

## Used Crankcase Oils

Comments on the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act (CEPA)* First Priority Substances List (PSL1) Follow-up Report on Used Crankcase Oils (UCOs) were received during the public comment period from:

1. Department of Environment, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
2. Department of the Environment, Government of Nova Scotia
3. NEWALTA Corporation
4. Safety-Kleen Canada Inc.
5. Canadian Petroleum Products Institute
6. Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association
7. Environmental Management Division, Government of New Brunswick

The following comments were received following the close of the official public comment period. While there was no obligation to include these, the comments received were consistent with previous submissions and have been included to promote transparency. These comments were received from:

8. Saskatchewan Association for Resource Recovery Corporation (SARRC)
9. Manitoba Association for Resource Recovery Corporation (MARRC)
10. British Columbia Used Oil Management Association (BCUOMA)
11. Department of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Environment, Government of Prince Edward Island
12. Automotive Industries Association of Canada (AIA)
13. Environmental Protection Branch, Saskatchewan Environment, Government of Saskatchewan

Comments and responses are summarized below by Environment Canada (EC). All comments were based on the English version of the Follow-up Report.

Comment <sup>(source)</sup>	Response
Submission listed current management initiatives for UCOs; asks how EC proposes to manage UCOs and how management will impact provincial initiatives. <sup>1</sup>	EC has considered provincial and other risk management activities and has engaged provinces in discussions when developing the path forward.
Submission express concerns that the Follow-up Report and federal involvement undermine provincial initiatives. <sup>2, 3, 11</sup>	EC acknowledges the work done by provinces and industry in recycling and thereby controlling the release of UCOs. This information is summarized in Appendix A of the follow-up report.
Submission suggests that the “leaking from crankcases” surrogate scenario expands on the definition of UCOs to include the pre-collection component in	It is clearly stated in the Follow-up Report that the “leaking from crankcases” scenario is used as a surrogate for the PSL1 scenarios of concern involving “dumping on land” and use as a “dust

Comment <sup>(source)</sup>	Response
the life cycle, which goes beyond the PSL1 definition. <sup>2, 11</sup>	suppressant.” It is a direct release and was used to simulate the above scenarios of concern. Since the effects of leaking from crankcases were found to be harmful to benthic organisms, the much larger releases that could result from indiscriminate dumping on land by off-road operations or DIYs (do-it-yourself oil changers) could reasonably be assumed to result in harm to the environment as well.
Submissions suggest that there is insufficient information to conclude as toxic. <sup>3, 6, 11</sup>	It is considered that the Follow-up Report does provide sufficient information to support the conclusion the substance meets the criteria set out in section 64. Notably, in the consideration of “leaking from crankcases” scenario of concern referred to above.
Submission provide suggestions on how to get current information on UCOs, such as volumes, emissions, etc. <sup>3</sup>	Suggestions are noted.
Submission suggest that the Follow-up Report makes negative comments about recycling. <sup>3</sup>	The comments do not state what comments in the report were considered negative. It was not the intention of this report to make negative comments about recycling.
Submission supports adding UCOs to Schedule 1, as there are other Schedule 1 substances contained in UCOs. <sup>4</sup>	Comments are noted.
Submission suggests that addition to Schedule 1 will add a stigma to UCOs, resulting in a negative impact on industry. <sup>5, 8, 9, 10, 12</sup>	It is anticipated that communication of the hazards and risks associated with UCOs will raise awareness and encourage the use of UCO programs.
Submissions express concerns about the possible negative impact of a CEPA “toxic” designation <sup>6,7</sup> ; mentions how the United States dealt with UCOs. <sup>6</sup>	Concerns are noted.
Submission notes a contradiction between summary material, <i>Canada Gazette</i> Notice and background material, which appeared to reach different conclusions as to listing of UCOs as toxic. <sup>6</sup>	The summary material on the web site refers to the 1994 PSL1 conclusion, where there was insufficient information to conclude on whether UCOs were toxic; the 21 June 2003 <i>Canada Gazette</i> Notice and the background material (Follow-up Report) both propose conclusion on the criteria set out in section 64.
Submission suggest that data used in the report are old:	

<b>Comment</b> <sup>(source)</sup>	<b>Response</b>
<p>a) The direct release scenarios for dust suppression and disposing of oil in landfills are no longer relevant, as both are banned in New Brunswick. Therefore, the CEPA “toxic” conclusion is based on older data that do not reflect the current situation.<sup>7</sup></p> <p>b) Data are out of date and ignore the improvements made by provinces and industry in the management of UCOs.<sup>13</sup></p> <p>c) The report does not consider the increases in recycling/recovery since the onset of oil recycling programs.<sup>6</sup></p>	<p>a) While using UCOs as a dust suppressant has been banned in almost all provinces, indiscriminate dumping on land by off-road operations (e.g., forestry and mining) is still of concern. The Follow-up Report clearly makes the distinction between the dumping on land scenario (one of the four scenarios of concern) and disposing of UCOs in landfills. Releases from disposing of UCOs in landfills were not considered as a major scenario of concern, as stated in the PSL Assessment Report in 1994.</p> <p>b) When the provinces, territories and industry were canvassed for data on UCOs in 1996–97 and again in late 1999 and 2000, no new data were provided at that time. EC, however, does acknowledge the work done by provinces and industry in recycling and thereby controlling release of UCOs, as presented in Appendix A of the Follow-up Report.</p> <p>c) As indicated in the Introduction of the Follow-up Report, the provincial, territorial and federal governments and the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute were contacted to determine their management initiatives to reduce environmental and human health exposure to UCOs. The results are listed in Appendix A of the draft Follow-up Report. EC recognizes the initiatives taken by these governments and industry, and has considered their efforts in the development of the next steps.</p>
<p>The Saskatchewan Association for Resource Recovery Corporation (SARRC) 7th Annual Report 2002 was provided.<sup>13</sup></p>	<p>The report will be forwarded to risk managers for their consideration.</p>