccupent, s'il y en a? Y a-t-il autre chose?

Pistes de réponses : - la pollution
- le mauvais stockage/la mauvaise gestion des déchets
- les effets sur la santé (p. ex., l'exposition à l'agent orange à Gagetown)
- l'accumulation des contaminants au fil du temps

6. À votre avis, comment se comparent les répercussions des activités de l'Armée de terre sur l'environnement avec les effets dans l'environnement des activités de la Force aérienne et de la Marine? Est-ce que vous établissez une distinction entre ces trois éléments des Forces canadiennes en ce qui concerne l'incidence environnementale de leurs activités respectives? Si c'est oui, quelle est-elle?

7. Est-ce que votre organisation s'emploie actuellement à assurer une forme de surveillance ou de suivi s'attachant aux répercussions environnementales des activités militaires? Si c'est oui, quel est l'objet précis du suivi ou de la surveillance?

Pistes de réponses : - surveillance des Forces canadiennes en général
par rapport à l'Armée de terre en particulier

8. Avez-vous déjà cherché activement à trouver de l'information sur les répercussions des activités militaires sur l'environnement?

SI C'EST OUI :

9. Quel genre d'information cherchiez-vous à obtenir? Où avez-vous effectué vos recherches pour trouver l'information voulue? Avez-vous trouvé ce que vous cherchiez? Si c'est non, pourquoi pas?

Pistes de réponses : - si c'est au moyen d'Internet, où exactement? –
demander des précisions quant aux sites en particulier
- sites c. moteurs de recherche
- expressions qui ont servi dans les recherches

SI C'EST NON :

10. Si vous souhaitiez trouver de l'information sur la question, où chercheriez-vous à en obtenir? Y a-t-il d'autres sources?

Pistes de réponses : - si c'est au moyen d'Internet, où exactement?

11. En ce qui a trait à cet enjeu en général, qui vous inspirerait le plus confiance comme source d'information à ce sujet? Autrement dit, quel groupe ou quelle organisation vous semblerait le plus crédible ou digne de confiance dans ce domaine? Pourquoi? Y a-t-il un autre groupe, une autre organisation?
12. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que vous considéreriez que l'information provenant de l'Armée de terre est fiable? Est-ce que vous tiendriez l'Armée de terre pour crédible ou digne de confiance dans ce domaine? Si c'est non, pourquoi pas?
13. Selon vous, est-il nécessaire que l'Armée de terre effectue les opérations d'entraînement qui ont des répercussions sur l'environnement? Autrement dit, pensez-vous qu'il serait possible, pour l'Armée de terre, d'effectuer des opérations d'entraînement qui n'ont pas d'effet sur l'environnement?
14. Selon vous, dans quelle mesure est-il possible, pour l'Armée de terre, de réaliser ses objectifs dans le contexte de la défense, y compris l'état de préparation opérationnelle, d'une façon qui soit compatible avec la durabilité de l'environnement?

Pratiques environnementales de l'Armée de terre –notoriété et connaissances

15. Saviez-vous que l'Armée de terre est le plus important propriétaire foncier institutionnel au Canada?
16. Pour autant que vous sachiez, est-ce que l'Armée de terre a établi des programmes ou des pratiques en vue de gérer ou de surveiller les répercussions de ses activités sur l'environnement? Si c'est oui, que savez-vous à ce sujet? PRENDRE NOTE DES MENTIONS PRÉCISES DU PEAT
17. Connaissez-vous des programmes ou des pratiques que la Marine ou la Force aérienne auraient établis pour gérer ou surveiller les répercussions de leurs activités sur l'environnement? Si c'est oui, lesquels?

SI LE/LA PARTICIPANT(E) EST AU COURANT DE PROGRAMMES DE L'ARMÉE DE TERRE ET DE PROGRAMMES DE LA MARINE/FORCE AÉRIENNE :

18. Pour autant que vous sachiez, est-ce que l'Armée de terre est plus ou moins soucieuse des répercussions de ses activités sur l'environnement que la [Marine ou la Force aérienne]? Veuillez préciser.

Depuis 1992, l'Armée de terre a un programme environnemental visant à gérer les répercussions de ses activités sur l'environnement. Il s'agit du Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre (PEAT).

19. Aviez-vous déjà entendu parler de ce programme? Si c'est oui, comment en avez-vous entendu parler pour la première fois, et que savez-vous au sujet du programme? PRENDRE NOTE DES DÉTAILS

Perceptions à l'égard du Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre (PEAT)

À ce moment-ci, j'aimerais vous inviter à lire un court document que je viens juste de vous faire parvenir par courrier électronique. Le document expose des renseignements de base au sujet du Programme. Je vais maintenant vous accorder quelques minutes pour le lire. Je vous rappellerai ensuite pour que nous en discussions.

ACCORDER AU/À LA PARTICIPANT(E) 5-10 MINUTES POUR LIRE LE DOCUMENT; LE/LA RAPPELER ENSUITE POUR POURSUIVRE L'ENTREVUE :

20. Quelle réaction globale l'information que renferme le document vous a-t-elle inspirée? Pourquoi?

Pistes de réponses : - réaction positive, neutre, négative

21. Quelles sont les principales choses que vous avez apprises à la lecture du document? Autrement dit, quel est l'élément d'information le plus important que vous en avez retiré? Y a-t-il autre chose?

Pistes de réponses : - principal/principaux message(s) que communique le document

22. Est-ce que le document parvient efficacement à renseigner au sujet du Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre? Pourquoi/pourquoi pas? Est-ce que le document traite de la ou des principales choses au sujet desquelles vous souhaiteriez être renseigné(e)? Si c'est non, qu'est-ce qui manque?

Pistes de réponses : - points forts/points faibles

23. Est-ce que l'information communiquée est claire et facile à comprendre? Si c'est non, quels sont les passages ou les sections qui ne sont pas clairs?

24. Quelle impression le PEAT vous a-t-il laissée comme programme visant à gérer les répercussions des activités militaires sur l'environnement? Pourquoi?

25. Dans quelle mesure connaissez-vous les normes ISO 14000 pour la gestion environnementale de l'Organisation internationale de normalisation, sur lesquelles le Programme environnemental de l'Armée de terre prend appui? Que pensez-vous de ces normes? Pourquoi?

26. Est-ce que cette information inspire confiance à l'effet que l'Armée de terre s'occupe bien de cette question? Et pourquoi donc?

Pistes de réponses : - éléments rassurants/alarmants
- niveau de confiance à l'endroit de l'Armée de terre pour ce qui concerne les pratiques environnementales

27. Quel élément d'information tenez-vous pour le plus important ou pertinent pour ce qui est de renseigner les Canadiens à ce sujet? Pourquoi? Y a-t-il autre chose?

28. Dans quelle mesure est-ce que l'information communiquée a modifié vos perceptions à l'égard de l'Armée de terre en ce qui concerne les enjeux environnementaux, si c'est le cas?

29. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous convaincu(e) que l'Armée de terre met en œuvre les pratiques environnementales décrites dans son Programme environnemental? Veuillez préciser.

30. L'Armée de terre a aussi élaboré un plus long document (comptant 16 pages), également plus détaillé, qui expose le Système de gestion de l'environnement de l'Armée. Est-ce que ça pourrait vous intéresser de le lire et de présenter vos observations à ce sujet? Si c'est oui, nous pouvons vous le faire parvenir par courrier

électronique. Vous pourriez présenter vos commentaires au sujet du document dans un message électronique ou dans le cadre d'un court entretien téléphonique, à un moment qui vous conviendrait.

Conclusion

31. En terminant, aimeriez-vous formuler d'autres commentaires au sujet de l'un ou l'autre des sujets que nous avons abordés?

REMERCIER LE/LA PARTICIPANT(E).

SI LE/LA PARTICIPANT(E) EST D'ACCORD POUR EXAMINER LE PLUS LONG RAPPORT, VÉRIFIER DE QUELLE FAÇON IL/ELLE PRÉFÉRERAIT PRÉSENTER SES OBSERVATIONS (C.-À-D. PAR COURRIER ÉLECTRONIQUE OU AU TÉLÉPHONE). S'IL/SI ELLE PRÉFÈRE LA DEUXIÈME OPTION, CONVENIR DU MOMENT DU PROCHAIN APPEL.

EXPLIQUER QUE LES COMMENTAIRES DEVRONT PORTER SURTOUT SUR LES IMPRESSIONS GLOBALES, LA CLARTÉ, LES PRINCIPALES CONNAISSANCES ACQUISES ET LES LACUNES AU CHAPITRE DE L'INFORMATION COMMUNIQUÉE.

FAIRE VALOIR QUE NOUS AIMERIONS ÊTRE MIS AU COURANT DES COMMENTAIRES AU COURS DES PROCHAINS JOURS (DANS LA MESURE DU POSSIBLE).



Restoring the Past Protecting the Present Sustaining the Future

*A strategic environmental DIRECTION
for the Army of tomorrow
2008-2013*



Full document available at the following link:
<http://www.army.forces.gc.ca/lf/Downloads/Strategy%20EN%20White%20Cover.pdf>



**Réhabiliter le passé
Protéger le présent
Soutenir l'avenir**

Une DIRECTION environnementale
stratégique pour l'Armée de terre
de demain
2008-2013



Le document complet est disponible au site web suivant :
<http://www.army.forces.gc.ca/lf/Downloads/Strategy%20FR%20White%20Cover.pdf>