

2021 HOUSE JUDICIARY

HB 1079

2021 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Judiciary
Room JW327B, State Capitol

HB 1079
1/19/21

Relating to the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.

Chairman Klemin called the hearing to order at 9:30 AM.

Representatives	Attendance
Representative Lawrence R. Klemin	P
Representative Karen Karls	P
Representative Rick Becker	P
Representative Ruth Buffalo	P
Representative Cole Christensen	P
Representative Claire Cory	P
Representative Karla Rose Hanson	P
Representative Terry B. Jones	P
Representative Jeffery J. Magrum	P
Representative Bob Paulson	P
Representative Gary Paur	P
Representative Shannon Roers Jones	P
Representative Bernie Satrom	P
Representative Steve Vetter	P

Discussion Topics:

- Number of area covenants
- ND ground field locations
- Limitations of land activity and use
- Landowner assessment
- Requirements for periodic reporting
- Owners land utilization

Parrell Grossman, ND Uniform Law Commission: Introduced the bill. Testimonies #954, #1159, # 1160, #1161, #1162.#1163

David Glatt, ND Director of Environmental Quality: In Favor. Testimony #1301 (9.38)

Tony Weiler, Executive Director State Bar Association: Supported the bill. (10:02)

Opposition: None

Neutral: None

Do Not Pass Motion Made by Rep. Magrum; Seconded by Rep. Christensen

Representatives	Vote
Chairman Klemin	N
Vice Chairman Karls	N
Rep Becker	A
Rep. Christensen	Y
Rep. Cory	N
Rep T. Jones	N
Rep Magrum	Y
Rep Paulson	N
Rep Paur	N
Rep Roers Jones	N
Rep B. Satrom	N
Rep Vetter	N
Rep Buffalo	N
Rep K. Hanson	N

Motion for Do Not Pass failed. 2-11-1.

Do Pass motion made by Rep. Roers Jones, Seconded by Rep. Karls.

Representatives	Vote
Chairman Klemin	Y
Vice Chairman Karls	Y
Rep Becker	A
Rep. Christensen	N
Rep. Cory	Y
Rep T. Jones	Y
Rep Magrum	N
Rep Paulson	Y
Rep Paur	Y
Rep Roers Jones	Y
Rep B. Satrom	Y
Rep Vetter	Y
Rep Buffalo	Y
Rep K. Hanson	Y

Motion carried. 11-2-1

Chairman Klemin adjourned (10:03)

DeLores D. Shimek, Committee Clerk by Donna Whetham

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1079: Judiciary Committee (Rep. Klemin, Chairman) recommends **DO PASS** (11 YEAS, 2 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1079 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

21.0234.01000

Sixty-seventh
Legislative Assembly
of North Dakota

HOUSE BILL NO. 1079

Introduced by

Judiciary Committee

(At the request of the Commission on Uniform State Laws)

1 A BILL for an Act to create and enact chapter 47-37 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating
2 to the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.

3 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NORTH DAKOTA:**

4 **SECTION 1.** Chapter 47-37 of the North Dakota Century Code is created and enacted as
5 follows:

6 **47-37-01. Definitions.**

- 7 1. "Activity and use limitations" means restrictions or obligations created under this
8 chapter with respect to real property.
- 9 2. "Agency" means the department of environmental quality or any other state or federal
10 agency that determines or approves the environmental response project pursuant to
11 which the environmental covenant is created.
- 12 3. "Common interest community" means a condominium, cooperative, or other real
13 property with respect to which a person, by virtue of the person's ownership of a
14 parcel of real property, is obligated to pay property taxes or insurance premiums, or for
15 maintenance, or improvement of other real property described in a recorded covenant
16 that creates the common interest community.
- 17 4. "Environmental covenant" means a servitude arising under an environmental response
18 project that imposes activity and use limitations.
- 19 5. "Environmental response project" means a plan or work performed for environmental
20 remediation of real property and conducted:
 - 21 a. Under a federal or state program governing environmental remediation of real
22 property, including chapters 23.1-04, 23.1-08, and 61-28;
 - 23 b. Incident to closure of a solid or hazardous waste management unit, if the closure
24 is conducted with approval of an agency; or

- 1 c. Under a state voluntary cleanup program authorized in section 23.1-04-04.
- 2 6. "Holder" means the grantee of an environmental covenant as specified in subsection 1
3 of section 47-37-02.
- 4 7. "Person" means an individual, corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership,
5 limited liability company, association, joint venture, public corporation, government,
6 governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, or any other legal or commercial
7 entity.
- 8 8. "Record", used as a noun, means information inscribed on a tangible medium or
9 stored in an electronic or other medium and which is retrievable in perceivable form.
- 10 9. "State" means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the
11 United States Virgin Islands, or any territory or insular possession subject to the
12 jurisdiction of the United States.

13 **47-37-02. Nature of rights - Subordination of interests.**

- 14 1. Any person, including a person that owns an interest in the real property, the agency,
15 or a municipality or other unit of local government, may be a holder. An environmental
16 covenant may identify more than one holder. The interest of a holder is an interest in
17 real property.
- 18 2. A right of an agency under this chapter or under an environmental covenant, other
19 than a right as a holder, is not an interest in real property.
- 20 3. An agency is bound by any obligation it assumes in an environmental covenant, but an
21 agency does not assume obligations merely by signing an environmental covenant.
22 Any other person that signs an environmental covenant is bound by the obligations the
23 person assumes in the covenant, but signing the covenant does not change
24 obligations, rights, or protections granted or imposed under law other than this chapter
25 except as provided in the covenant.
- 26 4. The following rules apply to interests in real property in existence at the time an
27 environmental covenant is created or amended:
- 28 a. An interest that has priority under other law is not affected by an environmental
29 covenant unless the person that owns the interest subordinates that interest to
30 the covenant.

- 1 b. This chapter does not require a person that owns a prior interest to subordinate
2 that interest to an environmental covenant or to agree to be bound by the
3 covenant.
- 4 c. A subordination agreement may be contained in an environmental covenant
5 covering real property or in a separate record. If the environmental covenant
6 covers commonly owned property in a common interest community, the record
7 may be signed by any person authorized by the governing board of the owners'
8 association.
- 9 d. An agreement by a person to subordinate a prior interest to an environmental
10 covenant affects the priority of that person's interest but does not by itself impose
11 any affirmative obligation on the person with respect to the environmental
12 covenant.

13 **47-37-03. Contents of environmental covenant.**

- 14 1. An environmental covenant must:
- 15 a. State the instrument is an environmental covenant executed pursuant to chapter
16 47-37;
- 17 b. Contain a legally sufficient description of the real property subject to the
18 covenant;
- 19 c. Describe the activity and use limitations on the real property;
- 20 d. Identify every holder;
- 21 e. Be signed by the agency, every holder, and unless waived by the agency every
22 owner of the fee simple of the real property subject to the covenant; and
- 23 f. Identify the name and location of any administrative record for the environmental
24 response project reflected in the environmental covenant.
- 25 2. In addition to the information required by subsection 1, an environmental covenant
26 may contain other information, restrictions, and requirements agreed to by the persons
27 who signed it, including:
- 28 a. Requirements for notice following transfer of a specified interest in, or concerning
29 proposed changes in use of, applications for building permits for, or proposals for
30 any site work affecting the contamination on, the property subject to the
31 covenant;

- 1 b. Requirements for periodic reporting describing compliance with the covenant;
- 2 c. Rights of access to the property granted in connection with implementation or
- 3 enforcement of the covenant;
- 4 d. A brief narrative description of the contamination and remedy, including the
- 5 contaminants of concern, the pathways of exposure, limits on exposure, and the
- 6 location and extent of the contamination;
- 7 e. Limitation on amendment or termination of the covenant in addition to those
- 8 contained in sections 47-37-08 and 47-37-09; and
- 9 f. Rights of the holder in addition to its right to enforce the covenant pursuant to
- 10 section 47-37-10.
- 11 3. In addition to other conditions for its approval of an environmental covenant, the
- 12 agency may require those persons specified by the agency which have interests in the
- 13 real property to sign the covenant.
- 14 **47-37-04. Validity - Effect on other instruments.**
- 15 1. An environmental covenant that complies with this chapter runs with the land.
- 16 2. An environmental covenant that is otherwise effective is valid and enforceable even if:
- 17 a. It is not appurtenant to an interest in real property;
- 18 b. It can be or has been assigned to a person other than the original holder;
- 19 c. It is not of a character that has been recognized traditionally at common law;
- 20 d. It imposes a negative burden;
- 21 e. It imposes an affirmative obligation on a person having an interest in the real
- 22 property or on the holder;
- 23 f. The benefit or burden does not touch or concern real property;
- 24 g. There is no privity of estate or contract;
- 25 h. The holder dies, ceases to exist, resigns, or is replaced; or
- 26 i. The owner of an interest subject to the environmental covenant and the holder
- 27 are the same person.
- 28 3. An instrument that creates restrictions or obligations with respect to real property that
- 29 would qualify as activity and use limitations except for the fact that the instrument was
- 30 recorded before August 1, 2021, is not invalid or unenforceable because of any of the
- 31 limitations on enforcement of interests described in subsection 2 or because it was

1 identified as an easement, servitude, deed restriction, or other interest. This chapter
2 does not apply in any other respect to such an instrument.

3 4. This chapter does not invalidate or render unenforceable any interest, whether
4 designated as an environmental covenant or other interest, which is otherwise
5 enforceable under the law of this state.

6 **47-37-05. Relationship to other land-use law.**

7 This chapter does not authorize a use of real property which is otherwise prohibited by
8 zoning, by law other than this chapter regulating use of real property, or by a recorded
9 instrument that has priority over the environmental covenant. An environmental covenant may
10 prohibit or restrict uses of real property which are authorized by zoning or by law other than this
11 chapter.

12 **47-37-06. Notice.**

- 13 1. A copy of an environmental covenant must be provided by the persons and in the
14 manner required by the agency to:
- 15 a. Each person that signed the covenant;
 - 16 b. Each person holding a recorded interest in the real property subject to the
17 covenant;
 - 18 c. Each person in possession of the real property subject to the covenant;
 - 19 d. Each municipality or other unit of local government in which real property subject
20 to the covenant is located; and
 - 21 e. Any other person the agency requires.
- 22 2. The validity of a covenant is not affected by failure to provide a copy of the covenant
23 as required under this section.

24 **47-37-07. Recording.**

- 25 1. An environmental covenant and any amendment or termination of the covenant must
26 be recorded in every county in which any portion of the real property subject to the
27 covenant is located. For purposes of indexing, a holder must be treated as a grantee.
- 28 2. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3 of section 47-37-08 an environmental
29 covenant is subject to the laws of this state governing recording and priority of
30 interests in real property.

1 **47-37-08. Duration - Amendment by court action.**

2 1. An environmental covenant is perpetual unless it is:

3 a. By its terms limited to a specific duration or terminated by the occurrence of a
4 specific event;

5 b. Terminated by consent pursuant to section 47-37-09;

6 c. Terminated pursuant to subsection 2;

7 d. Terminated by foreclosure of an interest that has priority over the environmental
8 covenant; or

9 e. Terminated or modified in an eminent domain proceeding, but only if:

10 (1) The agency that signed the covenant is a party to the proceeding;

11 (2) All persons identified in subsections 1 and 2 of section 47-37-09 are given
12 notice of the pendency of the proceeding; and

13 (3) The court determines, after hearing, the termination or modification will not
14 adversely affect human health or the environment.

15 2. If the agency that signed an environmental covenant has determined the intended
16 benefits of the covenant can no longer be realized, a court, under the doctrine of
17 changed circumstances, in an action in which all persons identified in subsections 1
18 and 2 of section 47-37-09 have been given notice, may terminate the covenant or
19 reduce its burden on the real property subject to the covenant. The agency's
20 determination or its failure to make a determination upon request is subject to review
21 pursuant to chapter 28-32.

22 3. Except as otherwise provided in subsections 1 and 2, an environmental covenant may
23 not be extinguished, limited, or impaired through issuance of a tax deed, foreclosure of
24 a tax lien, or application of the doctrine of adverse possession, prescription,
25 abandonment, waiver, lack of enforcement, or acquiescence, or a similar doctrine.

26 4. An environmental covenant may not be extinguished, limited, or impaired by
27 application of chapters 38-18.1 and 47-19.1.

28 **47-37-09. Amendment or termination by consent.**

29 1. An environmental covenant may be amended or terminated by consent only if the
30 amendment or termination is signed by:

31 a. The agency;

- 1 b. Unless waived by the agency, the current owner of the fee simple of the real
- 2 property subject to the covenant;
- 3 c. Each person that originally signed the covenant, unless the person waived in a
- 4 signed record the right to consent or a court finds the person no longer exists or
- 5 cannot be located or identified with the exercise of reasonable diligence; and
- 6 d. Except as otherwise provided in subdivision b of subsection 4, the holder.
- 7 2. If an interest in real property is subject to an environmental covenant, the interest is
- 8 not affected by an amendment of the covenant unless the current owner of the interest
- 9 consents to the amendment or has waived in a signed record the right to consent to
- 10 amendments.
- 11 3. Except for an assignment undertaken pursuant to a governmental reorganization,
- 12 assignment of an environmental covenant to a new holder is an amendment.
- 13 4. Except as otherwise provided in an environmental covenant:
- 14 a. A holder may not assign its interest without consent of the other parties;
- 15 b. A holder may be removed and replaced by agreement of the other parties
- 16 specified in subsection 1; and
- 17 c. A court of competent jurisdiction may fill a vacancy in the position of holder.

18 **47-37-10. Enforcement of environmental covenant.**

- 19 1. A civil action for injunctive or other equitable relief for violation of an environmental
- 20 covenant may be maintained by:
- 21 a. A party to the covenant;
- 22 b. The agency or, if it is not the agency, the department of environmental quality;
- 23 c. Any person to which the covenant expressly grants power to enforce;
- 24 d. A person that has interest in the real property or has collateral or liability that may
- 25 be affected by the alleged violation of the covenant; or
- 26 e. A municipality or other unit of local government in which the real property subject
- 27 to the covenant is located.
- 28 2. This chapter does not limit the regulatory authority of the agency or the department of
- 29 environmental quality under law other than this chapter with respect to an
- 30 environmental response project.

1 3. A person is not responsible for or subject to liability for environmental remediation
2 solely because the person has the right to enforce an environmental covenant.

3 **47-37-11. Registry - Substitute notice.**

4 1. The department of environmental quality shall establish and maintain a registry that
5 contains all environmental covenants and any amendment or termination of those
6 covenants. The registry also may contain any other information concerning
7 environmental covenants and the real property subject to the covenants which the
8 department of environmental quality considers appropriate. The registry is a public
9 record for purposes of section 44-04-18.

10 2. After an environmental covenant or an amendment or termination of a covenant is filed
11 in the registry established pursuant to subsection 1, a notice of the covenant,
12 amendment, or termination that complies with this section may be recorded in the land
13 records in lieu of recording the entire covenant. Any such notice must contain:

14 a. A legally sufficient description and any available street address of the real
15 property subject to the covenant;

16 b. The name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property,
17 the agency, and the holder if other than the agency;

18 c. A statement that the covenant, amendment, or termination is available in a
19 registry at the department of environmental quality, which discloses the method of
20 any electronic access; and

21 d. A statement that the notice is notification of an environmental covenant executed
22 pursuant to chapter 47-37.

23 3. A statement in substantially the following form, executed with the same formalities as a
24 deed in this state, satisfies the requirements of subsection 2:

25 a. This notice is filed in the land records of the (insert political subdivision) of (insert
26 name of jurisdiction in which the real property is located) pursuant to, section
27 47-37-11.

28 b. This notice and the covenant, amendment, or termination to which it refers may
29 impose significant obligations with respect to the property described below.

- 1 c. A legal description of the property is attached as Exhibit A to this notice. The
2 address of the property subject to the environmental covenant is (insert either
3 address of property or not available).
- 4 d. The name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property
5 on the date of this notice is (insert name of current owner of the property and the
6 owner's current address as shown on the tax records of the jurisdiction in which
7 the property is located).
- 8 e. The environmental covenant, amendment, or termination was signed by (insert
9 name and address of the agency).
- 10 f. The environmental covenant, amendment, or termination was filed in the registry
11 on (insert date of filing).
- 12 g. The full text of the covenant, amendment, or termination and any other
13 information required by the agency is on file and available for inspection and
14 copying in the registry maintained for that purpose by the department of
15 environmental quality at 918 East Divide Avenue, Bismarck, North Dakota
16 58501The covenant, amendment, or termination may be found electronically at
17 <https://deq.nd.gov/>.

18 **47-37-12. Relation to Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act.**

19 This chapter modifies, limits, or supersedes the federal Electronic Signatures in Global and
20 National Commerce Act [15 U.S.C. 7001 et seq.], but does not modify, limit, or supersede
21 section 101(c) of that Act [15 U.S.C. 7001(c)], or authorize electronic delivery of any of the
22 notices described in section 103(b) of that Act [15 U.S.C. 7003(b)].

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

drafted by the

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS

ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

and by it

APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED FOR ENACTMENT
IN ALL THE STATES

at its

MEETING IN ITS ONE-HUNDRED-AND-TWELFTH YEAR
WASHINGTON, DC

AUGUST 1-7, 2003

WITH PREFATORY NOTE AND COMMENTS

Copyright ©2003

By

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

September 27, 2018

DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

WILLIAM R. BREETZ, JR., University of Connecticut School of Law, Connecticut Urban
Legal Initiative, 35 Elizabeth Street, Room K-202, Hartford, CT 06105, *Chair*
MARION W. BENFIELD, JR., 10 Overlook Circle, New Braunfels, TX 78132
DAVID D. BIKLEN, 153 N. Beacon St., Hartford, CT 06105
STEPHEN C. CAWOOD, 108 ½ Kentucky Ave., P.O. Drawer 128, Pineville, KY 40977-0128
BRUCE A. COGGESHALL, One Monument Sq., Portland, ME 04101
FRANK W. DAYKIN, 2180 Thomas Jefferson Dr., Reno, NV 89509, *Committee on Style*
Liaison
THEODORE C. KRAMER, 45 Walnut St., Brattleboro, VT 05301
DONALD E. MIELKE, Ken Caryl Starr Centre, 7472 S. Shaffer Ln., Suite 100, Littleton, CO
80127
LARRY L. RUTH, 530 S. 13th St., Suite 110, Lincoln, NE 68508-2820, *Enactment Plan*
Coordinator
HIROSHI SAKAI, 3773 Diamond Head Circle, Honolulu, HI 96815
YVONNE L. THARPES, Legislature of the Virgin Islands, Capitol Building, P.O. Box 1690, St.
Thomas, VI 00804
MICHELE L. TIMMONS, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, 700 State Office Bldg., 100 Rev.
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., St. Paul, MN 55155
KURT A. STRASSER, University of Connecticut School of Law, 65 Elizabeth St., Hartford, CT
06105-2290, *Reporter*

EX OFFICIO

K. KING BURNETT, P.O. Box 910, Salisbury, MD 21803-0910, *President*
CARL H. LISMAN, 84 Pine St., P.O. Box 728, Burlington, VT 05402, *Division Chair*

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADVISOR

ROGER D. SCHWENKE, Carlton Fields, PA 1 Harbour Pl., 777 S. Harbour Is. Blvd., P.O. Box
3239, Tampa, FL 33602-5950

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

WILLIAM HENNING, University of Alabama School of Law, Box 870382, Tuscaloosa, AL
35487-0382, *Executive Director*
WILLIAM J. PIERCE, 1505 Roxbury Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, *Executive Director*
Emeritus

Copies of this Act may be obtained from:
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS
211 E. Ontario Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312/915-0195
www.nccusl.org

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prefatory Note.....	1
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE	6
SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS.....	6
SECTION 3. NATURE OF RIGHTS; SUBORDINATION OF INTERESTS.....	11
SECTION 4. CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.....	14
SECTION 5. VALIDITY; EFFECT ON OTHER INSTRUMENTS.....	20
SECTION 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAND-USE LAW.....	24
SECTION 7. NOTICE.....	26
SECTION 8. RECORDING.....	26
SECTION 9. DURATION; AMENDMENT BY COURT ACTION.....	28
SECTION 10. AMENDMENT OR TERMINATION BY CONSENT.....	31
SECTION 11. ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.....	36
[SECTION 12. REGISTRY; SUBSTITUTE NOTICE.].....	38
SECTION 13. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION.....	41
SECTION 14. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT.....	41
SECTION 15. SEVERABILITY.....	41

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

Prefatory Note

Environmental covenants - whether called “institutional controls”, “land use controls” or some other term - are increasingly being used as part of the environmental remediation process for contaminated real property. An environmental covenant typically is used when the real property is to be cleaned up to a level determined by the potential environmental risks posed by a particular use, rather than to unrestricted use standards. Such risk-based remediation is both environmentally and economically preferable in many circumstances, although it will often allow the parties to leave residual contamination in the real property. An environmental covenant is then used to implement this risk-based cleanup by controlling the potential risks presented by that residual contamination.

Two principal policies are served by confirming the validity of environmental covenants. One is to ensure that land use restrictions, mandated environmental monitoring requirements, and a wide range of common engineering controls designed to control the potential environmental risk of residual contamination will be reflected on the land records and effectively enforced over time as a valid real property servitude. This Act addresses a variety of common law doctrines - the same doctrines that led to adoption of the Uniform Conservation Easement Act - that cast doubt on such enforceability.

A second important policy served by this Act is the return of previously contaminated property, often located in urban areas, to the stream of commerce. The environmental and real property legal communities have often been unable to identify a common set of principles applicable to such properties. The frequent result has been that these properties do not attract interested purchasers and therefore remain vacant, blighted and unproductive. This is an undesirable outcome for communities seeking to return once important commercial sites to productive use.

Large numbers of contaminated sites are unlikely to be successfully recycled until regulators, potentially responsible parties, affected communities, prospective purchasers and their lenders become confident that environmental covenants will be properly drafted, implemented, monitored and enforced for so long as needed. This Act should encourage transfer of ownership and property re-use by offering a clear and objective process for creating, modifying or terminating environmental covenants and for recording these actions in recorded instruments which will be reflected in the title abstract of the property in question.

Of course, risk-based remediation must effectively control the potential risk presented by the residual contamination that remains in the real property and thereby protect human health and the environment. When risk-based remediation imposes restrictions on how the property may be used after the cleanup, requires continued monitoring of the site, or requires construction of permanent containment or other remedial structures on the site, environmental covenants are crucial tools to make these restrictions and requirements effective. Yet environmental covenants can do so only if their legal status under state property law and their practical enforceability are

assured, as this proposed Uniform Act seeks to do.

At the time this Act was promulgated, approximately half the states had laws providing for land use restrictions in conjunction with risk-based remedies. Those existing laws vary greatly in scope – some simply note the need for land use restrictions, while others create tools similar to many of the legal structures envisioned by this Act. Most such acts apply only to cleanups under a state program.

In contrast, this Act includes a number of provisions absent from most existing state laws, including the Act's applicability to both federal and state-led cleanups. For example, this Act expressly precludes the application of traditional common law doctrines that might hinder enforcement. It ensures that a covenant will survive despite tax lien foreclosure, adverse possession, and marketable title statutes. The Act also provides detailed provisions regarding termination and amendment of older covenants, and includes important provisions on dealing with recorded interests that have priority over the new covenant. Further, it offers guidance to courts confronted with a proceeding that seeks to terminate such a covenant through eminent domain or the doctrine of changed circumstances.

This Act benefited greatly during the drafting process from broad stakeholder input. As a result, the Act contains unique provisions designed to protect a variety of interests commonly absent in existing state laws. For example, the Act confers on property owners that grant an environmental covenant the right to enforce the covenant and requires their consent to any termination or modification. This should mitigate an owner's future liability concerns for residual contamination and encourage the sale and reuse of contaminated properties. And, following traditional real property principles, the Act validates the interests of lenders who hold a prior mortgage on the contaminated property, absent voluntary subordination.

It is important to emphasize that environmental covenants are but one tool in a larger context of environmental remediation regulation; remediation is typically overseen by a government agency enforcing substantial statutory and regulatory requirements. The covenant should be the crucial end result of that process - it may be used to ensure that the activity and use limitations imposed in the agency's remedial decision process remain effective, and thus protect the public from residual contamination that remains, while also permitting re-use of the site in a timely and economically valuable way.

Environmental remediation projects may be done in a widely diverse array of contamination fact patterns and regulatory contexts. For example, the remediation may be done at a large industrial operating or waste disposal site. In such a situation, the cleanup could be done under federal law and regulation, such as the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA") or the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"). Generally speaking, CERCLA and RCRA would also apply to remediation done at Department of Defense or Department of Energy sites that are anticipated to be transferred out of federal ownership.

In other situations, state law and regulation will be an effective regulatory framework for remediation projects. State law is given a role to play in the federal environmental policy

discussed above. Beyond this, state law may be the primary source of regulatory authority for many remediation projects. These may include larger sites and will often include smaller, typically urban, sites. In addition, many states authorize and supervise voluntary cleanup efforts, and these also may find environmental covenants a useful policy tool. With both state and federal environmental remediation projects, the applicable cleanup statutes and regulations will provide the basis for the restrictions and controls to be included in the resulting environmental covenants.

This Act does not supplant or impose substantive clean-up standards, either generally or in a particular case. The Act assumes those standards will be developed in a prior regulatory proceeding. Rather, the Act is intended to validate site-specific, environmental use restrictions resulting from an environmental response project that proposes to leave residual contamination in the ground in any of the different situations described above. Once the governing regulatory authority and the property owner have determined to use a risk-based approach to cleanup to protect the public from residual contamination, this Act supplies the legal infrastructure for creating and enforcing the environmental covenant under state law.

This Act does not require issuance of regulations. However, many state and federal agencies have developed implementation tools, including model covenants, statements of best practices, and advisory groups that include members of the real property and environmental practice bars as well as business and environmental groups. Developing and sharing such implementation tools and the advice of such advisory groups should support the effective implementation of the Act and is encouraged.

This Act does not address or change the larger context of environmental remediation regulation discussed above, and a number of aspects of that regulation should be noted here.

First, many contaminated properties are subject to the concurrent regulatory jurisdiction of both federal and state agencies. This Act does not address the exercise of such concurrent jurisdiction, and it is not intended to limit the jurisdiction of any state agency.

A specific issue arises with federal property that is not anticipated to be transferred to a non-federal owner. This Act takes no position regarding the question of whether remediation of such property is subject to State regulatory jurisdiction. In contrast, where federal property is transferred to a non-federal owner, state agencies will clearly have jurisdiction over environmental covenants on the transferred property where state environmental law so provides.

Second, potential purchasers of property subject to an environmental covenant should be aware that both state and federal environmental law other than this Act may authorize reopening the environmental remediation determination, even after the relevant statutory standards have been met on that site. While such reopeners are rare, they may be possible to respond either to newly-discovered contamination or new scientific knowledge of the risk posed by existing contamination. As a consequence, under existing environmental law, the then-current owner may have remediation liability. While the dampening effect of such potential liability on the willingness of potential purchasers to buy contaminated property is clear, the issue remains

important in the eyes of some interest groups. Federal law now provides protection for bona fide purchasers of such property under specified circumstances, and the law of some states may also afford some protection. However, this Act does not provide any such bona fide purchaser protection.

For these and other reasons, it is important that prospective purchasers of contaminated properties - particularly those successors who may buy some years after a clean-up has been completed - have actual knowledge of covenants at the time of purchase. Environmental covenants recorded pursuant to this Act will provide constructive notice of the covenant and in many circumstances recording will provide actual notice. However, to ensure that such persons have actual notice, a state or a local recording authority may wish to highlight the existence of environmental covenants in their communities with maps showing the location of properties subject to environmental covenants, similar to the kinds of maps commonly found in local land records offices to show the location of zoning districts or flood plains.

Legislative Notes

Non Participating Owner. This Act contemplates a situation where a risk based clean-up is agreed to by the regulatory agency and the parties responsible for the clean-up, potentially including the fee owner and the owners of other interests in the property. As a consequence of that agreement, the Act assumes those parties will each negotiate the terms of and then sign the covenant.

The Act assumes the owners of appropriate interests in contaminated property will be willing to sign the covenant. Cooperation is not always possible, however. State and federal regulatory systems make a number of parties, in addition to the current owner of a fee simple or some other interests, potentially liable for the cost of remediation of contaminated real property. As a result, a remediation project may proceed even though an owner is no longer present or interested in the property. In those circumstances, the remediation project would be conducted pursuant to regulatory orders and could be financed either by other liable parties or by public funds. However, an environmental covenant may still be a useful tool in implementing the remediation project even in these situations.

When an owner is either unavailable or unwilling to participate in the environmental response project, it may be appropriate to condemn and take a partial interest in the real property in order to be able to record a valid servitude on it. Under the law of some states, states have the power to take that owner's interest by condemnation proceedings, paying the value of the interest taken, and then enter an environmental covenant as an owner. Where there is substantial contamination, the property may have little or no market value. In some states the court would take the cost of remediation into account in establishing the fair market value of the interest taken. See, e.g., *Northeast Ct. Economic Alliance, Inc. v. ATC Partnership*, 256 Conn. 813, 776 A.2d 1068 (2001). Although effective implementation of this Act may require that the state have a power of condemnation, this Act does not provide a substantive statutory basis for that power, and the state must therefore rely on other state law. Each state considering adoption of this Act should ensure that such a condemnation power is available for this purpose.

Similarly, while this Act provides substantive law governing creation, modification, and termination of environmental covenants, it does not include special administrative procedures for these and does not change the remedial decision making process. Rather, the Act presumes that the state's general administrative law or any specific procedure governing the environmental response project would apply to these activities.

“Actual” versus “Constructive” Notice of Contamination. The primary goal of the Act is to present to the states a statute that fully integrates environmental covenants into the traditional real property system. It seeks to ensure the long-term viability of those covenants by, among other means, providing constructive notice of those covenants to the world through resort to the land recording system.

Beyond that goal, it is very important to provide actual knowledge of the remaining contaminated conditions that the environmental covenants are designed to control. A broad range of stakeholders—children and adults that might inadvertently gain access to the contamination, tenants on the property, owners, abutting neighbors, prospective buyers, lenders, government officials, title insurance companies, public health providers and others—will have a real personal and financial stake in knowing what properties in their communities suffer from contamination and the extent of the risks they confront. The fact that this law may provide legally sufficient knowledge of those conditions is no substitute for real information regarding those conditions.

The challenge of providing that information is beyond the scope of this Act. However, in analogous situations—the location of zoning districts, flood plain boundaries, utility easements, and dangerous street conditions, for example—governments have devised techniques to make the public aware of those conditions on a continuing basis. Techniques such as maps in recorders' offices, on-site signage and monuments and, increasingly, computer databases accessible to the public are examples of possible solutions. All such devices have fiscal implications and are best addressed on a local basis. Over the long term, however, the public will likely be well served by innovative solutions to these issues.

Legislative Policy. Finally, this Act does not include a section of policy and legislative findings, although some states may choose to use such a section. If such a section is desired, the Colorado Statute, C.S.R.A. §25-15-317, may be an appropriate model.

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This [act] may be cited as the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS. In this [act]:

(1) “Activity and use limitations” means restrictions or obligations created under this [act] with respect to real property.

(2) “Agency” means the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] or any other state or federal agency that determines or approves the environmental response project pursuant to which the environmental covenant is created.

(3) “Common interest community” means a condominium, cooperative, or other real property with respect to which a person, by virtue of the person’s ownership of a parcel of real property, is obligated to pay property taxes or insurance premiums, or for maintenance, or improvement of other real property described in a recorded covenant that creates the common interest community.

(4) “Environmental covenant” means a servitude arising under an environmental response project that imposes activity and use limitations.

(5) “Environmental response project” means a plan or work performed for environmental remediation of real property and conducted:

(A) under a federal or state program governing environmental remediation of real property, including [insert references to state law governing environmental remediation];

(B) incident to closure of a solid or hazardous waste management unit, if the closure is conducted with approval of an agency; or

(C) under a state voluntary clean-up program authorized in [insert reference to

appropriate state law].

(6) “Holder” means the grantee of an environmental covenant as specified in Section 3(a).

(7) “Person” means an individual, corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, public corporation, government, governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, or any other legal or commercial entity.

(8) “Record”, used as a noun, means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

(9) “State” means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Comment

1. The following are examples of subsection (1) activity and use limitations:

(1) a prohibition or limitation of one or more uses of or activities on the real property, including restrictions on residential use, drilling for or pumping groundwater, or interference with activity and use limitations or other remedies,

(2) an activity required to be conducted on the real property, including monitoring, reporting, or operating procedures and maintenance for physical controls or devices,

(3) any right of access necessary to implement the activity and use limitations, and

(4) any physical structure or device required to be placed on the real property.

The specific activity and use limitations in any covenant will depend on the nature of the proceeding in the environmental response project that led to the covenant. For example, in a major environmental response project where the administrative process was conducted by either a state or federal agency, the activity and use limitations would generally be identified in the record of decision and then implemented in the environmental covenant pursuant to this Act. In contrast, in a voluntary clean-up supervised by privately licensed professionals, as authorized in some states, the activity and use limitations would not be developed by the agency during an administrative proceeding but by the parties themselves and their contracted professionals.

Nothing in this Act prevents the use of privately negotiated use restrictions which are recorded in the land records, without agency involvement: the validity of such covenants,

however, is not governed by this Act but by other law of the enacting state. *See* Section 5(d).

2. The governmental body with responsibility for the environmental response project in question is the agency under this Act. Generally, this agency will supply the public supervision necessary to protect human health and the environment in creating and modifying the environmental covenant.

In addition, as noted in Comment 1, the definition of “environmental response project” contemplates the possibility that the project may be undertaken pursuant to a voluntary clean-up program, where the actual determination of the sufficiency of the proposed clean-up is made by a private professional party, rather than an agency. In this case, the definition contemplates that an agency - typically, the state environmental agency - will nevertheless be asked to consent to the environmental covenant by signing it. Section 4 of the Act makes clear that the covenant is not valid under this Act unless an agency signs it. Section 3 of the Act makes clear that the mere signature of the agency, without more, means only that the agency has “approved” the covenant in order to satisfy the definitional requirements of definition (2) and the mandated contents of Section 4. That signature imposes no duties or obligations on the agency.

3. The agency, for purposes of this Act, may be either a federal government entity or the appropriate state regulatory agency for environmental protection.

Further, in some cases, the appropriate federal agency may be the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Defense as ‘lead agency’ under federal law, or another body.

4. Section 4 of the Act makes clear that an environmental covenant is valid if only one agency signs it. However, in many circumstances, both a federal and a state agency may have jurisdiction over the environmental contamination that led to the environmental response project. In this situation, the best practice may be for both federal and state agencies with jurisdiction over the contaminated property to sign the environmental covenant.

5. Definition (4) states that an environmental covenant is a “servitude”; the term generally refers to either a burden or restriction on the use of real property, or to a benefit that flows from the ownership of land, that in either case “runs with the land” - that is, the benefit or the burden passes to successive owners of the real property.

The law of servitudes is a long established body of real property law. The term is defined in §1.1 of the Restatement (3d) of Servitudes as follows: “(1) A servitude is a legal device that creates a right or an obligation that runs with land or an interest in land.” The Restatement goes on to provide that the forms of servitudes which are subject to that Restatement are “easements, profits, and covenants.”

This Act emphasizes that an environmental covenant is a servitude in order to implicate this full body of real property law and to sustain the validity and enforceability of the covenant. By first characterizing the environmental covenant as a servitude, the Act expressly avoids the argument that an environmental covenant is simply a personal common law contract between the

agency and the owner of the real property at the time the covenant is signed, and thus is not binding on later owners or tenants of that land.

6. The definition of “environmental covenant” also provides that the servitude is created to implement an environmental response project. An environmental response project may determine, in some circumstances, to leave some residual contamination on the real property. This may be done because complete cleanup is technologically impossible, or because it is either ecologically or economically undesirable. In this situation, the environmental response project may impose activity and use limitations to control residual risk that results from contamination remaining in real property. An environmental covenant is then recorded on the land records as required by Section 8 to ensure that the activity and use limitations are both legally and practically enforceable.

7. An “environmental response project” covered by definition (5) may be undertaken pursuant to authorization by one of several different statutes. Definition (5)(a) specifically covers remediation projects required under state law. However, the definition is written broadly to also encompass both current federal law, future amendments to both state and federal law, as well as new environmental protection regimes should they be developed. Without limiting this breadth and generality, the Act intends to reach environmental response projects undertaken pursuant to any of the following specific federal statutes:

- (1) Subchapter III or IX of the federal "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976", 42 U.S.C. sec. 6921 to 6939e and 6991 to 6991i, as amended;
- (2) Section 7002 or 7003 of the federal "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976", 42 U.S.C. sec. 6972 and 6973, as amended;
- (3) "Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980", 42 U.S.C. sec. 9601 to 9647, as amended;
- (4) "Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978", 42 U.S.C. sec. 7901 et seq., as amended;
- (5) "Toxic Substances Control Act", 15 U.S.C. 2601 to 2692, as amended;
- (6) "Safe Drinking Water Act", 42 U.S.C. 300f to 300j-26, as amended;
- (7) "Atomic Energy Act", 42 U.S.C. 2011 et. sec., as amended.

8. Definition (5)(C) extends the Act’s coverage to voluntary remediation projects that are undertaken under state law. Environmental covenants that are part of voluntary remediation projects may serve both the goal of environmental protection and the goal of facilitating reuse of the real property. However, approval of these projects by a governmental body or other authorized party ensures that the project serves these goals. Even though preparation of the clean-up plan and supervision of the work may be undertaken by private parties, this Act requires that covenants undertaken as part of a formal voluntary clean-up program must be approved by the agency as evidenced by the agency’s signature on the covenant, in order to be effective under this Act.

9. Some states authorize properly certified private parties to supervise remediation to pre-existing standards and certify the cleanup. For example, in Connecticut and Massachusetts, these are “licensed site professionals”. *See, e.g.,* M.G.L. ch. 21A §19; 310 CMR 40.1071;

C.G.S. §§22a-133o, 22a-133y. Supervision and certification by statutorily-authorized parties is intended to accomplish the same public function as supervision and certification by the governmental entity. Thus, these environmental response projects are also covered by this definition.

10. Under definition (5)(C), environmental response projects may include specific agreements between an owner and the agency for remediation that go beyond prevailing requirements. Alternatively, an owner may choose to contract with a potential purchaser for additional use restrictions in an instrument that does not purport to come within this Act; *see* Section 5(d). Because the owner may have residual liability for the site, even after remediation and transfer to a third party for redevelopment, the owner may require further restrictions as a condition of creating the environmental covenant and eventual reuse of the real property.

11. The definition of “holder” is in definition (6). As the practice of using environmental covenants continues to grow, new entities may emerge to serve as holders. This Act does not intend to limit this process. A holder may be any person under the broad definition of this Act, including an affected local government, the agency, or an owner. The identity of an individual holder must be approved by the agency and an owner as part of the process of creating an environmental covenant, as specified in Section 4. A holder is authorized to enforce the covenant under Section 11. A holder has the rights specified in Section 4 of this Act and may be given additional rights or obligations in the environmental covenant. Under Section 8(a), a recording officer should index an environmental covenant in the grantee index under the name of the person identified as the holder in the covenant.

Section 3(a) makes clear that a holder’s interest is an interest in real property. Some environmental enforcement agencies are not authorized by their enabling legislation to own an interest in real property after the environmental remediation is completed. As a consequence, those agencies may not be entitled to serve as holders under the Act. In those cases where an agency wishes to be certain that a viable holder exists, a private entity may serve this purpose, acting, for example by contract, in accordance with the agency’s direction.

More generally, the nature of a holder’s interest in the real property may influence whether its rights and duties with respect to the real property are likely to lead to potential liability for future environmental remediation, should such remediation become necessary. Under CERCLA, an “owner” is liable for remediation costs; *see* 42 U.S.C.A. 9607(a)(1). Unfortunately, the definition of “owner” in the statute is circular and unhelpful in evaluating whether a holder is potentially liable under it. 42 U.S.C.A. 9601(20).

In general, a holder’s right to enforce the covenant under Section 11 should be considered comparable to the rights covered in an easement and, thus, should not lead to a determination that the holder is liable as an “owner” under CERCLA. The two cases that have considered this question have found that the parties which held the easements were not CERCLA “owners”. Long Beach Unified School District v. Dorothy B. Godwin California Living Trust, 32 F.3d 1364 (9th Cir. 1994); Grand Trunk RR. V. Acme Belt Recoating, 859 F. Supp. 1125 (W.D. MI 1994). In each case, the court reasoned that the circular definition of owner meant that the

term's most common meaning would prevail. The common law's distinction between an easement holder and the property owner was then applied to find the easement holder not to be an "owner" for purposes of this statute. In each of these cases, the party that held the easement had not contributed to contamination on the property. The amendments to CERCLA Section 9601(35), Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-118, 115 Stat. 2360 (2002) (HR 2869, 107th Cong. 1st Session), added the term "easement" to the definition of parties which are in a "contractual relationship" under CERCLA. However, this does not affect whether the easement holder will be held to be a CERCLA "owner".

Where the holder or another person has more extensive rights than enforcement, a careful analysis will be required. The CERCLA liability cases typically emphasize that a party that exercises the degree of control over a site equivalent to the control typically exercised by an owner of the site will be held liable as an "owner". Under this approach, for example, lessees have been held liable as owners when their control over the site approximated that which an owner would have. *See, e.g., Delaney v. Town of Carmel*, 55 F. Supp. 2d 237 (S.D.N.Y. 1999); *U.S. v. A & N Cleaners and Launderers*, 788 F. Supp. 1317 (S.D.N.Y. 1990); *U.S. v. S.C. Dept. of Health and Env. Control*, 653 F. Supp. 984 (D.C.S.C. 1984.) Accordingly, a holder contemplating extensive control over the site should consider potential "owner" liability carefully.

CERCLA liability also extends to an "operator" of the site (42 U.S.C.A. 9607(a)(1)), and the case law interpreting this definition emphasizes that a party is liable as an operator if it has a high degree of control over the operating decisions and day to day management at the site. Thus, for example, a party that held an easement could be liable as an operator if its degree of control met this standard. A holder will, in general, have only control authority over the site related to effective enforcement of the environmental covenant and does not typically need more extensive day to day control. However, this will not likely be true in all cases.

SECTION 3. NATURE OF RIGHTS; SUBORDINATION OF INTERESTS.

(a) Any person, including a person that owns an interest in the real property, the agency, or a municipality or other unit of local government, may be a holder. An environmental covenant may identify more than one holder. The interest of a holder is an interest in real property.

(b) A right of an agency under this [act] or under an environmental covenant, other than a right as a holder, is not an interest in real property.

(c) An agency is bound by any obligation it assumes in an environmental covenant, but an agency does not assume obligations merely by signing an environmental covenant. Any other person that signs an environmental covenant is bound by the obligations the person assumes in

the covenant, but signing the covenant does not change obligations, rights, or protections granted or imposed under law other than this [act] except as provided in the covenant.

(d) The following rules apply to interests in real property in existence at the time an environmental covenant is created or amended:

(1) An interest that has priority under other law is not affected by an environmental covenant unless the person that owns the interest subordinates that interest to the covenant.

(2) This [act] does not require a person that owns a prior interest to subordinate that interest to an environmental covenant or to agree to be bound by the covenant.

(3) A subordination agreement may be contained in an environmental covenant covering real property or in a separate record. If the environmental covenant covers commonly owned property in a common interest community, the record may be signed by any person authorized by the governing board of the owners' association.

(4) An agreement by a person to subordinate a prior interest to an environmental covenant affects the priority of that person's interest but does not by itself impose any affirmative obligation on the person with respect to the environmental covenant.

Comment

Subsection (a) confirms that the holder holds an interest in real property, thus distinguishing that right from a personal or contractual right that does not run with the land. The definition of 'holder' in Section 2, departing from traditional real property concepts, makes clear that the holder may be the agency or the owner, thus making it possible for the owner to be both grantor and grantee.

Subsection (a) also makes clear that if the agency chooses to be the holder, the agency will thereby hold an interest in the real property. Otherwise, subsection (b) provides that the agency's interest in the covenant as a consequence of signing the covenant or having a right to enforce it under this Act is not an interest in real property.

Subsection (c) validates and confirms any contractual obligations that an agency may

assume in an environmental covenant. So, for example, if the agency were to agree to authorize certain activities on the property, to undertake periodic inspections of the site or to provide notice of particular actions to specified persons, those undertakings and obligations would be enforceable against the agency in accordance with their terms by parties adversely affected by any breach.

At the same time, subsection (c) also makes clear that the mere act of signing the covenant in order to signify the agency's 'approval' of the covenant, which is required by the Act as a condition of its effectiveness under this Act, is not an assumption of obligations and the agency has not thereby exposed itself to any liability. The agency manifests its approval of an environmental covenant by signing it. Likewise, subsection (c) makes this same principle clear for any other person that signs an environmental covenant; the rights and obligations of that person are established by other law and by the terms of the covenant and not merely by the fact that the person signed the covenant.

Subsection (d) restates and clarifies traditional real property rules regarding the effect of an environmental covenant on prior recorded interests. The basic rule remains that pre-existing prior valid and effective interests – "First in time, first in right" – remain valid. As § 7.1 of the Restatement (3d) of Property: Mortgages states:

"A valid foreclosure of a mortgage terminates all interests in the foreclosed real estate that are junior [that is, later in time] to the mortgage being foreclosed....Foreclosure does not terminate interests ...that are senior...."

At the same time, it is not uncommon for interested parties to re-order the priorities among them by agreement in order to accommodate the economic interests of various parties. The usual device used to re-order priorities is a so-called 'subordination' agreement. Again, this section tracks the outcome suggested in The Restatement (3d) of Property: Mortgages. Section 7.7 of the Restatement provides in pertinent part that:

A mortgage, by a declaration of its mortgagee, [that is, the lender] may be made subordinate in priority to another interest in the mortgaged real estate, whether existing or to be created in the future....A subordination that would materially prejudice the mortgagor [that is, the owner of the real estate] or the person whose interest is advanced in priority is ineffective without the consent of the person prejudiced.

The impact of the newly recorded environmental covenant on the priorities of other lien holders is sufficiently important that the Act emphasizes this issue both in this section and in Sections 8(b) and 9(c). In all these instances, the Act provides that the usual rules of priorities are

preserved, except in the case of foreclosure of tax liens.

Thus, in preparing an environmental covenant, it might be advisable for the agency to identify all prior interests, determine which interests may interfere with the covenant protecting human health and the environment, and then take steps to avoid the possibility of such interference. The agency may do this by, for example, having the parties obtain appropriate subordination of prior interests, as a condition to the agency's approval of the environmental covenant.

The combined effect of Sections 3, 8 and 9 creates a curious "circular" lien problem, where (1) foreclosure of a 2003 municipal tax lien would terminate a 2000 pre-existing mortgage (the usual outcome), but (2) that same foreclosure would not affect the environmental covenant created in 2002 under this Act; while (3) foreclosure of the 2000 pre-existing mortgage would terminate the 2002 environmental covenant (again, the usual rule), but (4) not the 2003 municipal tax lien (also, the usual rule). Circular liens, however, are not unique to this situation.

SECTION 4. CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.

(a) An environmental covenant must:

(1) state that the instrument is an environmental covenant executed pursuant to [insert statutory reference to this [act].]

(2) contain a legally sufficient description of the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) describe the activity and use limitations on the real property;

(4) identify every holder;

(5) be signed by the agency, every holder, and unless waived by the agency every owner of the fee simple of the real property subject to the covenant; and

(6) identify the name and location of any administrative record for the environmental response project reflected in the environmental covenant.

(b) In addition to the information required by subsection (a), an environmental covenant may contain other information, restrictions, and requirements agreed to by the persons who signed it, including any:

(1) requirements for notice following transfer of a specified interest in, or concerning proposed changes in use of, applications for building permits for, or proposals for any site work affecting the contamination on, the property subject to the covenant;

(2) requirements for periodic reporting describing compliance with the covenant;

(3) rights of access to the property granted in connection with implementation or enforcement of the covenant;

(4) a brief narrative description of the contamination and remedy, including the contaminants of concern, the pathways of exposure, limits on exposure, and the location and extent of the contamination;

(5) limitation on amendment or termination of the covenant in addition to those contained in Sections 9 and 10; and

(6) rights of the holder in addition to its right to enforce the covenant pursuant to Section 11.

(c) In addition to other conditions for its approval of an environmental covenant, the agency may require those persons specified by the agency who have interests in the real property to sign the covenant.

Comment

1. Subsection (a)(2) of this section requires that the covenant contain a “legally sufficient description” of the “real property” subject to the covenant. While these terms are familiar to real property practitioners, it may be useful to describe precisely what is required by this section.

First, a description of the real property that is “legally sufficient” will depend upon the practice of the enacting state. The purpose of such a requirement, for the real property practitioner, will be to assure that the particular parcel subject to the covenant will be properly indexed in the land records and thus readily located during the course of a title search. This, in turn, will enable a buyer, lender or other interest holder to be confident of what they own or hold as security.

The most commonly used legal descriptions of land are: (1) a metes and bounds

description - that is, a description that begins with reference to a known point on the surface of the earth, followed by references to distances and angles from that point to other monuments or terminals that mark the outer boundaries of the parcel; (2) reference to a recorded map or survey, that contains a “picture” of the metes and bounds description; (3) reference to a particular parcel number on a governmental grid system; and (4) a coordinates reference system, derived from a Global Positioning System or other mapping tool. These, and other generally obsolete forms of legal description [e.g., “starting at the black oak tree in the pasture, then running along a stone wall to Bloody Creek, then generally south and west along the creek to a dirt road, then back to the tree where you started, being the same 50 acres, more or less, conveyed to my father by Lisman”] may all serve the same purpose, and would meet the requirement of being “legally sufficient.”

In contrast, as described in Comment 11 below, more precise measurements may be very useful for identifying precisely the “geospatial” location of sub-surface contaminants.

Second, the “real property” that is subject to the covenant may be narrowly or broadly defined, depending on the wishes of the parties. It may be, for example, that only a 3 acre portion of a 5,000 acre ranch is contaminated; in such a case, it may be unnecessary to describe all 5000 acres of real property as being subject to the covenant.

Alternatively, in a remote location, it may be that the 3 acre contaminated parcel owned by one person may be reached only by crossing a private road located on a 5000 acre ranch owned by another person. In such a case, a careful property description will want to include reference to the easement or other access right across the land owned by another person.

It is important to recognize, however, that real property is a three-dimensional concept (or a four-dimensional concept when one considers time as a dimension). A legal description of a particular parcel of real property which has only perimeter boundaries and no upper and lower boundaries encompasses both the surface of the earth within those boundaries, the airspace above the surface, all the dirt and minerals below the surface and all spaces within that volume of space that may be filled with water. Thus, in appropriate cases, a title searcher will need to be sensitive to cases where interests in the “real property” or “real property” have been sold or leased which leave the owner with less than all of the real property. A ten-year lease of the entire parcel, for example, represents a time-defined “boundary” to the owner’s interest in the real property in question. An agency seeking to identify all the interests in the parcel in order to secure their approval of a covenant will therefore want to ensure that a title search identifies all these interests.

2. This Act does not provide the standards for environmental remediation nor the specific activity and use limitations to be used at a particular site. Those will be provided by the state or federal agency based on other state and federal law governing mandatory and voluntary cleanups. This Act contemplates that those standards will then be incorporated into the environmental response project, which, in turn, will call for activity and use restrictions that can be implemented through creation of an environmental covenant. This section addresses creation of the environmental covenants.

3. Ordinarily, an environmental covenant will be created only by agreement between the agency and the owner. If there is a holder other than the agency or the owner, both the agency and the owner must approve the holder, and the holder must agree to the terms of the covenant. The agency may refuse to agree to an environmental covenant if it does not effectively implement the activity and use limitations specified in the environmental response project.

Where no owner is available or willing to participate in the environmental response project, it may be necessary for the agency to condemn and take an interest sufficient to record an environmental covenant on the property where it has the power to do so. This Act does not contain independent condemnation authority for the agency. Alternatively, in some states, there may be a basis for an agency to require an owner to cooperate with the implementation of the covenant as a regulatory matter.

4. This Act recognizes that there may be situations in which there is more than one fee simple owner. For example, Husband and Wife may own Blackacre as tenants in common, joint tenants, or tenants of the entirety. In all of these configurations of ownership, both Husband and Wife are owners of Blackacre and both must sign an environmental covenant unless the agency waives this requirement.

Similarly, it is common practice in mining states, such as Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, for the fee ownership of the mineral interests to be conveyed separate and apart from the fee ownership of the remaining parcel. Thus, under the conventional real property practices of these states, there may be two separate fee ownership interests in the same “parcel” of real property, and each owner must sign the environmental covenant unless this requirement is waived. It may be that those two owners of different interests in the same parcel have an agreement between them prohibiting separate conveyances of interests in the land without permission of the other. However, if that agreement does not appear of record, it would not run with the land, would likely not be binding on the agency [in the absence of the agency’s actual knowledge] and thus not affect the validity of a covenant signed by one of the owners with respect to that owner’s interest in the real estate.

5. In addition to the parties specified in Section 4(a)(5), other persons may wish to sign the environmental covenant and, in any event, the agency may require their signature as a condition of approving the covenant. (See Section 4(c)). Under current law, persons other than the owner may be liable for cleanup of the contamination, including contingent future liability if further cleanup is needed or personal injury claims are brought. These could be parties which previously used the property or whose waste was disposed of on the property. Such a person may have liability for some or all of the cost of the environmental response project and may thus have a compelling interest in signing the covenant so as to be informed of future enforcement, modification and termination.

6. Section 4(a)(5) also authorizes the agency to waive the requirement that the covenant be signed by the owner of the fee simple. The Act contemplates that such waivers should be rare because in most situations the covenant can be effective only if the fee owner’s interest is subject to the covenant. However, in some circumstances the fee owner may have transferred most or all of the economic value of the property to the holder of another interest, either permanently or for

the time period during which the covenant's restrictions are needed. Consider, for example, the situation in which the contamination remaining presents environmental risks for only twenty years and the property is subject to a ninety-nine year lease. In this case, it is critical that the owner of the leasehold interest be a party to the covenant so its interest will be subject to it. However, in this situation, the fee owner's participation is not essential for the covenant to protect human health and the environment. If the fee owner is unavailable or unwilling to participate, the agency might choose to waive its signature. Of course, such a situation, when the likely duration of the covenant is both short and clearly known, is likely to be exceptional.

7. A holder is the grantee of the environmental covenant and the Act requires that there be a holder for a covenant to be valid and enforceable. Under Section 5(b)(9), the grantee may also be the grantor, who is the owner of the property and who might remain a holder upon sale of the property, or the agency. In addition to enforcement rights, the holder may be given specific rights or obligations with respect to future implementation of the environmental covenant. These could include, for example, the obligation to monitor groundwater or maintain a cap or containment structure on the property. Such rights and obligations will be specified in the environmental covenant and, like any obligations, would be enforceable against the holder if the holder failed to satisfy its obligations.

8. Section 4(a)(5) requires an agency to sign the covenant. In some states it may be necessary to amend the state agency's enabling statute to empower it to so sign.

9. Section 4(a)(6) requires the covenant to disclose the "name and location of any administrative record" for the underlying environmental response project. Typically, this information will require a docket or file number, identifying names of the parties, and an indication of the agency office in which the record of decision or other administrative record has been retained. In those cases where a state-wide registry is maintained, the registry also requires this information. In the case of voluntary clean-ups, of course, there may not be an administrative record.

Section (4) (b) is a permissive provision intended by the breadth of its provisions ("...may contain other information ...agreed to by the persons who signed it...") to encourage the agency and the other parties to include provisions in the particular covenant that are tailored to the specific needs of that project. This may well be accomplished in order to maximize the likelihood that the covenant, when properly implemented and monitored, will protect human health and the environment.

Persons dealing with this Act must recognize that no statute and no commentary can fully contemplate all the possibilities that are likely to arise in implementation of this Act. This issue permeates this subsection. In (b)(1), for example, the text contemplates the possibility that the agency may, in a particular case, require an owner or other persons to notify the agency before, among other things, that party applies for "...building permits." The suggested language is not intended to exclude notice of any other type of work permit that might trigger a violation of an environmental covenant, such as, for example, drilling or excavation permits.

10. Section 4(b)(4) suggests that, in an appropriate case, the agency may wish to provide

a summary of the contamination on the site and the remedial solutions that have been identified. From a public health perspective, this may be very useful. The reference to “pathways of exposure” requires a statement that, for example, the contaminant might be of danger if it comes in contact with skin, if breathed, or only if ingested.

11. Section 4(b)(4) also suggests that, in an appropriate case, the agency may require the covenant to contain not only a legally sufficient description of the real property subject to the covenant (as mandated under section 4(a)(2)) but also the ‘location of the contamination.’”

One way of identifying such location is by the concept of “geospatial” location as defined by the Federal Geographic Data Committee of the U.S. Geological Survey. Such an identification would define the location with geospatial data, which the Committee defines as follows:

Geospatial Data: Information that identifies the geographic location and characteristics of natural or constructed features and boundaries on the Earth. This information may be derived from, among other things, remote sensing, mapping, and surveying technologies. Statistical data may be included in this definition....

Depending on the nature of the contamination and the size of the parcel subject to the covenant, a description of the “geospatial location” of the contamination and the legal boundary description of the real property parcel on which those contaminants are located may be very different, and the kinds of information required to usefully describe the “location” of the contamination may also differ. As a simple example, it may be appropriate to use grid coordinates and projected elevations below ground level to define the upper and lower levels of a groundwater contamination plume, together with sensing or other data that projects the mobility of that plume over time, in order to accurately provide useful information that a simple metes and bounds description could not convey.

12. Subsection (b)(5) contemplates that the environmental covenant may impose additional restrictions on amendment or termination beyond those required by this Act. For example, in some circumstances the owner or another party who may have contingent residual liability for further cleanup of the real property subject to the environmental covenant, may seek further restrictions in the covenant to protect against this contingent liability.

13. Subsection (c) confirms that the agency is under no obligation to approve a particular environmental covenant by signing it. This may be particularly significant in those cases where the agency was unable to secure subordination of prior interests in the real property which is proposed to be subject to the covenant. If a prior security or other interest is not subordinated to the environmental covenant, and then is foreclosed at some later time, under traditional real property law that foreclosure would extinguish or limit an environmental covenant. Since such an outcome is antithetical to the policies

underlying this Act, the Act contemplates that the agency may, before agreeing to the covenant, require subordination of these interests. At the time of creation of the environmental covenant, the agency must determine whether the prior interest presents a realistic threat to the covenant's ability to protect the environment and human health. Section 3 of the Act makes clear that by subordinating its interest, an owner of a prior interest does not change its liability with respect to the property subject to the environmental covenant. Any such liability of a subordinating party would arise by operation of other law and not under this Act.

Subsection (c) contemplates that there are many circumstances that might cause an agency, in the exercise of its regulatory discretion as defined in other law, either to refuse to sign a covenant in the form presented, or to agree to sign it only upon satisfaction of specified conditions. The listing of the following examples is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

Example 1: As a condition of signing the covenant, the agency requires the owner to provide an abstract of title of the property to be subjected to the covenant. If the owner declines to do so, the agency may reasonably be expected to decline to approve the covenant, since it will have insufficient evidence of the priority of its new covenant.

Example 2: The owner provides the title abstract, which discloses that the property to be subjected to the covenant is presently subject to a first mortgage for \$5 million. The agency's decision to condition its approval on the first lender's willingness to subordinate to the covenant would plainly be appropriate.

Example 3: The agency's policies require that an independent company regularly engaged in the business of monitoring and enforcing environmental covenants on behalf of the agency be named as 'holder' in the covenant. The owner's refusal to agree to such a provision would justify an agency's refusal to approve the covenant.

SECTION 5. VALIDITY; EFFECT ON OTHER INSTRUMENTS.

(a) An environmental covenant that complies with this [act] runs with the land.

(b) An environmental covenant that is otherwise effective is valid and enforceable even if:

(1) it is not appurtenant to an interest in real property;

(2) it can be or has been assigned to a person other than the original holder;

(3) it is not of a character that has been recognized traditionally at

common law;

(4) it imposes a negative burden;

(5) it imposes an affirmative obligation on a person having an interest in the real property or on the holder;

(6) the benefit or burden does not touch or concern real property;

(7) there is no privity of estate or contract;

(8) the holder dies, ceases to exist, resigns, or is replaced; or

(9) the owner of an interest subject to the environmental covenant and the holder are the same person.

(c) An instrument that creates restrictions or obligations with respect to real property that would qualify as activity and use limitations except for the fact that the instrument was recorded before the effective date of this [act] is not invalid or unenforceable because of any of the limitations on enforcement of interests described in subsection (b) or because it was identified as an easement, servitude, deed restriction, or other interest. This [act] does not apply in any other respect to such an instrument.

(d) This [act] does not invalidate or render unenforceable any interest, whether designated as an environmental covenant or other interest, that is otherwise enforceable under the law of this state.

Comment

1. Subsection (a), when considered with the common law, makes clear that environmental covenants will be binding not only on the persons who originally negotiate them but also on subsequent owners of the property and others who hold an interest in the property, such as tenants, so long as those owners and others have actual or constructive knowledge of the covenant.

To be binding on future owners who may not have actual knowledge of the covenant, the Act requires that the covenant comply with all provisions of the Act.

Section 8(a) of this Act requires the covenant to be recorded. The Act then states the usual real property rule that a recorded instrument “runs with the land” and binds all who have an interest in it.

2. Recording requirements are an important means by which the law protects ‘bona fide purchasers’ - BFP’s - who acquire property without knowledge of its conditions. Even in the absence of recording a document on the land records, the common law has long held that those who have actual knowledge of the document take title subject to the document. The BFP, on the other hand, is bound at common law only by an instrument affecting the real property to the extent the BFP has constructive knowledge of the document.

Importantly, a BFP is charged with constructive knowledge of the land records. In some respects, one of the fundamental tensions between traditional real property law and environmental law is the change in this rule, by which environmental law seeks to impose liability on “innocent” purchasers of contaminated property who take without knowledge of the property’s condition and may have no practical means of learning of its condition. To the extent this Act tracks traditional real property practice by requiring recorded covenants, this tension may be considerably lessened.

3. Subsection (b) and its comments are modeled on Section 4 of the Uniform Conservation Easement Act. One of the Environmental Covenant Act’s basic goals is to remove common law defenses that could impede the use of environmental covenants. This section addresses that goal by comprehensively identifying these defenses and negating their applicability to environmental covenants.

This Act’s policy supports the enforceability of environmental covenants by precluding applicability of doctrines, including older common law doctrines, that would limit enforcement. That policy is broadly consistent with the Restatement of the Law Third of Property (Servitudes), including §2.6 and chapter 3. For specific doctrines see §§ 2.4 (horizontal privity), 2.5 (benefited or burdened estates), 2.6 (benefits in gross and third party benefits), 3.2 (touch and concern doctrine), 3.3 (rule against perpetuities), and 3.5 (indirect restraints on alienation).

Subsection (b)(1) provides that an environmental covenant, the benefit of which is held in gross, may be enforced against the grantor or his successors or assigns. By stating that the covenant need not be appurtenant to an interest in real property, it eliminates the requirement in force in some states that the holder of an easement must own an interest in real property (the “dominant estate”) benefited by the easement.

Subsection (b)(2) also clarifies existing law by providing that a covenant may be enforced by an assignee of the holder. Section 10(c) of this Act specifies that assignment to a new holder will be treated as a modification and Section 10 governs modification of environmental covenants.

Subsection (b)(3) addresses the problem posed by the existing law’s recognition

of servitudes that served only a limited number of purposes and that law's reluctance to approve so-called "novel incidents". This restrictive view might defeat enforcement of covenants serving the environmental protection ends enumerated in this Act. Accordingly, subsection (b)(3) establishes that environmental covenants are not unenforceable solely because they do not serve purposes or fall within the categories of easements traditionally recognized at common law or other applicable law.

Subsection (b)(4) deals with a variant of the foregoing problem. Some applicable law recognizes only a limited number of "negative easements" – those preventing the owner of the burdened real property from performing acts on his real property that he would be privileged to perform absent the easement. Because a far wider range of negative burdens might be imposed by environmental covenants, subsection (b)(4) modifies existing law by eliminating the defense that an environmental covenant imposes a "novel" negative burden.

Subsection (b)(5) addresses the opposite problem – the potential unenforceability under existing law of an easement that imposes affirmative obligations upon either the owner of the burdened real property or upon the holder. Under some existing law, neither of those interests was viewed as a true easement at all. The first, in fact, was labeled a "spurious" easement because it obligated an owner of the burdened real property to perform affirmative acts. (The spurious easement was distinguished from an affirmative easement, illustrated by a right of way, which empowered the easement's holder to perform acts on the burdened real property that the holder would not have been privileged to perform absent the easement.)

Achievement of environmental protection goals may require that affirmative obligations be imposed on the burdened real property owner or on the covenant holder or both. For example, the grantor of an environmental covenant may agree to use restrictions and may also agree to undertake affirmative monitoring or maintenance obligations. In addition, the covenant might impose specific engineering or monitoring obligations on the holder, which may be for a profit corporation, a charitable corporation or trust holder. In all these cases, the environmental covenant would impose affirmative obligations and Subsection (b)(5) makes clear that the covenant would not be unenforceable solely because it is affirmative in nature.

Subsections (b)(6) and (b)(7) preclude the touch and concern and privity of estate or contract defenses, respectively. They have traditionally been asserted as defenses against the enforcement of covenants and equitable servitudes.

Subsection (b) (8) addresses the possibility that the holder may have died or for other reason fails to exist. Failure of the holder ought not invalidate the covenant and Sections 10(c) and (d) authorize replacement of a holder in various circumstances.

Subsection (b) (9) addresses the case where an owner of a contaminated parcel may agree to remedy an existing condition and may further agree to serve as holder in order to perform the necessary tasks. Under this Act, the owner may be willing to do so

because Section 4 of the Act requires that a holder be named and the owner may not be inclined to create an interest in a stranger. Under these circumstances, the owner's name would appear as both the grantor and the grantee in the land records, and this outcome ought not invalidate the covenant.

Subsection (b) identifies the principal common law doctrines that have been applied to defeat covenants such as those created by this Act. Drafters in individual states may wish to consider whether references to other common law or statutory impediments of a similar nature ought to be added to this subsection.

Subsection (c) addresses the treatment of instruments recorded before the date of this Act that seek to accomplish the purposes of environmental covenants under this Act. It seeks to validate such instruments, in a limited way, by specifying that the defenses covered in subsection (b), or the fact that the instrument was identified as something other than an environmental covenant, will not make prior covenants unenforceable. Beyond negating these specific defenses, however, this Act does not apply to those prior covenants. If the parties to a prior covenant wish to have the other benefits of this Act for that covenant, they must re-execute the covenant in a manner which satisfies the requirements of this Act.

Section (d) is a general savings clause for other interests in real property and other agreements concerning environmental remediation which are not covered under this Act. It disavows the intent to invalidate any interest created either before or after the Act which does not comply with the Act but which otherwise may be valid under the state's law. Nor does the Act intend, in any way, to validate or invalidate an action taken by a person to remediate contamination that is taken without formal governmental oversight or approval. A recorded instrument that does not satisfy the requirements of this Act does not come within the scope of this Act; it does not enjoy the protections of this Act and must be evaluated under other law of the state.

For example, the Act is clear that its requirements apply only to land use restrictions placed on real property pursuant to an "environmental response project" as that term is defined in the Act. If private parties choose to use conventional deed restrictions or other devices to place further activity and use restrictions on a parcel, nothing in this Act would affect that contractual arrangement either to insulate it from attack as invalid under that state's other law or to invalidate it under this law.

SECTION 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAND-USE LAW. This [act] does not authorize a use of real property that is otherwise prohibited by zoning, by law other than this [act] regulating use of real property, or by a recorded instrument that has priority over the environmental covenant. An environmental covenant may prohibit or

restrict uses of real property which are authorized by zoning or by law other than this [act].

Comment

This section clarifies that this Act does not displace other restrictions on land use laws, including zoning laws, building codes, sanitary sewer or subdivision requirements and the like. Restrictions under those laws apply unchanged to real property covered by an environmental covenant.

Where other law, including either a state or federal environmental response project, requires structures or activities in order to perform the environmental remediation, the status of those requirements is likely to be determined by that other law and not by this Act. Thus, for example, where the environmental covenant is implementing an environmental response project under federal CERCLA law, a federal appellate court has held that the federal law authorizing the environmental response project preempts a conflicting city ordinance. U.S. v. City and County of Denver, 100 F.3d 1509 (10th Cir. 1996).

Clearly, the large and complex body of zoning and land use law and the law of environmental regulation supplement the provisions of this Act. In appropriate cases, a court will be called upon to articulate the interrelationship of this Act and those laws, and the Act does not attempted to articulate all those outcomes. On the other hand, certain obvious examples may be helpful in understanding this interplay.

First, the Act contemplates that an environmental covenant might, for example, prohibit residential use on a parcel subject to a covenant. Under conventional real property principles, without references to this Act, such a prohibition or restriction in an environmental covenant will be valid even if other real property law, including local zoning, would authorize the use for residential purposes.

Alternatively, a covenant might, at the time it is recorded, permit both retail use and industrial use on a vacant parcel of contaminated real property while prohibiting residential use. Assuming all retail and industrial uses were permitted by local zoning at the time the covenant is recorded, the municipality might, before construction begins, change that zoning to bar industrial use. If such a zone change is otherwise valid under state law, nothing in this Act would affect the municipality's ability to "down zone" the parcel.

If, on the other hand, an industrial use was existing and ongoing at the time the covenant was recorded, and an effort was then made to prohibit that use by ordinance, such state law doctrines as "vested rights" or non-conforming uses, rather than this Act, would govern the validity of the zoning action.

SECTION 7. NOTICE.

(a) A copy of an environmental covenant shall be provided by the persons and in the manner required by the agency to:

(1) each person that signed the covenant;

(2) each person holding a recorded interest in the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) each person in possession of the real property subject to the covenant;

(4) each municipality or other unit of local government in which real property subject to the covenant is located; and

(5) any other person the agency requires.

(b) The validity of a covenant is not affected by failure to provide a copy of the covenant as required under this section.

Comment

This section contemplates that the agency will normally require that the final signed environmental covenant be sent to affected parties. In addition to the obvious persons who should be notified, in an appropriate case, the agency might require notice to abutting property owners. These persons are likely to have been directly involved in any major administrative proceeding, but in other cases, such as a voluntary clean-up, they may have no knowledge of the existing conditions on abutting land.

In any event, the extent and manner of giving notice rests in the discretion of the agency, and the statute imposes an affirmative duty on the persons required to provide that notice to comply.

Subsection (b) provides that failure to provide a copy of the covenant does not invalidate the covenant. Such a failure will not prevent the covenant from protecting human health and the environment and thus need not invalidate the covenant. The remedy for such a failure would be provided by other law.

SECTION 8. RECORDING.

(a) An environmental covenant and any amendment or termination of the

covenant must be recorded in every [county] in which any portion of the real property subject to the covenant is located. For purposes of indexing, a holder shall be treated as a grantee.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in Section 9(c), an environmental covenant is subject to the laws of this state governing recording and priority of interests in real property.

Comment

Subsection (a) confirms that customary indexing rules apply to the covenant. Since the owner is granting the enforcement right to a holder, all the owners' names would appear in the grantor index and the holder's name would appear in the grantee index.

In those states where a tract or another recording system other than a grantor/grantee index is used, this section should be revised as appropriate.

The Act assumes that all parties will wish to record the environmental covenant and accordingly makes the state's recording rules apply. As between the parties, however, the effectiveness of the covenant does not depend on whether the covenant is recorded. A signed but unrecorded covenant, under traditional real property law, binds the parties who sign it and, generally, those who have knowledge of the covenant.

The Act makes clear that, as with all recorded instruments, an environmental covenant takes priority under the normal rules of "First in time, First in Right." *See* The Restatement of The Law Third Property–Mortgages § § 7.1 and 7.3. In that sense, the covenant does not enjoy the same priority afforded real property tax liens, because of the substantial constitutional impediment such a change in priority would likely create.

However, the Act departs in important ways from the consequences of the normal priority and other traditional rules. For example, under Section 9, foreclosure of a tax lien cannot extinguish an environmental covenant. *See* Section 9(c).

Finally, in those cases where the holder's interest is transferred to a successor holder, the assignment of that interest will be recorded, and the usual grantor/grantee indexing rules would apply. Note, however, that under Section 10(d), the assignment would be treated as an amendment of the covenant.

Recording of an environmental covenant pursuant to the law of this state provides the same constructive notice of the covenant as the recording or any other instrument

provides of an interest in real property.

SECTION 9. DURATION; AMENDMENT BY COURT ACTION.

(a) An environmental covenant is perpetual unless it is:

(1) by its terms limited to a specific duration or terminated by the occurrence of a specific event;

(2) terminated by consent pursuant to Section 10;

(3) terminated pursuant to subsection (b);

(4) terminated by foreclosure of an interest that has priority over the environmental covenant; or

(5) terminated or modified in an eminent domain proceeding, but only if:

(A) the agency that signed the covenant is a party to the proceeding;

(B) all persons identified in Section 10(a) and (b) are given notice of the pendency of the proceeding; and

(C) the court determines, after hearing, that the termination or modification will not adversely affect human health or the environment.

(b) If the agency that signed an environmental covenant has determined that the intended benefits of the covenant can no longer be realized, a court, under the doctrine of changed circumstances, in an action in which all persons identified in Section 10(a) and (b) have been given notice, may terminate the covenant or reduce its burden on the real property subject to the covenant. The agency's determination or its failure to make a determination upon request is subject to review pursuant to [insert reference to appropriate administrative procedure act].

(c) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a) and (b), an environmental covenant may not be extinguished, limited, or impaired through issuance of a tax deed, foreclosure of a tax lien, or application of the doctrine of adverse possession, prescription, abandonment, waiver, lack of enforcement, or acquiescence, or a similar doctrine.

(d) An environmental covenant may not be extinguished, limited, or impaired by application of [insert reference to state Marketable Title and Dormant Mineral Interests statutes].

Comment

1. Subject to the other provisions in this Act, environmental covenants are intended to be perpetual, as provided in subsection (a). A covenant may be limited by its terms as provided in this Section, or amended or terminated under Section 10. Alternatively, in the limited circumstances described in this Section it may be modified in an eminent domain proceeding which meets the requirements of Subsection (a)(5). With concurrence of the agency, an environmental covenant may also be terminated in a judicial proceeding asserting “changed circumstances” as provided in Subsection (b).

2. Subsection (a)(5) provides special requirements to modify or terminate an environmental covenant by an exercise of eminent domain. The rationale for these special requirements is that an exercise of eminent domain may result in a change of use for real property. Such a change must ensure that it does not increase environmental risk related to the real property.

The Act does not attempt to resolve all the many complex issues likely to arise when one government agency seeks to condemn an environmental covenant imposed by another agency pursuant to an agreement with a current or former owner of the property. For example, eminent domain may result in a change of use of that property. If the changed use requires termination of the covenant’s existing activity and use limitations, and thus additional clean-up of the property, complex questions of liability and financial responsibility may arise. Alternatively, state law may already address questions of which governments have or do not have authority to condemn real property, or who are necessary or indispensable parties. State statutes are also likely to have so-called “quick take” provisions, a well developed Administrative Procedures Act, and other important provisions for aspects of condemnation proceedings beyond the scope of this Act.

Section 9(a)(5) has specific requirements for an exercise of eminent domain that modifies or terminates an environmental covenant. The applicability of this Act’s

eminent domain requirements to an eminent domain action under federal law will be determined by that law.

On the other hand, if the eminent domain proceeding were to go forward without the need to terminate or amend the environmental covenant, the existing covenant would remain in place and then the approval required by this subsection of the Act would not apply.

3. Subsection (b) imposes two specific requirements for a judicial change in an environmental covenant under the doctrine of changed circumstances. The first requires agency approval of such an application. The second requires that all parties to the covenant be given notice of the proceeding. This will allow those parties to protect their interests in the proceeding, including their interests arising from contingent future liability.

The Act intends that a court, in considering this section, would apply the doctrine of changed circumstances in its traditional sense – that is, as a proposed modification of the covenant to reduce or eliminate its burden. This section does not provide a substitute procedure for modifying a covenant to increase the burden on the real property. Such an outcome would be antithetical to the careful balancing of interests embedded in the Act. It would also be inconsistent with the expectations of owners and legally liable parties who have entered into the covenant with an expectation that the burden would not be increased except pursuant to the procedures set out in this Act.

4. Subsection (c) provides that environmental covenants are not extinguished by later tax foreclosure sales, or by a range of potential common law and statutory impairments. As a matter of public policy, these new forms of covenants seek to protect human health and the environment and, presumably, the contamination of the real property that led to the activity and use limitations would still be present if the covenant were extinguished. Accordingly, the impairment of those limitations as a consequence of application of tax lien foreclosure or other doctrines would likely result in greater exposure to health risk. Thus termination of that protection to serve other public policies of governments seems inconsistent.

In contrast, to avoid any suggestion of impairment of contract, the Act confirms that prior mortgages and other lien holders, upon foreclosure, may extinguish a subsequent covenant that was not subordinated. The lien holder in that case, of course, would still be faced with the physical condition of the property and the agency would have whatever regulations and rights against such an owner that state and federal law afforded.

5. While this section imposes statutory constraints on the authority of the court to act in the first instance, the Act does not restrict application of other procedural and administrative law to judicial supervision of agency conduct. Thus, if a court were to determine that an agency has acted in violation of its statutory obligations in considering whether to approve a modification or termination of an environmental covenant, that

conduct would be itself be subject to judicial scrutiny under other law of that state.

Where an environmental covenant applies to real property that is otherwise subject to one of the doctrines listed in Subsection (c), circumstances may arise in which the protections of the covenant are not needed. For example, rights gained by adverse possession would be limited by the environmental covenant's restrictions where a house had been inadvertently placed on real property subject to an environmental covenant that precluded residential use. In a case such as these, modification of the covenant can be sought pursuant to Section 10. Seeking such a modification will ensure that appropriate consideration will be given to residual environmental risks.

The basic policy of this Act to ensure that environmental covenants survive impairment is consistent with the broad policy articulated in the Restatement of the Law of Property (Servitudes) Third, §7.9.

States that do not have a Marketable Record Title Act or a Dominant Mineral Interests Act will not need subsection (d). States that do have either or both of these acts may choose to put this exception in the respective statute rather than in this Act.

The exception to the Marketable Record Title Act and the Dormant Mineral Interests Act in optional (d) is analogous to exceptions commonly made for conservation and preservation servitudes. Restatement of the Law of Property Third (Servitudes) § 7.16 (5) (1998). It is based on the public importance of ensuring continued enforcement of environmental covenants to protect human health and the environment. For states adopting the registry of environmental covenants to be kept by the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] under Section 12 of this Act, the cost of extending title searches to this registry should be low.

If there is any question whether a specific environmental covenant is exempt from the requirements of the Marketable Record Title Act or the Dominant Mineral Interests Act, the agency should comply with that Act by re-recording the covenant within the relevant act's specified statutory period. This will ensure that the covenant is not extinguished under either of these acts.

Finally, the fact that the Act specifies that notice of either an eminent domain proceeding or an action to apply the doctrine of changed circumstances be given to persons identified in Section 10 does not mean that other persons might not also be entitled to notice of the action or to intervene as parties in the action under other legal principles. Other state law may require such notice and this Act does not affect such other, additional notice requirements.

SECTION 10. AMENDMENT OR TERMINATION BY CONSENT.

(a) An environmental covenant may be amended or terminated by consent only if

the amendment or termination is signed by:

(1) the agency;

(2) unless waived by the agency, the current owner of the fee simple of the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) each person that originally signed the covenant, unless the person waived in a signed record the right to consent or a court finds that the person no longer exists or cannot be located or identified with the exercise of reasonable diligence; and

(4) except as otherwise provided in subsection (d)(2), the holder.

(b) If an interest in real property is subject to an environmental covenant, the interest is not affected by an amendment of the covenant unless the current owner of the interest consents to the amendment or has waived in a signed record the right to consent to amendments.

(c) Except for an assignment undertaken pursuant to a governmental reorganization, assignment of an environmental covenant to a new holder is an amendment.

(d) Except as otherwise provided in an environmental covenant:

(1) a holder may not assign its interest without consent of the other parties;

(2) a holder may be removed and replaced by agreement of the other parties specified in subsection (a); and

(3) a court of competent jurisdiction may fill a vacancy in the position of holder.

Comment

1. A variety of circumstances may lead the parties to wish to amend an environmental covenant to change its activity and use limitations or to terminate the

covenant.

Subsection (a) specifies the parties that must consent to the amendment. Subsection (a)(3) reaches a party that originally signed the covenant whether or not it was an owner of the real property. Such parties might typically be ones which were liable for some or all of the environmental remediation specified in the environmental response project, including contingent liability for future remediation. This provision is intended to apply to successors in interest to the party which originally signed the covenant where the successor continues to be subject to the contingent liability under the environmental response project.

Some of the original parties to the covenant may have signed the covenant because they have contingent liability for future remediation should it become necessary. The extension of that liability to successor businesses is a complex subject controlled by the underlying state or federal environmental law creating the liability. See Blumberg, Strasser and Fowler, The Law of Corporate Groups: Statutory Law, 2002 Annual Supplement, §18.02 and §18.02.4 (Aspen, 2002) and Blumberg and Strasser, The Law of Corporate Groups: Statutory Law—State §§ 15.03.2 and 15.03.3 (Aspen, 1995). Where the party that originally signed the covenant has been merged into or otherwise become part of another business entity for purposes of future cleanup liability, subsection (a)(3) is intended to require the consent of that successor entity rather than the consent of the original party.

2. In considering the potential liability of successor businesses, as discussed above, it is important to understand the dual chains of successors that a particular circumstance presents – (1) successors to ownership of the business that originally caused the contamination; and (2) successors to owners of the contaminated real property. Particularly when contamination occurred many years ago, those chains of successors may be very different.

Consider this hypothetical – although very typical – situation:

Real Property Ownership In 1925, Peter Plating, Inc. built a factory on a 3-acre lot in Hartford, CT and commenced its business, which was to apply chromium plating to coffee pots on that site. Customary business practice at the time was to discharge the exhausted chromium into “sumps” - holes dug in the ground, and filled with large stones. Peter Plating did this for 25 years.

In 1950, Peter Plating closed its Hartford plating operation, and sold the land and factory to Rabbit Warehouses, Inc. Rabbit used the factory for 25 years as a storage facility, and then sold the factory in 1975 to Ernie Entrepreneur, an individual, who bought the land with the proceeds of a first mortgage from First Local Bank.

Ernie used the factory for light manufacturing until 1985. He also leased part of the site to Acme Auto Repair, Inc. Acme dumped used oil and degreasers into its own sump on the lot. At some unknown date, Acme ceased operations.

In 1985, after Ernie learned of the contamination, he transferred ownership of the land to a corporation – Ernie, Inc. Ernie and his wife owned all the stock of the new corporation. In 1986, Ernie ceased operations, abandoned the factory, and moved with his family to an island off North Carolina. Ernie, Inc. was later administratively dissolved under state law for failure to file its annual reports.

First Local Bank started foreclosure in 1986, learned of the contamination, and withdrew the foreclosure action because of its reluctance to be in the chain of title. The Bank still holds the mortgage, but long ago wrote off the debt on its books.

Real property taxes have not been paid since 1984. City officials started to foreclose for unpaid taxes, but when they learned of the contamination, they, like First Local Bank, decided not to foreclose.

In 2002, the City demolished the factory as a safety measure, put a fence around it and put a \$200,000 demolition lien on the property. Today, the site is abandoned, and neighborhood children play games on the lot after crawling under the fence. Clean-up costs are estimated at \$1.6 million; a “clean” 1.5-acre lot in this run-down neighborhood recently sold for \$50,000.

The traditional “chain of title” doctrine in real property suggests that successive owners and operators of the real property, beginning with the original owner or tenant that caused contamination of the real property, may all have potential liability. In chronological order, they include: (1) Peter Plating, Inc.; (2) Rabbit Warehousing, Inc. (3) Ernie Entrepreneur, individually; (4) Acme Auto Repair, Inc.; and (5) Ernie, Inc.

Stock and Asset Ownership Aside from the successor real property ownership, we must also consider the successor ownership of the business that caused the contamination. Assume that 100% of Peter Plating’s stock was acquired by a publicly-held corporation, Jefferson, Inc., in 1950. The parent corporation moved the plating business to a southern state, which is why the Hartford business closed. In 1970, Jefferson sold off the plating assets, but no stock, to Hiccup, NA, a publicly traded British corporation. Both Jefferson and Hiccup are still in business.

This chain of stock and asset sales should result in at least one and perhaps two additional “successors” whose role in the transaction may require further analysis.

Assume this Act had been in effect in 1940, and Peter Plating, Inc. had signed the original environmental covenant. If the agency wishes in 2003 to amend the 1940 covenant, it will be important to determine who must sign on behalf of Peter Plating – the person who originally signed the covenant in 1940 – as required by subsection 10 (a) (3).

3. Note also that Ernie, Inc. – the current owner – has abandoned the property and moved out of state. Neither this corporation nor Ernie Entrepreneur, as an individual, is likely to cooperate in signing a new covenant today or an amendment to an

original covenant that was signed in 1940. This may pose practical difficulties in satisfying the requirements of Section 10)(a)(2).

4. In order to secure the consents required by this section, it is likely that the agency will require the party seeking the amendment to provide notice to the parties whose consent is required by the statute.

5. Note that this section does not require the consent of intermediate owners of the real property – in our example, if the original owner in 1940 was Peter Plating, and the current owner is Ernie, Inc., then Rabbit Warehouses, Inc., would not be required to approve an amendment to the covenant. Rabbit would have been bound by the covenant when it bought the parcel in 1975. Since there is no allegation that Rabbit took any action in violation of the covenant, and Rabbit conveyed the property to Ernie without retention of any interest in the property, Rabbit would not be affected by the covenant and therefore need not sign the amendment.

6. Finally, the covenant may be amended or terminated with respect only to a portion of the real property that was originally subject to the covenant. Thus, for example, if a covenant originally covered 100 acres of real property and as a result of remediation activity, 50 acres of the site eventually became completely free of contamination and pose no further environmental risk, the parties might agree to terminate the activity and use limitations on the cleaned up 50 acres while leaving the covenant in place on the remaining land.

7. As provided in Section 11(b), this Act does not limit the agency's regulatory authority under other law to regulate an environmental response project and the agency may be well advised to consider the implication of this provision in drafting a specific environmental covenant. Thus, for example, if new science suggested a need for additional monitoring or remediation at a contaminated site beyond that mandated in a recorded environmental covenant applicable to that site, the agency's authority to require that additional work would depend on other law, while its authority to impose the remediation cost on other parties may depend both on that law and on the terms of any prior agreements the agency may have executed with potentially liable parties.

Under this Act, however, the agency would be prevented from administratively releasing or amending real property covenants without approval of the parties designated in this section. Given the potential legal liability of the parties in the two chains of title who may be affected by an amendment to or termination of the covenant, this is an appropriate outcome.

However, over time, it may not be practical to identify the original parties or their corporate successors in order to secure their consent. Section 10(a)(3) provides a judicial mechanism by which the need for absent parties' consent may be avoided.

The same section highlights the possibility that the agency might seek the agreement of the original parties to future amendments of the covenant, without the need

for later consent. Such a waiver might be attractive to original parties, depending on the extent to which the agency was willing to hold original parties harmless from the liability that might otherwise accrue from a claimed injury following a use once prohibited by the original covenant, and depending also on the overall cost of the transaction.

Where there is a change in either the current knowledge of remaining contamination or the current understanding of the environmental risks it presents, the agency may conclude that the environmental response project should be changed or new regulatory action taken. The agency's ability to take such action is contemplated by §11(b) but, in the absence of consent, is not governed by this Act.

The agency may wish to consider whether the following parties have a sufficient interest in a particular proposal to make notice of the proposed amendment to them advisable:

- (1) All affected local governments;
- (2) The state regulatory agency for environmental protection if it is not the agency for this environmental response project;
- (3) All persons holding an interest of record in the real property;
- (4) All persons known to have an unrecorded interest in the real property;
- (5) All affected persons in possession of the real property;
- (6) All owners of the fee or any other interests in abutting real property and any other property likely to be affected by the proposed modification;
- (7) All persons specifically designated to have enforcement powers in the covenant; and
- (8) The public.

The agency may also wish to consider whether the notice should include any of the following:

- (1) New information showing that the risks posed by the residual contamination are less or greater than originally thought;
- (2) Information demonstrating that the amount of residual contamination has diminished; and
- (3) Information demonstrating that one or more activity limitations or use restrictions is no longer necessary.

SECTION 11. ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.

(a) A civil action for injunctive or other equitable relief for violation of an environmental covenant may be maintained by:

- (1) a party to the covenant;

(2) the agency or, if it is not the agency, the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection];

(3) any person to whom the covenant expressly grants power to enforce;

(4) a person whose interest in the real property or whose collateral or liability may be affected by the alleged violation of the covenant; or

(5) a municipality or other unit of local government in which the real property subject to the covenant is located.

(b) This [act] does not limit the regulatory authority of the agency or the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] under law other than this [act] with respect to an environmental response project.

(c) A person is not responsible for or subject to liability for environmental remediation solely because it has the right to enforce an environmental covenant.

Comment

1. Subsection (a) specifies which persons may bring an action to enforce an environmental covenant.

2. Importantly, the Act seeks to distinguish between the expanded rights granted to enforce the covenant in accordance with its terms, and actions for money damages, restitution, tort claims and the like.

This Act confers standing to enforce an environmental covenant on persons other than the agency and other parties to the covenant because of the important policies underlying compliance with the terms of the covenant. Thus, for example, in the case of a covenant approved by a federal agency on real property which has been conveyed out of federal ownership, the Act confers standing on a state agency to enforce the covenant, even though the agency may not have signed it. Further, a local affected government is empowered to seek injunctive relief to enforce a covenant to which it may not be a party. In both cases, absent this Act, those state and municipal agencies might not have standing to enforce a covenant, and might simply be relegated to seeking standing under other law.

Similarly, the mandated ‘holder’ has a statutory right to enforce the covenant under this section, since the holder must be a party to the covenant. Over time, the holder may come to play a significant role in the monitoring and enforcement process.

On the other hand, the Act does not provide any authority for a citizens' suit to enforce a covenant, although other law may authorize such suits. This Act does not affect that other law.

3. The Act does not authorize any claims for damages, restitution, court costs, attorneys' fees or other such awards. Standing to bring such claims, and the bases for any such cause of action, must be found, if at all, under other law. At the same time, while this action does not authorize any such cause of action, it does not bar them if available under other law.

4. Subsection (b) recognizes that in many situations the statutes authorizing an environmental response project will provide substantial authority for governmental enforcement of an environmental covenant in addition to rights specified in the environmental covenant. For example, EPA could bring a civil action to enforce an environmental covenant at a Superfund site under Section 106(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9606, or to enforce an environmental covenant at a RCRA facility under Section 7003 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6973.

[SECTION 12. REGISTRY; SUBSTITUTE NOTICE.

(a) The [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency] shall [establish and maintain a] [maintain its currently existing] registry that contains all environmental covenants and any amendment or termination of those covenants. The registry may also contain any other information concerning environmental covenants and the real property subject to them which the [state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency] considers appropriate. The registry is a public record for purposes of [insert reference to State Freedom of Information Act].

(b) After an environmental covenant or an amendment or termination of a covenant is filed in the registry [established][maintained] pursuant to subsection (a), a notice of the covenant, amendment, or termination that complies with this section may be recorded in the land records in lieu of recording the entire covenant. Any such notice

must contain:

(1) a legally sufficient description and any available street address of the real property subject to the covenant;

(2) the name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property, the agency, and the holder if other than the agency;

(3) a statement that the covenant, amendment, or termination is available in a registry at the [insert name and address of state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency], which discloses the method of any electronic access; and

(4) a statement that the notice is notification of an environmental covenant executed pursuant to [insert statutory reference to this [act]].

(c) A statement in substantially the following form, executed with the same formalities as a deed in this state, satisfies the requirements of subsection (b):

“1. This notice is filed in the land records of the [political subdivision] of [insert name of jurisdiction in which the real property is located] pursuant to, [insert statutory reference to Section 12 of the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act].

2. This notice and the covenant, amendment or termination to which it refers may impose significant obligations with respect to the property described below.

3. A legal description of the property is attached as Exhibit A to this notice. The address of the property that is subject to the environmental covenant is [insert address of property] [not available].

4. The name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property on the date of this notice is [insert name of current owner of the property and the

owner's current address as shown on the tax records of the jurisdiction in which the property is located].

5. The environmental covenant, amendment or termination was signed by [insert name and address of the agency].

6. The environmental covenant, amendment, or termination was filed in the registry on [insert date of filing].

7. The full text of the covenant, amendment, or termination and any other information required by the agency is on file and available for inspection and copying in the registry maintained for that purpose by the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] at [insert address and room of building in which the registry is maintained]. [The covenant, amendment or termination may be found electronically at [insert web address for covenant].”]

Comment

1. This section should be used only by states that require creation of a registry of environmental covenants pursuant to this optional Section. At the time this Act was promulgated, Section 101 of CERCLA had recently been amended to encourage states to create registries of sites where remediation work had been completed; *see* Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-118 § 128(b)(1)(C) (2002). The Act anticipates that in those states that choose to create such a registry for federal law purposes, this section would prove useful in integrating local land recording systems with a single, state-wide registry.

2. The notice specified in this Section may be recorded in the land records in lieu of recording the environmental covenant. However, such a notice should be authorized only if the registry is established and the environmental covenant is recorded there. Where there is no separate registry, the environmental covenant must be recorded in the land records and this notice would not be used.

3. A description of the property under subsection (b)(1) may include identification by latitude/longitude coordinates. Note also that a description of the location of the contamination itself on the site may require considerably more detail than the description of the real property subject to the covenant; *see* the discussion of this subject in the comments to Section 4.

4. The web address required to be contained in the notice by subsection (c)(7) should reflect the most direct means of identifying the full covenant and accompanying information. As appropriate, the address may require a specific internet address, page or name reference, document number or other unique identifying name, number or symbol.

A registry created under this optional section could be self-funding, in the same way that the corporate records departments of most Secretaries of State offices and the land recording offices of most counties and municipalities are self-funding.]

SECTION 13. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION. In applying and construing this uniform act, consideration must be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law with respect to its subject matter among states that enact it.

SECTION 14. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT. This [act] modifies, limits, or supersedes the federal Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. Section 7001 et seq.) but does not modify, limit, or supersede Section 101(c) of that Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001(c), or authorize electronic delivery of any of the notices described in Section 103(b) of that Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7003(b).

SECTION 15. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this [act] or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of this [act] which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this [act] are severable.



THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

- A Summary -

Virtually everywhere in America, state and local governments are struggling with the problem of brownfields – vacant, abandoned and underused sites with various forms and degrees of environmental contamination. Reclaiming many of these sites for beneficial uses is very difficult and very expensive. Total cleanup, if possible, would often cost much more than the market value of the property. However, if a legal mechanism can be developed for long term control of use and clean-up or remediation (the current term of art), some properties may be safely returned to use and may be bought and sold. Current real property law is inadequate. Various common-law doctrines and other legal rules often work against such long-term controls, a situation which undermines the use and marketability of contaminated property.

In 2003, the Uniform Law Commission promulgated the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA) to overcome the inadequate common law rules. The statutory legal mechanism it creates is called an “environmental covenant.” Covenants are generally recognized in the common law as a means of conveying restrictions on use of land. The environmental covenant relies on the common law base, but re-creates it for the specific purpose of controlling the use of contaminated real estate, perpetually if necessary, while allowing that real estate to be conveyed from one person to another subject to those controls.

An environmental covenant is a specific recordable interest in the real estate. It arises from an environmental response project that imposes activity and use limitations. Such a project must arise under an appropriate federal or state program or approval for cleanup of the property or closure of a waste management site. No environmental covenant is effective without the relevant agency signature. The interest is created in a specific instrument for the purpose. The instrument recites the controls and remediation requirements imposed upon the property. The rights under the covenant must be granted to a party or parties called the holders. The covenant is perpetual unless limited in time within the instrument. It runs with the land and does not have to be “appurtenant.” This means it cannot be extinguished when one owner transfers rights or interests in the property to another, no matter who the holders are.

Two principal policies are served by confirming the validity of environmental covenants. One is to ensure that land use restrictions, mandated environmental monitoring requirements, and a wide range of common engineering controls designed to control the potential environmental risk of residual contamination will be recorded in the land records and effectively enforced over time as a valid real property servitude. UECA reverses the variety of common law doctrines that cast doubt on such enforceability.

A second important policy served by UECA is the return of previously contaminated property, often located in urban areas, to the stream of commerce. The environmental and real property legal communities have often been unable to identify a common set of principles applicable to such properties. The frequent result has been that these properties do not attract interested purchasers and therefore remain vacant, blighted and unproductive. This is an undesirable

outcome for communities seeking to return once important commercial sites to productive use. Large numbers of contaminated sites, often known as brownfields, are unlikely to be successfully recycled until regulators, owners, responsible parties, affected communities, and prospective purchasers and their lenders become confident that environmental covenants will be properly drafted, implemented, monitored and enforced for so long as needed. UECA should encourage transfer of ownership and property re-use by offering a clear and objective process for creating, modifying or terminating environmental covenants and for recording these instruments which will appear in any title abstract for the property in question.

At the time UECA was promulgated, approximately half the states had laws providing for land use restrictions in some real estate form pertaining to environmental contamination. Those existing laws varied greatly in scope – some simply noted the need for land use restrictions, while others created tools similar to many of the legal structures envisioned by UECA. Most such acts applied only to cleanups under a state program. In contrast, UECA includes a number of provisions absent from most of those outdated state laws, including the act's applicability to both federal and state-led cleanups. It ensures that a covenant will survive despite tax lien foreclosure, adverse possession, and marketable title statutes. UECA also provides detailed provisions regarding termination and amendment of covenants, and includes important provisions on dealing with recorded interests that have priority over the new covenant. There is broad enforcement authority to make sure a covenant does govern the property. Holders are expected to enforce, but any party to the covenant and appropriate agencies may enforce as well. Further, UECA offers guidance to courts confronted with a proceeding that seeks to terminate such a covenant through eminent domain or the doctrine of changed circumstances.

Under UECA, the governmental regulators who sign an environmental covenant will serve to ensure that the risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science and that affected third parties have notice of the covenant and associated controls. The act specifies that persons with a recorded interest in the property or who are in possession of the property, together with local governments in which the property is located and any other person the agencies require, must be given notice of the covenant. Environmental covenants, and any associated amendments or terminations, must be recorded in the local land records.

It is important to note UECA does not supplant or impose substantive clean-up standards, either generally or in a particular case. The act assumes those standards will be developed in the prior regulatory process. Rather, UECA validates site-specific, environmental use restrictions that result from the environmental response project which an environmental covenant helps implement. Implicit in use controls is the fact that, despite best efforts, total cleanups of many contaminated sites are not possible, but property may be put to limited uses without risk to others, nonetheless. UECA also does not affect the liability of principally responsible parties for the cleanup or any harm caused to third parties by the contamination – rather it provides a method for minimizing the exposure of third parties to such risks and for owners and responsible parties to engage in long-term cleanup mechanisms.

The Uniform Environmental Covenants Act is an important tool in revitalizing inner cities and other areas where vacant and underused properties are preventing vital redevelopment and economic expansion. It was drafted with the active participation of federal and state

environmental regulators, public and private land holders, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts. Its uniform enactment nationwide will provide owners, especially owners with properties in multiple states, with the confidence to engage in long-term remediation strategies and use controls, and bring economic growth back to blighted sites and areas.

For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at (312) 450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
LAWRENCE R. KLEMIN, CHAIRMAN
JANUARY 19, 2021

TESTIMONY BY
PARRELL D. GROSSMAN
MEMBER, NORTH DAKOTA COMMISSION ON UNIFORM LAWS
RE: HOUSE BILL NO. 1079

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee. I am Parrell Grossman, and it is my privilege to be a member of the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission and member of the National Conference of Uniform Law Commissioners. I appear on behalf of the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission in support of House Bill No. 1079.

House Bill 1079 is the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act and was introduced at the request of the Commission on Uniform State Laws and on behalf of the Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”). Therefore, after my introductory comments and overview, Dave Glatt, Director of DEQ, will explain the legislation in more detail and may answer some of your particular questions about its purpose, function, impact, *et cetera*.

The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws is a nonprofit organization formed in 1892 to create nonpartisan state legislation. Over 350 volunteer commissioners, including legislators, legislative staff, lawyers, judges, law professors, and others work together to draft laws ranging from the Uniform Commercial Code to acts on property, trust and estates, family law, criminal law and other areas where uniformity of state law is desirable.

This uniform act has been enacted by 24 states, including South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska and Iowa.

I have attached the full Act for background because it provides important useful comments that, among other things, provide legislators and legislatures information on the purposes of various sections or provisions and how such provisions should be interpreted in the future when a state enacts the Uniform Law. In addition, I have attached a Summary of the Act, which also is too lengthy to discuss in any detail, although you should find it helpful if you have time to review this Summary.

The Uniform Law Commission has provided a list of reasons supporting the adoption of this act and I have attached the same. Therefore, I will share with you a few of the highlights.

The Act allows for the long-term enforcement of clean-up controls (restrictions on certain uses, prohibitions on using wells, protection of concrete “caps,” maintenance of monitoring equipment, etc.) to be contained in a statutorily-defined agreement known as an “environmental covenant” which will be binding on subsequent purchasers of the property and be listed in the local land records.

The Act removes various legal obstacles to the use of such restrictions and lessens liability concerns of sellers and lenders associated with the redevelopment and sale of “brownfields” while at the same time requiring state approval of the remediation and control plan as well as notice to surrounding landowners, local governments, and other parties in interest. In this manner the Act protects public health and ensures the economically viable reuse of the property in question.

- It helps return previously contaminated property to the stream of commerce, by allowing the owners of that property to engage in responsible risk-based cleanups and then transfer or sell the property subject to state-approved controls on its use.
- It provides a broad array of interested parties the ability to enforce the use and activity restrictions contained in an environmental covenant, helping to ensure those controls will remain in place and prevent secondary harms.
- It protects valid environmental covenants from being inadvertently extinguished by application of various common law doctrines, adverse possession, tax lien foreclosures, less-restrictive zoning changes, and marketable title statutes.
- It requires the Department of Environmental Quality to be a signatory to the covenant, and ensures that risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science, adequately protect human health and surrounding properties, and that notice of the covenant and associated controls is provided to affected third parties.
- It **does not** supplant or impose substantive cleanup standards or liability; rather it validates approved site-specific controls resulting from an environmental response project, and makes sure those controls are maintained as long as necessary to meet the approved objectives.

The Act was drafted with the participation of state and federal regulators, public and private landowners, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts.

One of the North Dakota Commission members is Law Professor Owen L. Anderson, formerly of the University of North Dakota Law School and the University of Oklahoma Law School, and now a Professor and Distinguished Oil and Gas Scholar at the University of Texas School of Law in the Kay Bailey Hutchinson Center for Energy Law & Business. Professor Anderson noted that the law is designed to protect the integrity of contaminated property and to determine liability for interference with such property and the Uniform Act certainly is superior to existing North Dakota law on such covenants.

Therefore, the Commission and the Department of Environmental Quality will now leave it to the Judiciary Committee to decide whether you support the enactment of this important legislation. With that, unless you have questions I can answer, I will defer to testimony by Director Dave Glatt.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



WHY YOUR STATE SHOULD ADOPT THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT (UECA)

The **Uniform Environmental Covenants Act** allows for the long-term enforcement of clean-up controls (restrictions on certain uses, prohibitions on using wells, protection of concrete “caps,” maintenance of monitoring equipment, etc.) to be contained in a statutorily-defined agreement known as an “environmental covenant” which will be binding on subsequent purchasers of the property and be listed in the local land records. The purpose of this act is to remove various legal impediments to the use of such restrictions and to thereby lessen liability concerns of sellers and lenders associated with the redevelopment and sale of “brownfields” while at the same time requiring state approval of the remediation and control plan as well as notice to surrounding landowners, local governments, and other parties in interest. By ensuring such “institutional controls” are maintained and enforced, UECA helps fulfill the dual purposes of such restrictions – the protection of human health and the economically viable reuse of the property in question.

- UECA helps to return previously contaminated property to the stream of commerce, by allowing the owners of that property to engage in responsible risk-based cleanups and then transfer or sell the property subject to state-approved controls on its use.
- UECA gives a broad array of interested parties the ability to enforce the use and activity restrictions contained in an environmental covenant, thereby helping to ensure those controls will remain in place and prevent secondary harms.
- UECA protects valid environmental covenants from being inadvertently extinguished by application of various common law doctrines, adverse possession, tax lien foreclosures, less-restrictive zoning changes, and marketable title statutes.
- UECA requires the state environmental agency to be a signatory to the covenant, thereby ensuring that risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science, adequately protect human health and surrounding properties, and that notice of the covenant and associated controls is provided to affected third parties.
- UECA does not supplant or impose substantive cleanup standards or liability; rather it validates approved site-specific controls resulting from an environmental response project, and makes sure those controls are maintained as long as necessary to meet the objective for which they were approved.

The **Uniform Environmental Covenants Act** is an important tool in revitalizing inner cities and other areas where vacant and underused properties are preventing vital redevelopment. It was drafted with the participation of state and federal regulators, public and private land owners, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts. Its enactment will provide the owners of contaminated land the confidence to invest in long-term remediation strategies and use controls, while at the same time protecting human health and allowing those properties to be developed and thus bring economic revitalization to blighted areas and sites.

For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at (312) 450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.



Uniform Law Commission

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

111 N. Wabash Ave.
Suite 1010
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 450-6600 tel
(312) 450-6601 fax
www.uniformlaws.org


A Few Facts about THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

PURPOSE: The Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA) provides clear rules for a perpetual real estate interest – an environmental covenant – to regulate the use of brownfields when real estate is transferred from one owner to another.

ORIGIN: Completed by the Uniform Law Commission in 2003.

APPROVED BY: American Bar Association, ABA Section on Real Property, Trust & Estate Law.

ENACTED BY:



For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at 312-450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.

The ULC is a nonprofit formed in 1892 to create nonpartisan state legislation. Over 350 volunteer commissioners—lawyers, judges, law professors, legislative staff, and others—work together to draft laws ranging from the Uniform Commercial Code to acts on property, trusts and estates, family law, criminal law and other areas where uniformity of state law is desirable.

Testimony
House Bill 1079
House Judiciary Committee
January 19, 2021; 9:30 am
North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality

Chairman Klemin and members of the House Judiciary Committee. My name is David Glatt, Director for the North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The DEQ is responsible for implementing many of the environmental protection programs in the state. I am here today to provide testimony in support of HB 1079.

Historically, the DEQ has provided technical and regulatory oversight relating to the cleanup and ongoing use of contaminated properties. The success of cleanup actions depends on the type of contaminant, site location and local geology. When cleanup of a property to background conditions is not achievable or would far exceed the property's value, residual contamination may be left in place. Leaving contamination can result in the land being designated as a Brownfield where the land is typically left vacant, abandoned or underused. However, we note that some Brownfield properties can be safely used for certain activities with appropriate environmental controls. The environmental or institutional controls are also referred to as environmental covenants. These environmental covenants identify controls that ensure that the contamination does not spread or adversely impact human health.

North Dakota law has provided for environmental covenants since 2005. They are necessary to ensure that environmental or institutional controls remain in place even if the property is transferred to new ownership. Although environmental covenants have been a useful tool in North Dakota for many years, there are concerns with the current law (NDCC 23.1-04-04). It provides little detail on how environmental covenants interact with other areas of law, including real estate and environmental law. The need for the law clarification recently became evident when working on a large cleanup project involving several environmental covenants.

The Uniform Environmental Covenant Act, which HB 1079 was modeled after, was drafted with input from various stakeholders, including regulators, landowners, and bankers. It has been adopted by 26 states and provides certainty

for investors across state lines. Adopting the Uniform Environmental Covenant Act would ensure there are no conflicts or gaps in existing state law.

Some key areas the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act would address that are currently not addressed in ND law are:

- **47-37-02:** adopts the basic rule that interests prior to the environmental covenant remain valid (e.g., a mortgage) and clarifies that relevant parties can agree to re-order the priorities in a “subordination agreement”
- **47-37-04:** clarifies that certain traditional common law doctrines do not apply, ensuring an environmental covenant remains enforceable and in effect
- **47-37-05:** clarifies that the Act does not authorize a use that is prohibited by zoning law or a prior recorded instrument
- **47-37-06:** expands who must receive notice of the environmental covenant
- **47-37-08 & 47-37-09:** clarifies and simplifies the termination or amendment of an environmental covenant
- **47-37-11:** requires the DEQ to establish a registry of environmental covenants and allows notice of the covenant to be recorded instead of the entire document, which should simplify the recording process and make it easier for interested parties to locate documents

It is important to note that the DEQ has a companion bill, SB 2070, also referred to as the “mini Superfund” bill, that addresses other aspects of cleaning up contaminated properties. SB 2070 repeals NDCC 23.1-04-04 and includes reference to the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.

We believe HB 1079 would provide clarity in the process and certainty to property owners and investors involved with the Environmental Covenants.

This concludes my testimony on HB 1079. I will stand for any questions from the committee.

2021 SENATE JUDICIARY

HB 1079

2021 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Judiciary Committee
Peace Garden Room, State Capitol

HB 1079
2/16/2021

A BILL for an Act to create and enact chapter 47-37 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.

Hearing called to order all Senators Present: **Myrdal, Luick, Dwyer, Bakke, Fors, Heitkamp, Larson.** [9:28]

Discussion Topics:

- Statute as it applies to environmental issues
- History of uniform laws

Parrell Grossman, Uniform Law Commission provided testimony in favor #6561, #6562, #6563, #6564, #6565 [9:29]

David Glatt, Department of Environmental Quality provided testimony in favor #6744 [9:35]

Kevin Ward, Department of Defense provided testimony in opposition #6559 [9:50]

Hearing Adjourned [10:33]

Jamal Omar, Committee Clerk

Madam Chairwoman and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am Parrell Grossman, and it is my privilege to be a member of the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission and member of the National Conference of Uniform Law Commissioners. I appear on behalf of the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission in support of House Bill No. 1079.

House Bill 1079 is the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act and was introduced at the request of the Commission on Uniform State Laws and on behalf of the Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”). Therefore, after my introductory comments and overview, Dave Glatt, Director of DEQ, will explain the legislation in more detail and may answer some of your particular questions about its purpose, function, impact, *et cetera*.

The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws is a nonprofit organization formed in 1892 to create nonpartisan state legislation. Over 350 volunteer commissioners, including legislators, legislative staff, lawyers, judges, law professors, and others work together to draft laws ranging from the Uniform Commercial Code to acts on property, trust and estates, family law, criminal law and other areas where uniformity of state law is desirable.

This uniform act has been enacted by 24 states, including South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska and Iowa.

I have attached the full Act for background because it provides important useful comments that, among other things, provide legislators and legislatures information on the purposes of various sections or provisions and how such provisions should be interpreted in the future when a state enacts the Uniform Law. In addition, I have attached a Summary of the Act, which also is too lengthy to discuss in any detail, although you should find it helpful if you have time to review this Summary.

The Uniform Law Commission has provided a list of reasons supporting the adoption of this act and I have attached the same. Therefore, I will share with you a few of the highlights.

The Act allows for the long-term enforcement of clean-up controls (restrictions on certain uses, prohibitions on using wells, protection of concrete “caps,” maintenance of monitoring equipment, etc.) to be contained in a statutorily-defined agreement known as an “environmental covenant” which will be binding on subsequent purchasers of the property and be listed in the local land records.

The Act removes various legal obstacles to the use of such restrictions and lessens liability concerns of sellers and lenders associated with the

redevelopment and sale of “brownfields” while at the same time requiring state approval of the remediation and control plan as well as notice to surrounding landowners, local governments, and other parties in interest. In this manner the Act protects public health and ensures the economically viable reuse of the property in question.

- It helps return previously contaminated property to the stream of commerce, by allowing the owners of that property to engage in responsible risk-based cleanups and then transfer or sell the property subject to state-approved controls on its use.
- It provides a broad array of interested parties the ability to enforce the use and activity restrictions contained in an environmental covenant, helping to ensure those controls will remain in place and prevent secondary harms.
- It protects valid environmental covenants from being inadvertently extinguished by application of various common law doctrines, adverse possession, tax lien foreclosures, less-restrictive zoning changes, and marketable title statutes.
- It requires the Department of Environmental Quality to be a signatory to the covenant, and ensures that risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science, adequately protect human health and surrounding properties, and that notice of the covenant and associated controls is provided to affected third parties.
- It **does not** supplant or impose substantive cleanup standards or liability; rather it validates approved site-specific controls resulting from an environmental response project, and makes sure those controls are maintained as long as necessary to meet the approved objectives.

The Act was drafted with the participation of state and federal regulators, public and private landowners, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts.

One of the North Dakota Commission members is Law Professor Owen L. Anderson, formerly of the University of North Dakota Law School and the University of Oklahoma Law School, and now a Professor and Distinguished Oil and Gas Scholar at the University of Texas School of Law in the Kay Bailey Hutchinson Center for Energy Law & Business. Professor Anderson noted that the law is designed to protect the integrity of contaminated property and to determine liability for interference with such property and the Uniform Act certainly is superior to existing North Dakota law on such covenants.

Therefore, the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission respectfully asks the Senate Judiciary Committee for a “Do Pass” recommendation for House Bill No. 1079.

With that, unless you have questions I can answer, I will defer to testimony by the DEQ Director, Dave Glatt.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

- A Summary -

Virtually everywhere in America, state and local governments are struggling with the problem of brownfields – vacant, abandoned and underused sites with various forms and degrees of environmental contamination. Reclaiming many of these sites for beneficial uses is very difficult and very expensive. Total cleanup, if possible, would often cost much more than the market value of the property. However, if a legal mechanism can be developed for long term control of use and clean-up or remediation (the current term of art), some properties may be safely returned to use and may be bought and sold. Current real property law is inadequate. Various common-law doctrines and other legal rules often work against such long-term controls, a situation which undermines the use and marketability of contaminated property.

In 2003, the Uniform Law Commission promulgated the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA) to overcome the inadequate common law rules. The statutory legal mechanism it creates is called an “environmental covenant.” Covenants are generally recognized in the common law as a means of conveying restrictions on use of land. The environmental covenant relies on the common law base, but re-creates it for the specific purpose of controlling the use of contaminated real estate, perpetually if necessary, while allowing that real estate to be conveyed from one person to another subject to those controls.

An environmental covenant is a specific recordable interest in the real estate. It arises from an environmental response project that imposes activity and use limitations. Such a project must arise under an appropriate federal or state program or approval for cleanup of the property or closure of a waste management site. No environmental covenant is effective without the relevant agency signature. The interest is created in a specific instrument for the purpose. The instrument recites the controls and remediation requirements imposed upon the property. The rights under the covenant must be granted to a party or parties called the holders. The covenant is perpetual unless limited in time within the instrument. It runs with the land and does not have to be “appurtenant.” This means it cannot be extinguished when one owner transfers rights or interests in the property to another, no matter who the holders are.

Two principal policies are served by confirming the validity of environmental covenants. One is to ensure that land use restrictions, mandated environmental monitoring requirements, and a wide range of common engineering controls designed to control the potential environmental risk of residual contamination will be recorded in the land records and effectively enforced over time as a valid real property servitude. UECA reverses the variety of common law doctrines that cast doubt on such enforceability.

A second important policy served by UECA is the return of previously contaminated property, often located in urban areas, to the stream of commerce. The environmental and real property legal communities have often been unable to identify a common set of principles applicable to such properties. The frequent result has been that these properties do not attract interested purchasers and therefore remain vacant, blighted and unproductive. This is an undesirable

outcome for communities seeking to return once important commercial sites to productive use. Large numbers of contaminated sites, often known as brownfields, are unlikely to be successfully recycled until regulators, owners, responsible parties, affected communities, and prospective purchasers and their lenders become confident that environmental covenants will be properly drafted, implemented, monitored and enforced for so long as needed. UECA should encourage transfer of ownership and property re-use by offering a clear and objective process for creating, modifying or terminating environmental covenants and for recording these instruments which will appear in any title abstract for the property in question.

At the time UECA was promulgated, approximately half the states had laws providing for land use restrictions in some real estate form pertaining to environmental contamination. Those existing laws varied greatly in scope – some simply noted the need for land use restrictions, while others created tools similar to many of the legal structures envisioned by UECA. Most such acts applied only to cleanups under a state program. In contrast, UECA includes a number of provisions absent from most of those outdated state laws, including the act's applicability to both federal and state-led cleanups. It ensures that a covenant will survive despite tax lien foreclosure, adverse possession, and marketable title statutes. UECA also provides detailed provisions regarding termination and amendment of covenants, and includes important provisions on dealing with recorded interests that have priority over the new covenant. There is broad enforcement authority to make sure a covenant does govern the property. Holders are expected to enforce, but any party to the covenant and appropriate agencies may enforce as well. Further, UECA offers guidance to courts confronted with a proceeding that seeks to terminate such a covenant through eminent domain or the doctrine of changed circumstances.

Under UECA, the governmental regulators who sign an environmental covenant will serve to ensure that the risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science and that affected third parties have notice of the covenant and associated controls. The act specifies that persons with a recorded interest in the property or who are in possession of the property, together with local governments in which the property is located and any other person the agencies require, must be given notice of the covenant. Environmental covenants, and any associated amendments or terminations, must be recorded in the local land records.

It is important to note UECA does not supplant or impose substantive clean-up standards, either generally or in a particular case. The act assumes those standards will be developed in the prior regulatory process. Rather, UECA validates site-specific, environmental use restrictions that result from the environmental response project which an environmental covenant helps implement. Implicit in use controls is the fact that, despite best efforts, total cleanups of many contaminated sites are not possible, but property may be put to limited uses without risk to others, nonetheless. UECA also does not affect the liability of principally responsible parties for the cleanup or any harm caused to third parties by the contamination – rather it provides a method for minimizing the exposure of third parties to such risks and for owners and responsible parties to engage in long-term cleanup mechanisms.

The Uniform Environmental Covenants Act is an important tool in revitalizing inner cities and other areas where vacant and underused properties are preventing vital redevelopment and economic expansion. It was drafted with the active participation of federal and state

environmental regulators, public and private land holders, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts. Its uniform enactment nationwide will provide owners, especially owners with properties in multiple states, with the confidence to engage in long-term remediation strategies and use controls, and bring economic growth back to blighted sites and areas.

For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at (312) 450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.

WHY YOUR STATE SHOULD ADOPT THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT (UECA)

The **Uniform Environmental Covenants Act** allows for the long-term enforcement of clean-up controls (restrictions on certain uses, prohibitions on using wells, protection of concrete “caps,” maintenance of monitoring equipment, etc.) to be contained in a statutorily-defined agreement known as an “environmental covenant” which will be binding on subsequent purchasers of the property and be listed in the local land records. The purpose of this act is to remove various legal impediments to the use of such restrictions and to thereby lessen liability concerns of sellers and lenders associated with the redevelopment and sale of “brownfields” while at the same time requiring state approval of the remediation and control plan as well as notice to surrounding landowners, local governments, and other parties in interest. By ensuring such “institutional controls” are maintained and enforced, UECA helps fulfill the dual purposes of such restrictions – the protection of human health and the economically viable reuse of the property in question.

- UECA helps to return previously contaminated property to the stream of commerce, by allowing the owners of that property to engage in responsible risk-based cleanups and then transfer or sell the property subject to state-approved controls on its use.
- UECA gives a broad array of interested parties the ability to enforce the use and activity restrictions contained in an environmental covenant, thereby helping to ensure those controls will remain in place and prevent secondary harms.
- UECA protects valid environmental covenants from being inadvertently extinguished by application of various common law doctrines, adverse possession, tax lien foreclosures, less-restrictive zoning changes, and marketable title statutes.
- UECA requires the state environmental agency to be a signatory to the covenant, thereby ensuring that risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science, adequately protect human health and surrounding properties, and that notice of the covenant and associated controls is provided to affected third parties.
- UECA does not supplant or impose substantive cleanup standards or liability; rather it validates approved site-specific controls resulting from an environmental response project, and makes sure those controls are maintained as long as necessary to meet the objective for which they were approved.

The **Uniform Environmental Covenants Act** is an important tool in revitalizing inner cities and other areas where vacant and underused properties are preventing vital redevelopment. It was drafted with the participation of state and federal regulators, public and private land owners, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts. Its enactment will provide the owners of contaminated land the confidence to invest in long-term remediation strategies and use controls, while at the same time protecting human health and allowing those properties to be developed and thus bring economic revitalization to blighted areas and sites.

For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at (312) 450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

drafted by the

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS

ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

and by it

APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED FOR ENACTMENT
IN ALL THE STATES

at its

MEETING IN ITS ONE-HUNDRED-AND-TWELFTH YEAR
WASHINGTON, DC

AUGUST 1-7, 2003

WITH PREFATORY NOTE AND COMMENTS

Copyright ©2003

By

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

September 27, 2018

DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

WILLIAM R. BREETZ, JR., University of Connecticut School of Law, Connecticut Urban
Legal Initiative, 35 Elizabeth Street, Room K-202, Hartford, CT 06105, *Chair*
MARION W. BENFIELD, JR., 10 Overlook Circle, New Braunfels, TX 78132
DAVID D. BIKLEN, 153 N. Beacon St., Hartford, CT 06105
STEPHEN C. CAWOOD, 108 ½ Kentucky Ave., P.O. Drawer 128, Pineville, KY 40977-0128
BRUCE A. COGGESHALL, One Monument Sq., Portland, ME 04101
FRANK W. DAYKIN, 2180 Thomas Jefferson Dr., Reno, NV 89509, *Committee on Style*
Liaison
THEODORE C. KRAMER, 45 Walnut St., Brattleboro, VT 05301
DONALD E. MIELKE, Ken Caryl Starr Centre, 7472 S. Shaffer Ln., Suite 100, Littleton, CO
80127
LARRY L. RUTH, 530 S. 13th St., Suite 110, Lincoln, NE 68508-2820, *Enactment Plan*
Coordinator
HIROSHI SAKAI, 3773 Diamond Head Circle, Honolulu, HI 96815
YVONNE L. THARPES, Legislature of the Virgin Islands, Capitol Building, P.O. Box 1690, St.
Thomas, VI 00804
MICHELE L. TIMMONS, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, 700 State Office Bldg., 100 Rev.
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., St. Paul, MN 55155
KURT A. STRASSER, University of Connecticut School of Law, 65 Elizabeth St., Hartford, CT
06105-2290, *Reporter*

EX OFFICIO

K. KING BURNETT, P.O. Box 910, Salisbury, MD 21803-0910, *President*
CARL H. LISMAN, 84 Pine St., P.O. Box 728, Burlington, VT 05402, *Division Chair*

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADVISOR

ROGER D. SCHWENKE, Carlton Fields, PA 1 Harbour Pl., 777 S. Harbour Is. Blvd., P.O. Box
3239, Tampa, FL 33602-5950

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

WILLIAM HENNING, University of Alabama School of Law, Box 870382, Tuscaloosa, AL
35487-0382, *Executive Director*
WILLIAM J. PIERCE, 1505 Roxbury Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, *Executive Director*
Emeritus

Copies of this Act may be obtained from:
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS
211 E. Ontario Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312/915-0195
www.nccusl.org

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prefatory Note.....	1
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE	6
SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS.....	6
SECTION 3. NATURE OF RIGHTS; SUBORDINATION OF INTERESTS.....	11
SECTION 4. CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.....	14
SECTION 5. VALIDITY; EFFECT ON OTHER INSTRUMENTS.....	20
SECTION 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAND-USE LAW.....	24
SECTION 7. NOTICE.....	26
SECTION 8. RECORDING.....	26
SECTION 9. DURATION; AMENDMENT BY COURT ACTION.....	28
SECTION 10. AMENDMENT OR TERMINATION BY CONSENT.....	31
SECTION 11. ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.....	36
[SECTION 12. REGISTRY; SUBSTITUTE NOTICE.].....	38
SECTION 13. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION.....	41
SECTION 14. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT.....	41
SECTION 15. SEVERABILITY.....	41

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

Prefatory Note

Environmental covenants - whether called “institutional controls”, “land use controls” or some other term - are increasingly being used as part of the environmental remediation process for contaminated real property. An environmental covenant typically is used when the real property is to be cleaned up to a level determined by the potential environmental risks posed by a particular use, rather than to unrestricted use standards. Such risk-based remediation is both environmentally and economically preferable in many circumstances, although it will often allow the parties to leave residual contamination in the real property. An environmental covenant is then used to implement this risk-based cleanup by controlling the potential risks presented by that residual contamination.

Two principal policies are served by confirming the validity of environmental covenants. One is to ensure that land use restrictions, mandated environmental monitoring requirements, and a wide range of common engineering controls designed to control the potential environmental risk of residual contamination will be reflected on the land records and effectively enforced over time as a valid real property servitude. This Act addresses a variety of common law doctrines - the same doctrines that led to adoption of the Uniform Conservation Easement Act - that cast doubt on such enforceability.

A second important policy served by this Act is the return of previously contaminated property, often located in urban areas, to the stream of commerce. The environmental and real property legal communities have often been unable to identify a common set of principles applicable to such properties. The frequent result has been that these properties do not attract interested purchasers and therefore remain vacant, blighted and unproductive. This is an undesirable outcome for communities seeking to return once important commercial sites to productive use.

Large numbers of contaminated sites are unlikely to be successfully recycled until regulators, potentially responsible parties, affected communities, prospective purchasers and their lenders become confident that environmental covenants will be properly drafted, implemented, monitored and enforced for so long as needed. This Act should encourage transfer of ownership and property re-use by offering a clear and objective process for creating, modifying or terminating environmental covenants and for recording these actions in recorded instruments which will be reflected in the title abstract of the property in question.

Of course, risk-based remediation must effectively control the potential risk presented by the residual contamination that remains in the real property and thereby protect human health and the environment. When risk-based remediation imposes restrictions on how the property may be used after the cleanup, requires continued monitoring of the site, or requires construction of permanent containment or other remedial structures on the site, environmental covenants are crucial tools to make these restrictions and requirements effective. Yet environmental covenants can do so only if their legal status under state property law and their practical enforceability are

assured, as this proposed Uniform Act seeks to do.

At the time this Act was promulgated, approximately half the states had laws providing for land use restrictions in conjunction with risk-based remedies. Those existing laws vary greatly in scope – some simply note the need for land use restrictions, while others create tools similar to many of the legal structures envisioned by this Act. Most such acts apply only to cleanups under a state program.

In contrast, this Act includes a number of provisions absent from most existing state laws, including the Act's applicability to both federal and state-led cleanups. For example, this Act expressly precludes the application of traditional common law doctrines that might hinder enforcement. It ensures that a covenant will survive despite tax lien foreclosure, adverse possession, and marketable title statutes. The Act also provides detailed provisions regarding termination and amendment of older covenants, and includes important provisions on dealing with recorded interests that have priority over the new covenant. Further, it offers guidance to courts confronted with a proceeding that seeks to terminate such a covenant through eminent domain or the doctrine of changed circumstances.

This Act benefited greatly during the drafting process from broad stakeholder input. As a result, the Act contains unique provisions designed to protect a variety of interests commonly absent in existing state laws. For example, the Act confers on property owners that grant an environmental covenant the right to enforce the covenant and requires their consent to any termination or modification. This should mitigate an owner's future liability concerns for residual contamination and encourage the sale and reuse of contaminated properties. And, following traditional real property principles, the Act validates the interests of lenders who hold a prior mortgage on the contaminated property, absent voluntary subordination.

It is important to emphasize that environmental covenants are but one tool in a larger context of environmental remediation regulation; remediation is typically overseen by a government agency enforcing substantial statutory and regulatory requirements. The covenant should be the crucial end result of that process - it may be used to ensure that the activity and use limitations imposed in the agency's remedial decision process remain effective, and thus protect the public from residual contamination that remains, while also permitting re-use of the site in a timely and economically valuable way.

Environmental remediation projects may be done in a widely diverse array of contamination fact patterns and regulatory contexts. For example, the remediation may be done at a large industrial operating or waste disposal site. In such a situation, the cleanup could be done under federal law and regulation, such as the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA") or the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"). Generally speaking, CERCLA and RCRA would also apply to remediation done at Department of Defense or Department of Energy sites that are anticipated to be transferred out of federal ownership.

In other situations, state law and regulation will be an effective regulatory framework for remediation projects. State law is given a role to play in the federal environmental policy

discussed above. Beyond this, state law may be the primary source of regulatory authority for many remediation projects. These may include larger sites and will often include smaller, typically urban, sites. In addition, many states authorize and supervise voluntary cleanup efforts, and these also may find environmental covenants a useful policy tool. With both state and federal environmental remediation projects, the applicable cleanup statutes and regulations will provide the basis for the restrictions and controls to be included in the resulting environmental covenants.

This Act does not supplant or impose substantive clean-up standards, either generally or in a particular case. The Act assumes those standards will be developed in a prior regulatory proceeding. Rather, the Act is intended to validate site-specific, environmental use restrictions resulting from an environmental response project that proposes to leave residual contamination in the ground in any of the different situations described above. Once the governing regulatory authority and the property owner have determined to use a risk-based approach to cleanup to protect the public from residual contamination, this Act supplies the legal infrastructure for creating and enforcing the environmental covenant under state law.

This Act does not require issuance of regulations. However, many state and federal agencies have developed implementation tools, including model covenants, statements of best practices, and advisory groups that include members of the real property and environmental practice bars as well as business and environmental groups. Developing and sharing such implementation tools and the advice of such advisory groups should support the effective implementation of the Act and is encouraged.

This Act does not address or change the larger context of environmental remediation regulation discussed above, and a number of aspects of that regulation should be noted here.

First, many contaminated properties are subject to the concurrent regulatory jurisdiction of both federal and state agencies. This Act does not address the exercise of such concurrent jurisdiction, and it is not intended to limit the jurisdiction of any state agency.

A specific issue arises with federal property that is not anticipated to be transferred to a non-federal owner. This Act takes no position regarding the question of whether remediation of such property is subject to State regulatory jurisdiction. In contrast, where federal property is transferred to a non-federal owner, state agencies will clearly have jurisdiction over environmental covenants on the transferred property where state environmental law so provides.

Second, potential purchasers of property subject to an environmental covenant should be aware that both state and federal environmental law other than this Act may authorize reopening the environmental remediation determination, even after the relevant statutory standards have been met on that site. While such reopeners are rare, they may be possible to respond either to newly-discovered contamination or new scientific knowledge of the risk posed by existing contamination. As a consequence, under existing environmental law, the then-current owner may have remediation liability. While the dampening effect of such potential liability on the willingness of potential purchasers to buy contaminated property is clear, the issue remains

important in the eyes of some interest groups. Federal law now provides protection for bona fide purchasers of such property under specified circumstances, and the law of some states may also afford some protection. However, this Act does not provide any such bona fide purchaser protection.

For these and other reasons, it is important that prospective purchasers of contaminated properties - particularly those successors who may buy some years after a clean-up has been completed - have actual knowledge of covenants at the time of purchase. Environmental covenants recorded pursuant to this Act will provide constructive notice of the covenant and in many circumstances recording will provide actual notice. However, to ensure that such persons have actual notice, a state or a local recording authority may wish to highlight the existence of environmental covenants in their communities with maps showing the location of properties subject to environmental covenants, similar to the kinds of maps commonly found in local land records offices to show the location of zoning districts or flood plains.

Legislative Notes

Non Participating Owner. This Act contemplates a situation where a risk based clean-up is agreed to by the regulatory agency and the parties responsible for the clean-up, potentially including the fee owner and the owners of other interests in the property. As a consequence of that agreement, the Act assumes those parties will each negotiate the terms of and then sign the covenant.

The Act assumes the owners of appropriate interests in contaminated property will be willing to sign the covenant. Cooperation is not always possible, however. State and federal regulatory systems make a number of parties, in addition to the current owner of a fee simple or some other interests, potentially liable for the cost of remediation of contaminated real property. As a result, a remediation project may proceed even though an owner is no longer present or interested in the property. In those circumstances, the remediation project would be conducted pursuant to regulatory orders and could be financed either by other liable parties or by public funds. However, an environmental covenant may still be a useful tool in implementing the remediation project even in these situations.

When an owner is either unavailable or unwilling to participate in the environmental response project, it may be appropriate to condemn and take a partial interest in the real property in order to be able to record a valid servitude on it. Under the law of some states, states have the power to take that owner's interest by condemnation proceedings, paying the value of the interest taken, and then enter an environmental covenant as an owner. Where there is substantial contamination, the property may have little or no market value. In some states the court would take the cost of remediation into account in establishing the fair market value of the interest taken. See, e.g., *Northeast Ct. Economic Alliance, Inc. v. ATC Partnership*, 256 Conn. 813, 776 A.2d 1068 (2001). Although effective implementation of this Act may require that the state have a power of condemnation, this Act does not provide a substantive statutory basis for that power, and the state must therefore rely on other state law. Each state considering adoption of this Act should ensure that such a condemnation power is available for this purpose.

Similarly, while this Act provides substantive law governing creation, modification, and termination of environmental covenants, it does not include special administrative procedures for these and does not change the remedial decision making process. Rather, the Act presumes that the state's general administrative law or any specific procedure governing the environmental response project would apply to these activities.

“Actual” versus “Constructive” Notice of Contamination. The primary goal of the Act is to present to the states a statute that fully integrates environmental covenants into the traditional real property system. It seeks to ensure the long-term viability of those covenants by, among other means, providing constructive notice of those covenants to the world through resort to the land recording system.

Beyond that goal, it is very important to provide actual knowledge of the remaining contaminated conditions that the environmental covenants are designed to control. A broad range of stakeholders—children and adults that might inadvertently gain access to the contamination, tenants on the property, owners, abutting neighbors, prospective buyers, lenders, government officials, title insurance companies, public health providers and others—will have a real personal and financial stake in knowing what properties in their communities suffer from contamination and the extent of the risks they confront. The fact that this law may provide legally sufficient knowledge of those conditions is no substitute for real information regarding those conditions.

The challenge of providing that information is beyond the scope of this Act. However, in analogous situations—the location of zoning districts, flood plain boundaries, utility easements, and dangerous street conditions, for example—governments have devised techniques to make the public aware of those conditions on a continuing basis. Techniques such as maps in recorders' offices, on-site signage and monuments and, increasingly, computer databases accessible to the public are examples of possible solutions. All such devices have fiscal implications and are best addressed on a local basis. Over the long term, however, the public will likely be well served by innovative solutions to these issues.

Legislative Policy. Finally, this Act does not include a section of policy and legislative findings, although some states may choose to use such a section. If such a section is desired, the Colorado Statute, C.S.R.A. §25-15-317, may be an appropriate model.

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This [act] may be cited as the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS. In this [act]:

(1) “Activity and use limitations” means restrictions or obligations created under this [act] with respect to real property.

(2) “Agency” means the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] or any other state or federal agency that determines or approves the environmental response project pursuant to which the environmental covenant is created.

(3) “Common interest community” means a condominium, cooperative, or other real property with respect to which a person, by virtue of the person’s ownership of a parcel of real property, is obligated to pay property taxes or insurance premiums, or for maintenance, or improvement of other real property described in a recorded covenant that creates the common interest community.

(4) “Environmental covenant” means a servitude arising under an environmental response project that imposes activity and use limitations.

(5) “Environmental response project” means a plan or work performed for environmental remediation of real property and conducted:

(A) under a federal or state program governing environmental remediation of real property, including [insert references to state law governing environmental remediation];

(B) incident to closure of a solid or hazardous waste management unit, if the closure is conducted with approval of an agency; or

(C) under a state voluntary clean-up program authorized in [insert reference to

appropriate state law].

(6) “Holder” means the grantee of an environmental covenant as specified in Section 3(a).

(7) “Person” means an individual, corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, public corporation, government, governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, or any other legal or commercial entity.

(8) “Record”, used as a noun, means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

(9) “State” means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Comment

1. The following are examples of subsection (1) activity and use limitations:

(1) a prohibition or limitation of one or more uses of or activities on the real property, including restrictions on residential use, drilling for or pumping groundwater, or interference with activity and use limitations or other remedies,

(2) an activity required to be conducted on the real property, including monitoring, reporting, or operating procedures and maintenance for physical controls or devices,

(3) any right of access necessary to implement the activity and use limitations, and

(4) any physical structure or device required to be placed on the real property.

The specific activity and use limitations in any covenant will depend on the nature of the proceeding in the environmental response project that led to the covenant. For example, in a major environmental response project where the administrative process was conducted by either a state or federal agency, the activity and use limitations would generally be identified in the record of decision and then implemented in the environmental covenant pursuant to this Act. In contrast, in a voluntary clean-up supervised by privately licensed professionals, as authorized in some states, the activity and use limitations would not be developed by the agency during an administrative proceeding but by the parties themselves and their contracted professionals.

Nothing in this Act prevents the use of privately negotiated use restrictions which are recorded in the land records, without agency involvement: the validity of such covenants,

however, is not governed by this Act but by other law of the enacting state. *See* Section 5(d).

2. The governmental body with responsibility for the environmental response project in question is the agency under this Act. Generally, this agency will supply the public supervision necessary to protect human health and the environment in creating and modifying the environmental covenant.

In addition, as noted in Comment 1, the definition of “environmental response project” contemplates the possibility that the project may be undertaken pursuant to a voluntary clean-up program, where the actual determination of the sufficiency of the proposed clean-up is made by a private professional party, rather than an agency. In this case, the definition contemplates that an agency - typically, the state environmental agency - will nevertheless be asked to consent to the environmental covenant by signing it. Section 4 of the Act makes clear that the covenant is not valid under this Act unless an agency signs it. Section 3 of the Act makes clear that the mere signature of the agency, without more, means only that the agency has “approved” the covenant in order to satisfy the definitional requirements of definition (2) and the mandated contents of Section 4. That signature imposes no duties or obligations on the agency.

3. The agency, for purposes of this Act, may be either a federal government entity or the appropriate state regulatory agency for environmental protection.

Further, in some cases, the appropriate federal agency may be the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Defense as ‘lead agency’ under federal law, or another body.

4. Section 4 of the Act makes clear that an environmental covenant is valid if only one agency signs it. However, in many circumstances, both a federal and a state agency may have jurisdiction over the environmental contamination that led to the environmental response project. In this situation, the best practice may be for both federal and state agencies with jurisdiction over the contaminated property to sign the environmental covenant.

5. Definition (4) states that an environmental covenant is a “servitude”; the term generally refers to either a burden or restriction on the use of real property, or to a benefit that flows from the ownership of land, that in either case “runs with the land” - that is, the benefit or the burden passes to successive owners of the real property.

The law of servitudes is a long established body of real property law. The term is defined in §1.1 of the Restatement (3d) of Servitudes as follows: “(1) A servitude is a legal device that creates a right or an obligation that runs with land or an interest in land.” The Restatement goes on to provide that the forms of servitudes which are subject to that Restatement are “easements, profits, and covenants.”

This Act emphasizes that an environmental covenant is a servitude in order to implicate this full body of real property law and to sustain the validity and enforceability of the covenant. By first characterizing the environmental covenant as a servitude, the Act expressly avoids the argument that an environmental covenant is simply a personal common law contract between the

agency and the owner of the real property at the time the covenant is signed, and thus is not binding on later owners or tenants of that land.

6. The definition of “environmental covenant” also provides that the servitude is created to implement an environmental response project. An environmental response project may determine, in some circumstances, to leave some residual contamination on the real property. This may be done because complete cleanup is technologically impossible, or because it is either ecologically or economically undesirable. In this situation, the environmental response project may impose activity and use limitations to control residual risk that results from contamination remaining in real property. An environmental covenant is then recorded on the land records as required by Section 8 to ensure that the activity and use limitations are both legally and practically enforceable.

7. An “environmental response project” covered by definition (5) may be undertaken pursuant to authorization by one of several different statutes. Definition (5)(a) specifically covers remediation projects required under state law. However, the definition is written broadly to also encompass both current federal law, future amendments to both state and federal law, as well as new environmental protection regimes should they be developed. Without limiting this breadth and generality, the Act intends to reach environmental response projects undertaken pursuant to any of the following specific federal statutes:

- (1) Subchapter III or IX of the federal "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976", 42 U.S.C. sec. 6921 to 6939e and 6991 to 6991i, as amended;
- (2) Section 7002 or 7003 of the federal "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976", 42 U.S.C. sec. 6972 and 6973, as amended;
- (3) "Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980", 42 U.S.C. sec. 9601 to 9647, as amended;
- (4) "Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978", 42 U.S.C. sec. 7901 et seq., as amended;
- (5) "Toxic Substances Control Act", 15 U.S.C. 2601 to 2692, as amended;
- (6) "Safe Drinking Water Act", 42 U.S.C. 300f to 300j-26, as amended;
- (7) "Atomic Energy Act", 42 U.S.C. 2011 et. sec., as amended.

8. Definition (5)(C) extends the Act’s coverage to voluntary remediation projects that are undertaken under state law. Environmental covenants that are part of voluntary remediation projects may serve both the goal of environmental protection and the goal of facilitating reuse of the real property. However, approval of these projects by a governmental body or other authorized party ensures that the project serves these goals. Even though preparation of the clean-up plan and supervision of the work may be undertaken by private parties, this Act requires that covenants undertaken as part of a formal voluntary clean-up program must be approved by the agency as evidenced by the agency’s signature on the covenant, in order to be effective under this Act.

9. Some states authorize properly certified private parties to supervise remediation to pre-existing standards and certify the cleanup. For example, in Connecticut and Massachusetts, these are “licensed site professionals”. *See, e.g.,* M.G.L. ch. 21A §19; 310 CMR 40.1071;

C.G.S. §§22a-133o, 22a-133y. Supervision and certification by statutorily-authorized parties is intended to accomplish the same public function as supervision and certification by the governmental entity. Thus, these environmental response projects are also covered by this definition.

10. Under definition (5)(C), environmental response projects may include specific agreements between an owner and the agency for remediation that go beyond prevailing requirements. Alternatively, an owner may choose to contract with a potential purchaser for additional use restrictions in an instrument that does not purport to come within this Act; *see* Section 5(d). Because the owner may have residual liability for the site, even after remediation and transfer to a third party for redevelopment, the owner may require further restrictions as a condition of creating the environmental covenant and eventual reuse of the real property.

11. The definition of “holder” is in definition (6). As the practice of using environmental covenants continues to grow, new entities may emerge to serve as holders. This Act does not intend to limit this process. A holder may be any person under the broad definition of this Act, including an affected local government, the agency, or an owner. The identity of an individual holder must be approved by the agency and an owner as part of the process of creating an environmental covenant, as specified in Section 4. A holder is authorized to enforce the covenant under Section 11. A holder has the rights specified in Section 4 of this Act and may be given additional rights or obligations in the environmental covenant. Under Section 8(a), a recording officer should index an environmental covenant in the grantee index under the name of the person identified as the holder in the covenant.

Section 3(a) makes clear that a holder’s interest is an interest in real property. Some environmental enforcement agencies are not authorized by their enabling legislation to own an interest in real property after the environmental remediation is completed. As a consequence, those agencies may not be entitled to serve as holders under the Act. In those cases where an agency wishes to be certain that a viable holder exists, a private entity may serve this purpose, acting, for example by contract, in accordance with the agency’s direction.

More generally, the nature of a holder’s interest in the real property may influence whether its rights and duties with respect to the real property are likely to lead to potential liability for future environmental remediation, should such remediation become necessary. Under CERCLA, an “owner” is liable for remediation costs; *see* 42 U.S.C.A. 9607(a)(1). Unfortunately, the definition of “owner” in the statute is circular and unhelpful in evaluating whether a holder is potentially liable under it. 42 U.S.C.A. 9601(20).

In general, a holder’s right to enforce the covenant under Section 11 should be considered comparable to the rights covered in an easement and, thus, should not lead to a determination that the holder is liable as an “owner” under CERCLA. The two cases that have considered this question have found that the parties which held the easements were not CERCLA “owners”. Long Beach Unified School District v. Dorothy B. Godwin California Living Trust, 32 F.3d 1364 (9th Cir. 1994); Grand Trunk RR. V. Acme Belt Recoating, 859 F. Supp. 1125 (W.D. MI 1994). In each case, the court reasoned that the circular definition of owner meant that the

term's most common meaning would prevail. The common law's distinction between an easement holder and the property owner was then applied to find the easement holder not to be an "owner" for purposes of this statute. In each of these cases, the party that held the easement had not contributed to contamination on the property. The amendments to CERCLA Section 9601(35), Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-118, 115 Stat. 2360 (2002) (HR 2869, 107th Cong. 1st Session), added the term "easement" to the definition of parties which are in a "contractual relationship" under CERCLA. However, this does not affect whether the easement holder will be held to be a CERCLA "owner".

Where the holder or another person has more extensive rights than enforcement, a careful analysis will be required. The CERCLA liability cases typically emphasize that a party that exercises the degree of control over a site equivalent to the control typically exercised by an owner of the site will be held liable as an "owner". Under this approach, for example, lessees have been held liable as owners when their control over the site approximated that which an owner would have. *See, e.g., Delaney v. Town of Carmel*, 55 F. Supp. 2d 237 (S.D.N.Y. 1999); *U.S. v. A & N Cleaners and Launderers*, 788 F. Supp. 1317 (S.D.N.Y. 1990); *U.S. v. S.C. Dept. of Health and Env. Control*, 653 F. Supp. 984 (D.C.S.C. 1984.) Accordingly, a holder contemplating extensive control over the site should consider potential "owner" liability carefully.

CERCLA liability also extends to an "operator" of the site (42 U.S.C.A. 9607(a)(1)), and the case law interpreting this definition emphasizes that a party is liable as an operator if it has a high degree of control over the operating decisions and day to day management at the site. Thus, for example, a party that held an easement could be liable as an operator if its degree of control met this standard. A holder will, in general, have only control authority over the site related to effective enforcement of the environmental covenant and does not typically need more extensive day to day control. However, this will not likely be true in all cases.

SECTION 3. NATURE OF RIGHTS; SUBORDINATION OF INTERESTS.

(a) Any person, including a person that owns an interest in the real property, the agency, or a municipality or other unit of local government, may be a holder. An environmental covenant may identify more than one holder. The interest of a holder is an interest in real property.

(b) A right of an agency under this [act] or under an environmental covenant, other than a right as a holder, is not an interest in real property.

(c) An agency is bound by any obligation it assumes in an environmental covenant, but an agency does not assume obligations merely by signing an environmental covenant. Any other person that signs an environmental covenant is bound by the obligations the person assumes in

the covenant, but signing the covenant does not change obligations, rights, or protections granted or imposed under law other than this [act] except as provided in the covenant.

(d) The following rules apply to interests in real property in existence at the time an environmental covenant is created or amended:

(1) An interest that has priority under other law is not affected by an environmental covenant unless the person that owns the interest subordinates that interest to the covenant.

(2) This [act] does not require a person that owns a prior interest to subordinate that interest to an environmental covenant or to agree to be bound by the covenant.

(3) A subordination agreement may be contained in an environmental covenant covering real property or in a separate record. If the environmental covenant covers commonly owned property in a common interest community, the record may be signed by any person authorized by the governing board of the owners' association.

(4) An agreement by a person to subordinate a prior interest to an environmental covenant affects the priority of that person's interest but does not by itself impose any affirmative obligation on the person with respect to the environmental covenant.

Comment

Subsection (a) confirms that the holder holds an interest in real property, thus distinguishing that right from a personal or contractual right that does not run with the land. The definition of 'holder' in Section 2, departing from traditional real property concepts, makes clear that the holder may be the agency or the owner, thus making it possible for the owner to be both grantor and grantee.

Subsection (a) also makes clear that if the agency chooses to be the holder, the agency will thereby hold an interest in the real property. Otherwise, subsection (b) provides that the agency's interest in the covenant as a consequence of signing the covenant or having a right to enforce it under this Act is not an interest in real property.

Subsection (c) validates and confirms any contractual obligations that an agency may

assume in an environmental covenant. So, for example, if the agency were to agree to authorize certain activities on the property, to undertake periodic inspections of the site or to provide notice of particular actions to specified persons, those undertakings and obligations would be enforceable against the agency in accordance with their terms by parties adversely affected by any breach.

At the same time, subsection (c) also makes clear that the mere act of signing the covenant in order to signify the agency's 'approval' of the covenant, which is required by the Act as a condition of its effectiveness under this Act, is not an assumption of obligations and the agency has not thereby exposed itself to any liability. The agency manifests its approval of an environmental covenant by signing it. Likewise, subsection (c) makes this same principle clear for any other person that signs an environmental covenant; the rights and obligations of that person are established by other law and by the terms of the covenant and not merely by the fact that the person signed the covenant.

Subsection (d) restates and clarifies traditional real property rules regarding the effect of an environmental covenant on prior recorded interests. The basic rule remains that pre-existing prior valid and effective interests – "First in time, first in right" – remain valid. As § 7.1 of the Restatement (3d) of Property: Mortgages states:

"A valid foreclosure of a mortgage terminates all interests in the foreclosed real estate that are junior [that is, later in time] to the mortgage being foreclosed....Foreclosure does not terminate interests ...that are senior...."

At the same time, it is not uncommon for interested parties to re-order the priorities among them by agreement in order to accommodate the economic interests of various parties. The usual device used to re-order priorities is a so-called 'subordination' agreement. Again, this section tracks the outcome suggested in The Restatement (3d) of Property: Mortgages. Section 7.7 of the Restatement provides in pertinent part that:

A mortgage, by a declaration of its mortgagee, [that is, the lender] may be made subordinate in priority to another interest in the mortgaged real estate, whether existing or to be created in the future....A subordination that would materially prejudice the mortgagor [that is, the owner of the real estate] or the person whose interest is advanced in priority is ineffective without the consent of the person prejudiced.

The impact of the newly recorded environmental covenant on the priorities of other lien holders is sufficiently important that the Act emphasizes this issue both in this section and in Sections 8(b) and 9(c). In all these instances, the Act provides that the usual rules of priorities are

preserved, except in the case of foreclosure of tax liens.

Thus, in preparing an environmental covenant, it might be advisable for the agency to identify all prior interests, determine which interests may interfere with the covenant protecting human health and the environment, and then take steps to avoid the possibility of such interference. The agency may do this by, for example, having the parties obtain appropriate subordination of prior interests, as a condition to the agency's approval of the environmental covenant.

The combined effect of Sections 3, 8 and 9 creates a curious "circular" lien problem, where (1) foreclosure of a 2003 municipal tax lien would terminate a 2000 pre-existing mortgage (the usual outcome), but (2) that same foreclosure would not affect the environmental covenant created in 2002 under this Act; while (3) foreclosure of the 2000 pre-existing mortgage would terminate the 2002 environmental covenant (again, the usual rule), but (4) not the 2003 municipal tax lien (also, the usual rule). Circular liens, however, are not unique to this situation.

SECTION 4. CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.

(a) An environmental covenant must:

(1) state that the instrument is an environmental covenant executed pursuant to [insert statutory reference to this [act].]

(2) contain a legally sufficient description of the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) describe the activity and use limitations on the real property;

(4) identify every holder;

(5) be signed by the agency, every holder, and unless waived by the agency every owner of the fee simple of the real property subject to the covenant; and

(6) identify the name and location of any administrative record for the environmental response project reflected in the environmental covenant.

(b) In addition to the information required by subsection (a), an environmental covenant may contain other information, restrictions, and requirements agreed to by the persons who signed it, including any:

(1) requirements for notice following transfer of a specified interest in, or concerning proposed changes in use of, applications for building permits for, or proposals for any site work affecting the contamination on, the property subject to the covenant;

(2) requirements for periodic reporting describing compliance with the covenant;

(3) rights of access to the property granted in connection with implementation or enforcement of the covenant;

(4) a brief narrative description of the contamination and remedy, including the contaminants of concern, the pathways of exposure, limits on exposure, and the location and extent of the contamination;

(5) limitation on amendment or termination of the covenant in addition to those contained in Sections 9 and 10; and

(6) rights of the holder in addition to its right to enforce the covenant pursuant to Section 11.

(c) In addition to other conditions for its approval of an environmental covenant, the agency may require those persons specified by the agency who have interests in the real property to sign the covenant.

Comment

1. Subsection (a)(2) of this section requires that the covenant contain a “legally sufficient description” of the “real property” subject to the covenant. While these terms are familiar to real property practitioners, it may be useful to describe precisely what is required by this section.

First, a description of the real property that is “legally sufficient” will depend upon the practice of the enacting state. The purpose of such a requirement, for the real property practitioner, will be to assure that the particular parcel subject to the covenant will be properly indexed in the land records and thus readily located during the course of a title search. This, in turn, will enable a buyer, lender or other interest holder to be confident of what they own or hold as security.

The most commonly used legal descriptions of land are: (1) a metes and bounds

description - that is, a description that begins with reference to a known point on the surface of the earth, followed by references to distances and angles from that point to other monuments or terminals that mark the outer boundaries of the parcel; (2) reference to a recorded map or survey, that contains a “picture” of the metes and bounds description; (3) reference to a particular parcel number on a governmental grid system; and (4) a coordinates reference system, derived from a Global Positioning System or other mapping tool. These, and other generally obsolete forms of legal description [e.g., “starting at the black oak tree in the pasture, then running along a stone wall to Bloody Creek, then generally south and west along the creek to a dirt road, then back to the tree where you started, being the same 50 acres, more or less, conveyed to my father by Lisman”] may all serve the same purpose, and would meet the requirement of being “legally sufficient.”

In contrast, as described in Comment 11 below, more precise measurements may be very useful for identifying precisely the “geospatial” location of sub-surface contaminants.

Second, the “real property” that is subject to the covenant may be narrowly or broadly defined, depending on the wishes of the parties. It may be, for example, that only a 3 acre portion of a 5,000 acre ranch is contaminated; in such a case, it may be unnecessary to describe all 5000 acres of real property as being subject to the covenant.

Alternatively, in a remote location, it may be that the 3 acre contaminated parcel owned by one person may be reached only by crossing a private road located on a 5000 acre ranch owned by another person. In such a case, a careful property description will want to include reference to the easement or other access right across the land owned by another person.

It is important to recognize, however, that real property is a three-dimensional concept (or a four-dimensional concept when one considers time as a dimension). A legal description of a particular parcel of real property which has only perimeter boundaries and no upper and lower boundaries encompasses both the surface of the earth within those boundaries, the airspace above the surface, all the dirt and minerals below the surface and all spaces within that volume of space that may be filled with water. Thus, in appropriate cases, a title searcher will need to be sensitive to cases where interests in the “real property” or “real property” have been sold or leased which leave the owner with less than all of the real property. A ten-year lease of the entire parcel, for example, represents a time-defined “boundary” to the owner’s interest in the real property in question. An agency seeking to identify all the interests in the parcel in order to secure their approval of a covenant will therefore want to ensure that a title search identifies all these interests.

2. This Act does not provide the standards for environmental remediation nor the specific activity and use limitations to be used at a particular site. Those will be provided by the state or federal agency based on other state and federal law governing mandatory and voluntary cleanups. This Act contemplates that those standards will then be incorporated into the environmental response project, which, in turn, will call for activity and use restrictions that can be implemented through creation of an environmental covenant. This section addresses creation of the environmental covenants.

3. Ordinarily, an environmental covenant will be created only by agreement between the agency and the owner. If there is a holder other than the agency or the owner, both the agency and the owner must approve the holder, and the holder must agree to the terms of the covenant. The agency may refuse to agree to an environmental covenant if it does not effectively implement the activity and use limitations specified in the environmental response project.

Where no owner is available or willing to participate in the environmental response project, it may be necessary for the agency to condemn and take an interest sufficient to record an environmental covenant on the property where it has the power to do so. This Act does not contain independent condemnation authority for the agency. Alternatively, in some states, there may be a basis for an agency to require an owner to cooperate with the implementation of the covenant as a regulatory matter.

4. This Act recognizes that there may be situations in which there is more than one fee simple owner. For example, Husband and Wife may own Blackacre as tenants in common, joint tenants, or tenants of the entirety. In all of these configurations of ownership, both Husband and Wife are owners of Blackacre and both must sign an environmental covenant unless the agency waives this requirement.

Similarly, it is common practice in mining states, such as Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, for the fee ownership of the mineral interests to be conveyed separate and apart from the fee ownership of the remaining parcel. Thus, under the conventional real property practices of these states, there may be two separate fee ownership interests in the same "parcel" of real property, and each owner must sign the environmental covenant unless this requirement is waived. It may be that those two owners of different interests in the same parcel have an agreement between them prohibiting separate conveyances of interests in the land without permission of the other. However, if that agreement does not appear of record, it would not run with the land, would likely not be binding on the agency [in the absence of the agency's actual knowledge] and thus not affect the validity of a covenant signed by one of the owners with respect to that owner's interest in the real estate.

5. In addition to the parties specified in Section 4(a)(5), other persons may wish to sign the environmental covenant and, in any event, the agency may require their signature as a condition of approving the covenant. (See Section 4(c)). Under current law, persons other than the owner may be liable for cleanup of the contamination, including contingent future liability if further cleanup is needed or personal injury claims are brought. These could be parties which previously used the property or whose waste was disposed of on the property. Such a person may have liability for some or all of the cost of the environmental response project and may thus have a compelling interest in signing the covenant so as to be informed of future enforcement, modification and termination.

6. Section 4(a)(5) also authorizes the agency to waive the requirement that the covenant be signed by the owner of the fee simple. The Act contemplates that such waivers should be rare because in most situations the covenant can be effective only if the fee owner's interest is subject to the covenant. However, in some circumstances the fee owner may have transferred most or all of the economic value of the property to the holder of another interest, either permanently or for

the time period during which the covenant's restrictions are needed. Consider, for example, the situation in which the contamination remaining presents environmental risks for only twenty years and the property is subject to a ninety-nine year lease. In this case, it is critical that the owner of the leasehold interest be a party to the covenant so its interest will be subject to it. However, in this situation, the fee owner's participation is not essential for the covenant to protect human health and the environment. If the fee owner is unavailable or unwilling to participate, the agency might choose to waive its signature. Of course, such a situation, when the likely duration of the covenant is both short and clearly known, is likely to be exceptional.

7. A holder is the grantee of the environmental covenant and the Act requires that there be a holder for a covenant to be valid and enforceable. Under Section 5(b)(9), the grantee may also be the grantor, who is the owner of the property and who might remain a holder upon sale of the property, or the agency. In addition to enforcement rights, the holder may be given specific rights or obligations with respect to future implementation of the environmental covenant. These could include, for example, the obligation to monitor groundwater or maintain a cap or containment structure on the property. Such rights and obligations will be specified in the environmental covenant and, like any obligations, would be enforceable against the holder if the holder failed to satisfy its obligations.

8. Section 4(a)(5) requires an agency to sign the covenant. In some states it may be necessary to amend the state agency's enabling statute to empower it to so sign.

9. Section 4(a)(6) requires the covenant to disclose the "name and location of any administrative record" for the underlying environmental response project. Typically, this information will require a docket or file number, identifying names of the parties, and an indication of the agency office in which the record of decision or other administrative record has been retained. In those cases where a state-wide registry is maintained, the registry also requires this information. In the case of voluntary clean-ups, of course, there may not be an administrative record.

Section (4) (b) is a permissive provision intended by the breadth of its provisions ("...may contain other information ...agreed to by the persons who signed it...") to encourage the agency and the other parties to include provisions in the particular covenant that are tailored to the specific needs of that project. This may well be accomplished in order to maximize the likelihood that the covenant, when properly implemented and monitored, will protect human health and the environment.

Persons dealing with this Act must recognize that no statute and no commentary can fully contemplate all the possibilities that are likely to arise in implementation of this Act. This issue permeates this subsection. In (b)(1), for example, the text contemplates the possibility that the agency may, in a particular case, require an owner or other persons to notify the agency before, among other things, that party applies for "...building permits." The suggested language is not intended to exclude notice of any other type of work permit that might trigger a violation of an environmental covenant, such as, for example, drilling or excavation permits.

10. Section 4(b)(4) suggests that, in an appropriate case, the agency may wish to provide

a summary of the contamination on the site and the remedial solutions that have been identified. From a public health perspective, this may be very useful. The reference to “pathways of exposure” requires a statement that, for example, the contaminant might be of danger if it comes in contact with skin, if breathed, or only if ingested.

11. Section 4(b)(4) also suggests that, in an appropriate case, the agency may require the covenant to contain not only a legally sufficient description of the real property subject to the covenant (as mandated under section 4(a)(2)) but also the ‘location of the contamination.’”

One way of identifying such location is by the concept of “geospatial” location as defined by the Federal Geographic Data Committee of the U.S. Geological Survey. Such an identification would define the location with geospatial data, which the Committee defines as follows:

Geospatial Data: Information that identifies the geographic location and characteristics of natural or constructed features and boundaries on the Earth. This information may be derived from, among other things, remote sensing, mapping, and surveying technologies. Statistical data may be included in this definition....

Depending on the nature of the contamination and the size of the parcel subject to the covenant, a description of the “geospatial location” of the contamination and the legal boundary description of the real property parcel on which those contaminants are located may be very different, and the kinds of information required to usefully describe the “location” of the contamination may also differ. As a simple example, it may be appropriate to use grid coordinates and projected elevations below ground level to define the upper and lower levels of a groundwater contamination plume, together with sensing or other data that projects the mobility of that plume over time, in order to accurately provide useful information that a simple metes and bounds description could not convey.

12. Subsection (b)(5) contemplates that the environmental covenant may impose additional restrictions on amendment or termination beyond those required by this Act. For example, in some circumstances the owner or another party who may have contingent residual liability for further cleanup of the real property subject to the environmental covenant, may seek further restrictions in the covenant to protect against this contingent liability.

13. Subsection (c) confirms that the agency is under no obligation to approve a particular environmental covenant by signing it. This may be particularly significant in those cases where the agency was unable to secure subordination of prior interests in the real property which is proposed to be subject to the covenant. If a prior security or other interest is not subordinated to the environmental covenant, and then is foreclosed at some later time, under traditional real property law that foreclosure would extinguish or limit an environmental covenant. Since such an outcome is antithetical to the policies

underlying this Act, the Act contemplates that the agency may, before agreeing to the covenant, require subordination of these interests. At the time of creation of the environmental covenant, the agency must determine whether the prior interest presents a realistic threat to the covenant's ability to protect the environment and human health. Section 3 of the Act makes clear that by subordinating its interest, an owner of a prior interest does not change its liability with respect to the property subject to the environmental covenant. Any such liability of a subordinating party would arise by operation of other law and not under this Act.

Subsection (c) contemplates that there are many circumstances that might cause an agency, in the exercise of its regulatory discretion as defined in other law, either to refuse to sign a covenant in the form presented, or to agree to sign it only upon satisfaction of specified conditions. The listing of the following examples is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

Example 1: As a condition of signing the covenant, the agency requires the owner to provide an abstract of title of the property to be subjected to the covenant. If the owner declines to do so, the agency may reasonably be expected to decline to approve the covenant, since it will have insufficient evidence of the priority of its new covenant.

Example 2: The owner provides the title abstract, which discloses that the property to be subjected to the covenant is presently subject to a first mortgage for \$5 million. The agency's decision to condition its approval on the first lender's willingness to subordinate to the covenant would plainly be appropriate.

Example 3: The agency's policies require that an independent company regularly engaged in the business of monitoring and enforcing environmental covenants on behalf of the agency be named as 'holder' in the covenant. The owner's refusal to agree to such a provision would justify an agency's refusal to approve the covenant.

SECTION 5. VALIDITY; EFFECT ON OTHER INSTRUMENTS.

(a) An environmental covenant that complies with this [act] runs with the land.

(b) An environmental covenant that is otherwise effective is valid and enforceable even if:

(1) it is not appurtenant to an interest in real property;

(2) it can be or has been assigned to a person other than the original holder;

(3) it is not of a character that has been recognized traditionally at

common law;

(4) it imposes a negative burden;

(5) it imposes an affirmative obligation on a person having an interest in the real property or on the holder;

(6) the benefit or burden does not touch or concern real property;

(7) there is no privity of estate or contract;

(8) the holder dies, ceases to exist, resigns, or is replaced; or

(9) the owner of an interest subject to the environmental covenant and the holder are the same person.

(c) An instrument that creates restrictions or obligations with respect to real property that would qualify as activity and use limitations except for the fact that the instrument was recorded before the effective date of this [act] is not invalid or unenforceable because of any of the limitations on enforcement of interests described in subsection (b) or because it was identified as an easement, servitude, deed restriction, or other interest. This [act] does not apply in any other respect to such an instrument.

(d) This [act] does not invalidate or render unenforceable any interest, whether designated as an environmental covenant or other interest, that is otherwise enforceable under the law of this state.

Comment

1. Subsection (a), when considered with the common law, makes clear that environmental covenants will be binding not only on the persons who originally negotiate them but also on subsequent owners of the property and others who hold an interest in the property, such as tenants, so long as those owners and others have actual or constructive knowledge of the covenant.

To be binding on future owners who may not have actual knowledge of the covenant, the Act requires that the covenant comply with all provisions of the Act.

Section 8(a) of this Act requires the covenant to be recorded. The Act then states the usual real property rule that a recorded instrument “runs with the land” and binds all who have an interest in it.

2. Recording requirements are an important means by which the law protects ‘bona fide purchasers’ - BFP’s - who acquire property without knowledge of its conditions. Even in the absence of recording a document on the land records, the common law has long held that those who have actual knowledge of the document take title subject to the document. The BFP, on the other hand, is bound at common law only by an instrument affecting the real property to the extent the BFP has constructive knowledge of the document.

Importantly, a BFP is charged with constructive knowledge of the land records. In some respects, one of the fundamental tensions between traditional real property law and environmental law is the change in this rule, by which environmental law seeks to impose liability on “innocent” purchasers of contaminated property who take without knowledge of the property’s condition and may have no practical means of learning of its condition. To the extent this Act tracks traditional real property practice by requiring recorded covenants, this tension may be considerably lessened.

3. Subsection (b) and its comments are modeled on Section 4 of the Uniform Conservation Easement Act. One of the Environmental Covenant Act’s basic goals is to remove common law defenses that could impede the use of environmental covenants. This section addresses that goal by comprehensively identifying these defenses and negating their applicability to environmental covenants.

This Act’s policy supports the enforceability of environmental covenants by precluding applicability of doctrines, including older common law doctrines, that would limit enforcement. That policy is broadly consistent with the Restatement of the Law Third of Property (Servitudes), including §2.6 and chapter 3. For specific doctrines see §§ 2.4 (horizontal privity), 2.5 (benefited or burdened estates), 2.6 (benefits in gross and third party benefits), 3.2 (touch and concern doctrine), 3.3 (rule against perpetuities), and 3.5 (indirect restraints on alienation).

Subsection (b)(1) provides that an environmental covenant, the benefit of which is held in gross, may be enforced against the grantor or his successors or assigns. By stating that the covenant need not be appurtenant to an interest in real property, it eliminates the requirement in force in some states that the holder of an easement must own an interest in real property (the “dominant estate”) benefited by the easement.

Subsection (b)(2) also clarifies existing law by providing that a covenant may be enforced by an assignee of the holder. Section 10(c) of this Act specifies that assignment to a new holder will be treated as a modification and Section 10 governs modification of environmental covenants.

Subsection (b)(3) addresses the problem posed by the existing law’s recognition

of servitudes that served only a limited number of purposes and that law's reluctance to approve so-called "novel incidents". This restrictive view might defeat enforcement of covenants serving the environmental protection ends enumerated in this Act. Accordingly, subsection (b)(3) establishes that environmental covenants are not unenforceable solely because they do not serve purposes or fall within the categories of easements traditionally recognized at common law or other applicable law.

Subsection (b)(4) deals with a variant of the foregoing problem. Some applicable law recognizes only a limited number of "negative easements" – those preventing the owner of the burdened real property from performing acts on his real property that he would be privileged to perform absent the easement. Because a far wider range of negative burdens might be imposed by environmental covenants, subsection (b)(4) modifies existing law by eliminating the defense that an environmental covenant imposes a "novel" negative burden.

Subsection (b)(5) addresses the opposite problem – the potential unenforceability under existing law of an easement that imposes affirmative obligations upon either the owner of the burdened real property or upon the holder. Under some existing law, neither of those interests was viewed as a true easement at all. The first, in fact, was labeled a "spurious" easement because it obligated an owner of the burdened real property to perform affirmative acts. (The spurious easement was distinguished from an affirmative easement, illustrated by a right of way, which empowered the easement's holder to perform acts on the burdened real property that the holder would not have been privileged to perform absent the easement.)

Achievement of environmental protection goals may require that affirmative obligations be imposed on the burdened real property owner or on the covenant holder or both. For example, the grantor of an environmental covenant may agree to use restrictions and may also agree to undertake affirmative monitoring or maintenance obligations. In addition, the covenant might impose specific engineering or monitoring obligations on the holder, which may be for a profit corporation, a charitable corporation or trust holder. In all these cases, the environmental covenant would impose affirmative obligations and Subsection (b)(5) makes clear that the covenant would not be unenforceable solely because it is affirmative in nature.

Subsections (b)(6) and (b)(7) preclude the touch and concern and privity of estate or contract defenses, respectively. They have traditionally been asserted as defenses against the enforcement of covenants and equitable servitudes.

Subsection (b) (8) addresses the possibility that the holder may have died or for other reason fails to exist. Failure of the holder ought not invalidate the covenant and Sections 10(c) and (d) authorize replacement of a holder in various circumstances.

Subsection (b) (9) addresses the case where an owner of a contaminated parcel may agree to remedy an existing condition and may further agree to serve as holder in order to perform the necessary tasks. Under this Act, the owner may be willing to do so

because Section 4 of the Act requires that a holder be named and the owner may not be inclined to create an interest in a stranger. Under these circumstances, the owner's name would appear as both the grantor and the grantee in the land records, and this outcome ought not invalidate the covenant.

Subsection (b) identifies the principal common law doctrines that have been applied to defeat covenants such as those created by this Act. Drafters in individual states may wish to consider whether references to other common law or statutory impediments of a similar nature ought to be added to this subsection.

Subsection (c) addresses the treatment of instruments recorded before the date of this Act that seek to accomplish the purposes of environmental covenants under this Act. It seeks to validate such instruments, in a limited way, by specifying that the defenses covered in subsection (b), or the fact that the instrument was identified as something other than an environmental covenant, will not make prior covenants unenforceable. Beyond negating these specific defenses, however, this Act does not apply to those prior covenants. If the parties to a prior covenant wish to have the other benefits of this Act for that covenant, they must re-execute the covenant in a manner which satisfies the requirements of this Act.

Section (d) is a general savings clause for other interests in real property and other agreements concerning environmental remediation which are not covered under this Act. It disavows the intent to invalidate any interest created either before or after the Act which does not comply with the Act but which otherwise may be valid under the state's law. Nor does the Act intend, in any way, to validate or invalidate an action taken by a person to remediate contamination that is taken without formal governmental oversight or approval. A recorded instrument that does not satisfy the requirements of this Act does not come within the scope of this Act; it does not enjoy the protections of this Act and must be evaluated under other law of the state.

For example, the Act is clear that its requirements apply only to land use restrictions placed on real property pursuant to an "environmental response project" as that term is defined in the Act. If private parties choose to use conventional deed restrictions or other devices to place further activity and use restrictions on a parcel, nothing in this Act would affect that contractual arrangement either to insulate it from attack as invalid under that state's other law or to invalidate it under this law.

SECTION 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAND-USE LAW. This [act] does not authorize a use of real property that is otherwise prohibited by zoning, by law other than this [act] regulating use of real property, or by a recorded instrument that has priority over the environmental covenant. An environmental covenant may prohibit or

restrict uses of real property which are authorized by zoning or by law other than this [act].

Comment

This section clarifies that this Act does not displace other restrictions on land use laws, including zoning laws, building codes, sanitary sewer or subdivision requirements and the like. Restrictions under those laws apply unchanged to real property covered by an environmental covenant.

Where other law, including either a state or federal environmental response project, requires structures or activities in order to perform the environmental remediation, the status of those requirements is likely to be determined by that other law and not by this Act. Thus, for example, where the environmental covenant is implementing an environmental response project under federal CERCLA law, a federal appellate court has held that the federal law authorizing the environmental response project preempts a conflicting city ordinance. U.S. v. City and County of Denver, 100 F.3d 1509 (10th Cir. 1996).

Clearly, the large and complex body of zoning and land use law and the law of environmental regulation supplement the provisions of this Act. In appropriate cases, a court will be called upon to articulate the interrelationship of this Act and those laws, and the Act does not attempted to articulate all those outcomes. On the other hand, certain obvious examples may be helpful in understanding this interplay.

First, the Act contemplates that an environmental covenant might, for example, prohibit residential use on a parcel subject to a covenant. Under conventional real property principles, without references to this Act, such a prohibition or restriction in an environmental covenant will be valid even if other real property law, including local zoning, would authorize the use for residential purposes.

Alternatively, a covenant might, at the time it is recorded, permit both retail use and industrial use on a vacant parcel of contaminated real property while prohibiting residential use. Assuming all retail and industrial uses were permitted by local zoning at the time the covenant is recorded, the municipality might, before construction begins, change that zoning to bar industrial use. If such a zone change is otherwise valid under state law, nothing in this Act would affect the municipality's ability to "down zone" the parcel.

If, on the other hand, an industrial use was existing and ongoing at the time the covenant was recorded, and an effort was then made to prohibit that use by ordinance, such state law doctrines as "vested rights" or non-conforming uses, rather than this Act, would govern the validity of the zoning action.

SECTION 7. NOTICE.

(a) A copy of an environmental covenant shall be provided by the persons and in the manner required by the agency to:

(1) each person that signed the covenant;

(2) each person holding a recorded interest in the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) each person in possession of the real property subject to the covenant;

(4) each municipality or other unit of local government in which real property subject to the covenant is located; and

(5) any other person the agency requires.

(b) The validity of a covenant is not affected by failure to provide a copy of the covenant as required under this section.

Comment

This section contemplates that the agency will normally require that the final signed environmental covenant be sent to affected parties. In addition to the obvious persons who should be notified, in an appropriate case, the agency might require notice to abutting property owners. These persons are likely to have been directly involved in any major administrative proceeding, but in other cases, such as a voluntary clean-up, they may have no knowledge of the existing conditions on abutting land.

In any event, the extent and manner of giving notice rests in the discretion of the agency, and the statute imposes an affirmative duty on the persons required to provide that notice to comply.

Subsection (b) provides that failure to provide a copy of the covenant does not invalidate the covenant. Such a failure will not prevent the covenant from protecting human health and the environment and thus need not invalidate the covenant. The remedy for such a failure would be provided by other law.

SECTION 8. RECORDING.

(a) An environmental covenant and any amendment or termination of the

covenant must be recorded in every [county] in which any portion of the real property subject to the covenant is located. For purposes of indexing, a holder shall be treated as a grantee.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in Section 9(c), an environmental covenant is subject to the laws of this state governing recording and priority of interests in real property.

Comment

Subsection (a) confirms that customary indexing rules apply to the covenant. Since the owner is granting the enforcement right to a holder, all the owners' names would appear in the grantor index and the holder's name would appear in the grantee index.

In those states where a tract or another recording system other than a grantor/grantee index is used, this section should be revised as appropriate.

The Act assumes that all parties will wish to record the environmental covenant and accordingly makes the state's recording rules apply. As between the parties, however, the effectiveness of the covenant does not depend on whether the covenant is recorded. A signed but unrecorded covenant, under traditional real property law, binds the parties who sign it and, generally, those who have knowledge of the covenant.

The Act makes clear that, as with all recorded instruments, an environmental covenant takes priority under the normal rules of "First in time, First in Right." *See* The Restatement of The Law Third Property–Mortgages § § 7.1 and 7.3. In that sense, the covenant does not enjoy the same priority afforded real property tax liens, because of the substantial constitutional impediment such a change in priority would likely create.

However, the Act departs in important ways from the consequences of the normal priority and other traditional rules. For example, under Section 9, foreclosure of a tax lien cannot extinguish an environmental covenant. *See* Section 9(c).

Finally, in those cases where the holder's interest is transferred to a successor holder, the assignment of that interest will be recorded, and the usual grantor/grantee indexing rules would apply. Note, however, that under Section 10(d), the assignment would be treated as an amendment of the covenant.

Recording of an environmental covenant pursuant to the law of this state provides the same constructive notice of the covenant as the recording or any other instrument

provides of an interest in real property.

SECTION 9. DURATION; AMENDMENT BY COURT ACTION.

(a) An environmental covenant is perpetual unless it is:

(1) by its terms limited to a specific duration or terminated by the occurrence of a specific event;

(2) terminated by consent pursuant to Section 10;

(3) terminated pursuant to subsection (b);

(4) terminated by foreclosure of an interest that has priority over the environmental covenant; or

(5) terminated or modified in an eminent domain proceeding, but only if:

(A) the agency that signed the covenant is a party to the proceeding;

(B) all persons identified in Section 10(a) and (b) are given notice of the pendency of the proceeding; and

(C) the court determines, after hearing, that the termination or modification will not adversely affect human health or the environment.

(b) If the agency that signed an environmental covenant has determined that the intended benefits of the covenant can no longer be realized, a court, under the doctrine of changed circumstances, in an action in which all persons identified in Section 10(a) and (b) have been given notice, may terminate the covenant or reduce its burden on the real property subject to the covenant. The agency's determination or its failure to make a determination upon request is subject to review pursuant to [insert reference to appropriate administrative procedure act].

(c) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a) and (b), an environmental covenant may not be extinguished, limited, or impaired through issuance of a tax deed, foreclosure of a tax lien, or application of the doctrine of adverse possession, prescription, abandonment, waiver, lack of enforcement, or acquiescence, or a similar doctrine.

(d) An environmental covenant may not be extinguished, limited, or impaired by application of [insert reference to state Marketable Title and Dormant Mineral Interests statutes].

Comment

1. Subject to the other provisions in this Act, environmental covenants are intended to be perpetual, as provided in subsection (a). A covenant may be limited by its terms as provided in this Section, or amended or terminated under Section 10. Alternatively, in the limited circumstances described in this Section it may be modified in an eminent domain proceeding which meets the requirements of Subsection (a)(5). With concurrence of the agency, an environmental covenant may also be terminated in a judicial proceeding asserting “changed circumstances” as provided in Subsection (b).

2. Subsection (a)(5) provides special requirements to modify or terminate an environmental covenant by an exercise of eminent domain. The rationale for these special requirements is that an exercise of eminent domain may result in a change of use for real property. Such a change must ensure that it does not increase environmental risk related to the real property.

The Act does not attempt to resolve all the many complex issues likely to arise when one government agency seeks to condemn an environmental covenant imposed by another agency pursuant to an agreement with a current or former owner of the property. For example, eminent domain may result in a change of use of that property. If the changed use requires termination of the covenant’s existing activity and use limitations, and thus additional clean-up of the property, complex questions of liability and financial responsibility may arise. Alternatively, state law may already address questions of which governments have or do not have authority to condemn real property, or who are necessary or indispensable parties. State statutes are also likely to have so-called “quick take” provisions, a well developed Administrative Procedures Act, and other important provisions for aspects of condemnation proceedings beyond the scope of this Act.

Section 9(a)(5) has specific requirements for an exercise of eminent domain that modifies or terminates an environmental covenant. The applicability of this Act’s

eminent domain requirements to an eminent domain action under federal law will be determined by that law.

On the other hand, if the eminent domain proceeding were to go forward without the need to terminate or amend the environmental covenant, the existing covenant would remain in place and then the approval required by this subsection of the Act would not apply.

3. Subsection (b) imposes two specific requirements for a judicial change in an environmental covenant under the doctrine of changed circumstances. The first requires agency approval of such an application. The second requires that all parties to the covenant be given notice of the proceeding. This will allow those parties to protect their interests in the proceeding, including their interests arising from contingent future liability.

The Act intends that a court, in considering this section, would apply the doctrine of changed circumstances in its traditional sense – that is, as a proposed modification of the covenant to reduce or eliminate its burden. This section does not provide a substitute procedure for modifying a covenant to increase the burden on the real property. Such an outcome would be antithetical to the careful balancing of interests embedded in the Act. It would also be inconsistent with the expectations of owners and legally liable parties who have entered into the covenant with an expectation that the burden would not be increased except pursuant to the procedures set out in this Act.

4. Subsection (c) provides that environmental covenants are not extinguished by later tax foreclosure sales, or by a range of potential common law and statutory impairments. As a matter of public policy, these new forms of covenants seek to protect human health and the environment and, presumably, the contamination of the real property that led to the activity and use limitations would still be present if the covenant were extinguished. Accordingly, the impairment of those limitations as a consequence of application of tax lien foreclosure or other doctrines would likely result in greater exposure to health risk. Thus termination of that protection to serve other public policies of governments seems inconsistent.

In contrast, to avoid any suggestion of impairment of contract, the Act confirms that prior mortgages and other lien holders, upon foreclosure, may extinguish a subsequent covenant that was not subordinated. The lien holder in that case, of course, would still be faced with the physical condition of the property and the agency would have whatever regulations and rights against such an owner that state and federal law afforded.

5. While this section imposes statutory constraints on the authority of the court to act in the first instance, the Act does not restrict application of other procedural and administrative law to judicial supervision of agency conduct. Thus, if a court were to determine that an agency has acted in violation of its statutory obligations in considering whether to approve a modification or termination of an environmental covenant, that

conduct would be itself be subject to judicial scrutiny under other law of that state.

Where an environmental covenant applies to real property that is otherwise subject to one of the doctrines listed in Subsection (c), circumstances may arise in which the protections of the covenant are not needed. For example, rights gained by adverse possession would be limited by the environmental covenant's restrictions where a house had been inadvertently placed on real property subject to an environmental covenant that precluded residential use. In a case such as these, modification of the covenant can be sought pursuant to Section 10. Seeking such a modification will ensure that appropriate consideration will be given to residual environmental risks.

The basic policy of this Act to ensure that environmental covenants survive impairment is consistent with the broad policy articulated in the Restatement of the Law of Property (Servitudes) Third, §7.9.

States that do not have a Marketable Record Title Act or a Dominant Mineral Interests Act will not need subsection (d). States that do have either or both of these acts may choose to put this exception in the respective statute rather than in this Act.

The exception to the Marketable Record Title Act and the Dormant Mineral Interests Act in optional (d) is analogous to exceptions commonly made for conservation and preservation servitudes. Restatement of the Law of Property Third (Servitudes) § 7.16 (5) (1998). It is based on the public importance of ensuring continued enforcement of environmental covenants to protect human health and the environment. For states adopting the registry of environmental covenants to be kept by the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] under Section 12 of this Act, the cost of extending title searches to this registry should be low.

If there is any question whether a specific environmental covenant is exempt from the requirements of the Marketable Record Title Act or the Dominant Mineral Interests Act, the agency should comply with that Act by re-recording the covenant within the relevant act's specified statutory period. This will ensure that the covenant is not extinguished under either of these acts.

Finally, the fact that the Act specifies that notice of either an eminent domain proceeding or an action to apply the doctrine of changed circumstances be given to persons identified in Section 10 does not mean that other persons might not also be entitled to notice of the action or to intervene as parties in the action under other legal principles. Other state law may require such notice and this Act does not affect such other, additional notice requirements.

SECTION 10. AMENDMENT OR TERMINATION BY CONSENT.

(a) An environmental covenant may be amended or terminated by consent only if

the amendment or termination is signed by:

(1) the agency;

(2) unless waived by the agency, the current owner of the fee simple of the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) each person that originally signed the covenant, unless the person waived in a signed record the right to consent or a court finds that the person no longer exists or cannot be located or identified with the exercise of reasonable diligence; and

(4) except as otherwise provided in subsection (d)(2), the holder.

(b) If an interest in real property is subject to an environmental covenant, the interest is not affected by an amendment of the covenant unless the current owner of the interest consents to the amendment or has waived in a signed record the right to consent to amendments.

(c) Except for an assignment undertaken pursuant to a governmental reorganization, assignment of an environmental covenant to a new holder is an amendment.

(d) Except as otherwise provided in an environmental covenant:

(1) a holder may not assign its interest without consent of the other parties;

(2) a holder may be removed and replaced by agreement of the other parties specified in subsection (a); and

(3) a court of competent jurisdiction may fill a vacancy in the position of holder.

Comment

1. A variety of circumstances may lead the parties to wish to amend an environmental covenant to change its activity and use limitations or to terminate the

covenant.

Subsection (a) specifies the parties that must consent to the amendment. Subsection (a)(3) reaches a party that originally signed the covenant whether or not it was an owner of the real property. Such parties might typically be ones which were liable for some or all of the environmental remediation specified in the environmental response project, including contingent liability for future remediation. This provision is intended to apply to successors in interest to the party which originally signed the covenant where the successor continues to be subject to the contingent liability under the environmental response project.

Some of the original parties to the covenant may have signed the covenant because they have contingent liability for future remediation should it become necessary. The extension of that liability to successor businesses is a complex subject controlled by the underlying state or federal environmental law creating the liability. See Blumberg, Strasser and Fowler, The Law of Corporate Groups: Statutory Law, 2002 Annual Supplement, §18.02 and §18.02.4 (Aspen, 2002) and Blumberg and Strasser, The Law of Corporate Groups: Statutory Law—State §§ 15.03.2 and 15.03.3 (Aspen, 1995). Where the party that originally signed the covenant has been merged into or otherwise become part of another business entity for purposes of future cleanup liability, subsection (a)(3) is intended to require the consent of that successor entity rather than the consent of the original party.

2. In considering the potential liability of successor businesses, as discussed above, it is important to understand the dual chains of successors that a particular circumstance presents – (1) successors to ownership of the business that originally caused the contamination; and (2) successors to owners of the contaminated real property. Particularly when contamination occurred many years ago, those chains of successors may be very different.

Consider this hypothetical – although very typical – situation:

Real Property Ownership In 1925, Peter Plating, Inc. built a factory on a 3-acre lot in Hartford, CT and commenced its business, which was to apply chromium plating to coffee pots on that site. Customary business practice at the time was to discharge the exhausted chromium into “sumps” - holes dug in the ground, and filled with large stones. Peter Plating did this for 25 years.

In 1950, Peter Plating closed its Hartford plating operation, and sold the land and factory to Rabbit Warehouses, Inc. Rabbit used the factory for 25 years as a storage facility, and then sold the factory in 1975 to Ernie Entrepreneur, an individual, who bought the land with the proceeds of a first mortgage from First Local Bank.

Ernie used the factory for light manufacturing until 1985. He also leased part of the site to Acme Auto Repair, Inc. Acme dumped used oil and degreasers into its own sump on the lot. At some unknown date, Acme ceased operations.

In 1985, after Ernie learned of the contamination, he transferred ownership of the land to a corporation – Ernie, Inc. Ernie and his wife owned all the stock of the new corporation. In 1986, Ernie ceased operations, abandoned the factory, and moved with his family to an island off North Carolina. Ernie, Inc. was later administratively dissolved under state law for failure to file its annual reports.

First Local Bank started foreclosure in 1986, learned of the contamination, and withdrew the foreclosure action because of its reluctance to be in the chain of title. The Bank still holds the mortgage, but long ago wrote off the debt on its books.

Real property taxes have not been paid since 1984. City officials started to foreclose for unpaid taxes, but when they learned of the contamination, they, like First Local Bank, decided not to foreclose.

In 2002, the City demolished the factory as a safety measure, put a fence around it and put a \$200,000 demolition lien on the property. Today, the site is abandoned, and neighborhood children play games on the lot after crawling under the fence. Clean-up costs are estimated at \$1.6 million; a “clean” 1.5-acre lot in this run-down neighborhood recently sold for \$50,000.

The traditional “chain of title” doctrine in real property suggests that successive owners and operators of the real property, beginning with the original owner or tenant that caused contamination of the real property, may all have potential liability. In chronological order, they include: (1) Peter Plating, Inc.; (2) Rabbit Warehousing, Inc. (3) Ernie Entrepreneur, individually; (4) Acme Auto Repair, Inc.; and (5) Ernie, Inc.

Stock and Asset Ownership Aside from the successor real property ownership, we must also consider the successor ownership of the business that caused the contamination. Assume that 100% of Peter Plating’s stock was acquired by a publicly-held corporation, Jefferson, Inc., in 1950. The parent corporation moved the plating business to a southern state, which is why the Hartford business closed. In 1970, Jefferson sold off the plating assets, but no stock, to Hiccup, NA, a publicly traded British corporation. Both Jefferson and Hiccup are still in business.

This chain of stock and asset sales should result in at least one and perhaps two additional “successors” whose role in the transaction may require further analysis.

Assume this Act had been in effect in 1940, and Peter Plating, Inc. had signed the original environmental covenant. If the agency wishes in 2003 to amend the 1940 covenant, it will be important to determine who must sign on behalf of Peter Plating – the person who originally signed the covenant in 1940 – as required by subsection 10 (a) (3).

3. Note also that Ernie, Inc. – the current owner – has abandoned the property and moved out of state. Neither this corporation nor Ernie Entrepreneur, as an individual, is likely to cooperate in signing a new covenant today or an amendment to an

original covenant that was signed in 1940. This may pose practical difficulties in satisfying the requirements of Section 10)(a)(2).

4. In order to secure the consents required by this section, it is likely that the agency will require the party seeking the amendment to provide notice to the parties whose consent is required by the statute.

5. Note that this section does not require the consent of intermediate owners of the real property – in our example, if the original owner in 1940 was Peter Plating, and the current owner is Ernie, Inc., then Rabbit Warehouses, Inc., would not be required to approve an amendment to the covenant. Rabbit would have been bound by the covenant when it bought the parcel in 1975. Since there is no allegation that Rabbit took any action in violation of the covenant, and Rabbit conveyed the property to Ernie without retention of any interest in the property, Rabbit would not be affected by the covenant and therefore need not sign the amendment.

6. Finally, the covenant may be amended or terminated with respect only to a portion of the real property that was originally subject to the covenant. Thus, for example, if a covenant originally covered 100 acres of real property and as a result of remediation activity, 50 acres of the site eventually became completely free of contamination and pose no further environmental risk, the parties might agree to terminate the activity and use limitations on the cleaned up 50 acres while leaving the covenant in place on the remaining land.

7. As provided in Section 11(b), this Act does not limit the agency's regulatory authority under other law to regulate an environmental response project and the agency may be well advised to consider the implication of this provision in drafting a specific environmental covenant. Thus, for example, if new science suggested a need for additional monitoring or remediation at a contaminated site beyond that mandated in a recorded environmental covenant applicable to that site, the agency's authority to require that additional work would depend on other law, while its authority to impose the remediation cost on other parties may depend both on that law and on the terms of any prior agreements the agency may have executed with potentially liable parties.

Under this Act, however, the agency would be prevented from administratively releasing or amending real property covenants without approval of the parties designated in this section. Given the potential legal liability of the parties in the two chains of title who may be affected by an amendment to or termination of the covenant, this is an appropriate outcome.

However, over time, it may not be practical to identify the original parties or their corporate successors in order to secure their consent. Section 10(a)(3) provides a judicial mechanism by which the need for absent parties' consent may be avoided.

The same section highlights the possibility that the agency might seek the agreement of the original parties to future amendments of the covenant, without the need

for later consent. Such a waiver might be attractive to original parties, depending on the extent to which the agency was willing to hold original parties harmless from the liability that might otherwise accrue from a claimed injury following a use once prohibited by the original covenant, and depending also on the overall cost of the transaction.

Where there is a change in either the current knowledge of remaining contamination or the current understanding of the environmental risks it presents, the agency may conclude that the environmental response project should be changed or new regulatory action taken. The agency's ability to take such action is contemplated by §11(b) but, in the absence of consent, is not governed by this Act.

The agency may wish to consider whether the following parties have a sufficient interest in a particular proposal to make notice of the proposed amendment to them advisable:

- (1) All affected local governments;
- (2) The state regulatory agency for environmental protection if it is not the agency for this environmental response project;
- (3) All persons holding an interest of record in the real property;
- (4) All persons known to have an unrecorded interest in the real property;
- (5) All affected persons in possession of the real property;
- (6) All owners of the fee or any other interests in abutting real property and any other property likely to be affected by the proposed modification;
- (7) All persons specifically designated to have enforcement powers in the covenant; and
- (8) The public.

The agency may also wish to consider whether the notice should include any of the following:

- (1) New information showing that the risks posed by the residual contamination are less or greater than originally thought;
- (2) Information demonstrating that the amount of residual contamination has diminished; and
- (3) Information demonstrating that one or more activity limitations or use restrictions is no longer necessary.

SECTION 11. ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.

(a) A civil action for injunctive or other equitable relief for violation of an environmental covenant may be maintained by:

- (1) a party to the covenant;

(2) the agency or, if it is not the agency, the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection];

(3) any person to whom the covenant expressly grants power to enforce;

(4) a person whose interest in the real property or whose collateral or liability may be affected by the alleged violation of the covenant; or

(5) a municipality or other unit of local government in which the real property subject to the covenant is located.

(b) This [act] does not limit the regulatory authority of the agency or the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] under law other than this [act] with respect to an environmental response project.

(c) A person is not responsible for or subject to liability for environmental remediation solely because it has the right to enforce an environmental covenant.

Comment

1. Subsection (a) specifies which persons may bring an action to enforce an environmental covenant.

2. Importantly, the Act seeks to distinguish between the expanded rights granted to enforce the covenant in accordance with its terms, and actions for money damages, restitution, tort claims and the like.

This Act confers standing to enforce an environmental covenant on persons other than the agency and other parties to the covenant because of the important policies underlying compliance with the terms of the covenant. Thus, for example, in the case of a covenant approved by a federal agency on real property which has been conveyed out of federal ownership, the Act confers standing on a state agency to enforce the covenant, even though the agency may not have signed it. Further, a local affected government is empowered to seek injunctive relief to enforce a covenant to which it may not be a party. In both cases, absent this Act, those state and municipal agencies might not have standing to enforce a covenant, and might simply be relegated to seeking standing under other law.

Similarly, the mandated ‘holder’ has a statutory right to enforce the covenant under this section, since the holder must be a party to the covenant. Over time, the holder may come to play a significant role in the monitoring and enforcement process.

On the other hand, the Act does not provide any authority for a citizens' suit to enforce a covenant, although other law may authorize such suits. This Act does not affect that other law.

3. The Act does not authorize any claims for damages, restitution, court costs, attorneys' fees or other such awards. Standing to bring such claims, and the bases for any such cause of action, must be found, if at all, under other law. At the same time, while this action does not authorize any such cause of action, it does not bar them if available under other law.

4. Subsection (b) recognizes that in many situations the statutes authorizing an environmental response project will provide substantial authority for governmental enforcement of an environmental covenant in addition to rights specified in the environmental covenant. For example, EPA could bring a civil action to enforce an environmental covenant at a Superfund site under Section 106(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9606, or to enforce an environmental covenant at a RCRA facility under Section 7003 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6973.

[SECTION 12. REGISTRY; SUBSTITUTE NOTICE.

(a) The [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency] shall [establish and maintain a] [maintain its currently existing] registry that contains all environmental covenants and any amendment or termination of those covenants. The registry may also contain any other information concerning environmental covenants and the real property subject to them which the [state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency] considers appropriate. The registry is a public record for purposes of [insert reference to State Freedom of Information Act].

(b) After an environmental covenant or an amendment or termination of a covenant is filed in the registry [established][maintained] pursuant to subsection (a), a notice of the covenant, amendment, or termination that complies with this section may be recorded in the land records in lieu of recording the entire covenant. Any such notice

must contain:

(1) a legally sufficient description and any available street address of the real property subject to the covenant;

(2) the name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property, the agency, and the holder if other than the agency;

(3) a statement that the covenant, amendment, or termination is available in a registry at the [insert name and address of state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency], which discloses the method of any electronic access; and

(4) a statement that the notice is notification of an environmental covenant executed pursuant to [insert statutory reference to this [act]].

(c) A statement in substantially the following form, executed with the same formalities as a deed in this state, satisfies the requirements of subsection (b):

“1. This notice is filed in the land records of the [political subdivision] of [insert name of jurisdiction in which the real property is located] pursuant to, [insert statutory reference to Section 12 of the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act].

2. This notice and the covenant, amendment or termination to which it refers may impose significant obligations with respect to the property described below.

3. A legal description of the property is attached as Exhibit A to this notice. The address of the property that is subject to the environmental covenant is [insert address of property] [not available].

4. The name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property on the date of this notice is [insert name of current owner of the property and the

owner's current address as shown on the tax records of the jurisdiction in which the property is located].

5. The environmental covenant, amendment or termination was signed by [insert name and address of the agency].

6. The environmental covenant, amendment, or termination was filed in the registry on [insert date of filing].

7. The full text of the covenant, amendment, or termination and any other information required by the agency is on file and available for inspection and copying in the registry maintained for that purpose by the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] at [insert address and room of building in which the registry is maintained]. [The covenant, amendment or termination may be found electronically at [insert web address for covenant].”]

Comment

1. This section should be used only by states that require creation of a registry of environmental covenants pursuant to this optional Section. At the time this Act was promulgated, Section 101 of CERCLA had recently been amended to encourage states to create registries of sites where remediation work had been completed; *see* Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-118 § 128(b)(1)(C) (2002). The Act anticipates that in those states that choose to create such a registry for federal law purposes, this section would prove useful in integrating local land recording systems with a single, state-wide registry.

2. The notice specified in this Section may be recorded in the land records in lieu of recording the environmental covenant. However, such a notice should be authorized only if the registry is established and the environmental covenant is recorded there. Where there is no separate registry, the environmental covenant must be recorded in the land records and this notice would not be used.

3. A description of the property under subsection (b)(1) may include identification by latitude/longitude coordinates. Note also that a description of the location of the contamination itself on the site may require considerably more detail than the description of the real property subject to the covenant; *see* the discussion of this subject in the comments to Section 4.

4. The web address required to be contained in the notice by subsection (c)(7) should reflect the most direct means of identifying the full covenant and accompanying information. As appropriate, the address may require a specific internet address, page or name reference, document number or other unique identifying name, number or symbol.

A registry created under this optional section could be self-funding, in the same way that the corporate records departments of most Secretaries of State offices and the land recording offices of most counties and municipalities are self-funding.]

SECTION 13. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION. In applying and construing this uniform act, consideration must be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law with respect to its subject matter among states that enact it.

SECTION 14. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT. This [act] modifies, limits, or supersedes the federal Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. Section 7001 et seq.) but does not modify, limit, or supersede Section 101(c) of that Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001(c), or authorize electronic delivery of any of the notices described in Section 103(b) of that Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7003(b).

SECTION 15. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this [act] or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of this [act] which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this [act] are severable.




A Few Facts about
THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

PURPOSE: The Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA) provides clear rules for a perpetual real estate interest – an environmental covenant – to regulate the use of brownfields when real estate is transferred from one owner to another.

ORIGIN: Completed by the Uniform Law Commission in 2003.

APPROVED BY: American Bar Association, ABA Section on Real Property, Trust & Estate Law.

ENACTED BY:



For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at 312-450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.

TESTIMONY OF

David Glatt, Director of North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality

Chairman Larson and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, my name is David Glatt, Director for the North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The DEQ is responsible for the implementation of many of the environmental protection programs in the state. I am here today to provide testimony in support of HB 1079.

Historically the DEQ has provided technical and regulatory oversight relating to the cleanup and ongoing use of contaminated properties. The success of cleanup actions is dependent in part by the type of contaminant, site location and local geology. When cleanup of a property to background conditions is not achievable or would far exceed the property value, residual contamination may be left in place. Leaving contamination in place can result in the land being designated as a Brownfield where the land is typically left vacant, abandoned or underused. However, we note that some Brownfield properties can be safely used for certain activities with appropriate environmental controls. The environmental or institutional controls are also referred to as environmental covenants. These environmental covenants identify controls that ensure that the contamination does not spread or adversely impact human health.

North Dakota law has provided for environmental covenants since 2005. They are necessary to ensure environmental or institutional controls remain in place even if the property is transferred to new ownership. Although environmental covenants have been a useful tool in North Dakota for many years, there are concerns with the current law (NDCC 23.1-04-04). It provides little detail on how environmental covenants interact with other law areas, including real estate and environmental law. The need for law clarification recently became evident when working on a large cleanup project involving several environmental covenants.

The Uniform Environmental Covenant Act, which HB 1079 was modeled after, was drafted with input from various stakeholders, including regulators, landowners, and bankers. It has been adopted by 24 states and provides certainty for investors across state lines. Adopting the Uniform Environmental Covenant Act would ensure no conflicts or gaps in existing state law.

(continued)



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR, REGION VIII REGIONAL
ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY OFFICE- WESTERN US CUSTOM HOUSE
721 19TH STREET, ROOM 427
DENVER, CO 80202

Senator Diane Larson
Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee
North Dakota Legislature
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

12 February 2021

Subject: North Dakota House Bill 1079 (HB 1079)

On behalf of the military Services in North Dakota, I am writing to inform you of our opposition to HB 1079 unless amended.

The Department of Defense (DOD) does not have the authority to grant a real property interest, such as a restrictive environmental covenant, on federally owned real property. Accordingly, we propose the following amendment:

Section 47-37-04, add new subsection 5.

"An environmental covenant is not required in the case of real property owned by the United States and under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of Defense so long as the property remains under the administrative jurisdiction of the United States. The Department of Defense may issue cleanup decision documents, in consultation with the North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality, to achieve the substantive goals of an environmental covenant."

The DOD is dedicated to protecting public health and the environment and providing a safe environment for the men and women in uniform and their families. The DOD is committed to working with the State of North Dakota and its agencies on environmental restoration and related issues.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. If you have questions you can contact me at 303.844.0956 or at mark.a.mahoney.civ@mail.mil

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark Mahoney", is written over a faint, larger version of the same signature.

Sincerely, Mark Mahoney
Department of Defense
Regional Environmental Coordinator, Region 8

2021 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Judiciary Committee
Peace Garden Room, State Capitol

HB 1079
2/17/2021

A BILL for an Act to create and enact chapter 47-37 of the North Dakota Century Code, relating to the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.
--

Hearing called to order all Senators Present: **Myrdal, Luick, Dwyer, Bakke, Fors, Heitkamp, Larson.** [10:19]

Discussion Topics:

- Department of Environmental Quality establishing authority to require clean ups
- Concept of environmental covenants

David Glatt, Department of Environmental Quality provided testimony in favor and an amendment #6744 and #6815 [10:19]

Senator Myrdal moved to amend
[LC 21.0234.01001] [10:25]

Senator Luick seconded the motion [10:25]
Vote passed 7-0-0

Vote to Amend HB 1079	Vote
Senator Diane Larson	Y
Senator Michael Dwyer	Y
Senator JoNell A. Bakke	Y
Senator Robert O. Fors	Y
Senator Jason G. Heitkamp	Y
Senator Larry Luick	Y
Senator Janne Myrdal	Y

Senator Dwyer moved a DO PASS
AS AMENDED [10:27]

Senator Luick seconded the motion [10:27]
Vote Passed 5-2-0

Senator Dwyer Carried the bill

DO PASS AS AMENDED On HB 1079	Vote
Senator Diane Larson	Y
Senator Michael Dwyer	Y
Senator JoNell A. Bakke	Y
Senator Robert O. Fors	N
Senator Jason G. Heitkamp	N
Senator Larry Luick	Y
Senator Janne Myrdal	Y

Additional written testimony:

Kevin Ward, Department of Defense provided testimony in opposition #6559

Parrell Grossman, Uniform Law Commission provided testimony in favor #6561, #6562, #6563, #6564, #6565

Hearing Adjourned [10:30]

Jamal Omar, Committee Clerk

21.0234.01001
Title.02000

Adopted by the Judiciary Committee

February 17, 2021

21
1041

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1079

Page 2, line 1, replace "in section 23.1-04-04" with "under title 23.1"

Renumber accordingly

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1079: Judiciary Committee (Sen. Larson, Chairman) recommends **AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS** and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** (5 YEAS, 2 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1079 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 2, line 1, replace "in section 23.1-04-04" with "under title 23.1"

Renumber accordingly



Environmental Quality

Testimony in Support of
House Bill No. 1079
Senate Judiciary Committee
February 16, 2021

TESTIMONY OF

David Glatt, Director of North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality

Chairman Larson and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, my name is David Glatt, Director for the North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). The DEQ is responsible for the implementation of many of the environmental protection programs in the state. I am here today to provide testimony in support of HB 1079.

Historically the DEQ has provided technical and regulatory oversight relating to the cleanup and ongoing use of contaminated properties. The success of cleanup actions is dependent in part by the type of contaminant, site location and local geology. When cleanup of a property to background conditions is not achievable or would far exceed the property value, residual contamination may be left in place. Leaving contamination in place can result in the land being designated as a Brownfield where the land is typically left vacant, abandoned or underused. However, we note that some Brownfield properties can be safely used for certain activities with appropriate environmental controls. The environmental or institutional controls are also referred to as environmental covenants. These environmental covenants identify controls that ensure that the contamination does not spread or adversely impact human health.

North Dakota law has provided for environmental covenants since 2005. They are necessary to ensure environmental or institutional controls remain in place even if the property is transferred to new ownership. Although environmental covenants have been a useful tool in North Dakota for many years, there are concerns with the current law (NDCC 23.1-04-04). It provides little detail on how environmental covenants interact with other law areas, including real estate and environmental law. The need for law clarification recently became evident when working on a large cleanup project involving several environmental covenants.

The Uniform Environmental Covenant Act, which HB 1079 was modeled after, was drafted with input from various stakeholders, including regulators, landowners, and bankers. It has been adopted by 24 states and provides certainty for investors across state lines. Adopting the Uniform Environmental Covenant Act would ensure no conflicts or gaps in existing state law.

(continued)

Some key areas the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act would address that are currently not addressed in ND law are:

- **47-37-02:** adopts the basic rule that interests prior to the environmental covenant remain valid (e.g., a mortgage) (and clarifies that relevant parties can agree to re-order the priorities in a "subordination agreement")
- **47-03-04:** clarifies that certain common law defenses do not invalidate an environmental covenant
- **47-03-05:** clarifies that the Act does not authorize a use that is prohibited by zoning law or a prior recorded instrument
- **47-03-06:** expands who must receive notice of the environmental covenant
- **47-37-08 & 47-37-09:** clarifies and simplifies the termination or amendment of an environmental covenant
- **47-03-11:** requires the DEQ to establish a registry of environmental covenants and allows a notice of the covenant to be recorded instead of the entire document, which should simplify the recording process and make it easier for interested parties to locate documents

It is important to note that the DEQ has a companion bill, SB 2070, also referred to as the "mini Superfund" bill, that addresses other aspects of cleaning up contaminated properties. SB 2070 repeals NDCC 23.1-04-04 and includes reference to the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act. We believe HB 1079 would clarify the process and certainty to property owners and investors involved with the Environmental Covenants.

This concludes my testimony on HB 1079. I will stand for any questions from the committee.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1079

Page 2, line 1, replace "section 23.1-04-04" with "title 23.1"

Renumber accordingly.



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR, REGION VIII REGIONAL
ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY OFFICE- WESTERN US CUSTOM HOUSE
721 19TH STREET, ROOM 427
DENVER, CO 80202

Senator Diane Larson
Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee
North Dakota Legislature
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505

12 February 2021

Subject: North Dakota House Bill 1079 (HB 1079)

On behalf of the military Services in North Dakota, I am writing to inform you of our opposition to HB 1079 unless amended.

The Department of Defense (DOD) does not have the authority to grant a real property interest, such as a restrictive environmental covenant, on federally owned real property. Accordingly, we propose the following amendment:

Section 47-37-04, add new subsection 5.

"An environmental covenant is not required in the case of real property owned by the United States and under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of Defense so long as the property remains under the administrative jurisdiction of the United States. The Department of Defense may issue cleanup decision documents, in consultation with the North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality, to achieve the substantive goals of an environmental covenant."

The DOD is dedicated to protecting public health and the environment and providing a safe environment for the men and women in uniform and their families. The DOD is committed to working with the State of North Dakota and its agencies on environmental restoration and related issues.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns. If you have questions you can contact me at 303.844.0956 or at mark.a.mahoney.civ@mail.mil

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark Mahoney", is written in a cursive style.

Sincerely, Mark Mahoney
Department of Defense
Regional Environmental Coordinator, Region 8

Madam Chairwoman and members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am Parrell Grossman, and it is my privilege to be a member of the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission and member of the National Conference of Uniform Law Commissioners. I appear on behalf of the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission in support of House Bill No. 1079.

House Bill 1079 is the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act and was introduced at the request of the Commission on Uniform State Laws and on behalf of the Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”). Therefore, after my introductory comments and overview, Dave Glatt, Director of DEQ, will explain the legislation in more detail and may answer some of your particular questions about its purpose, function, impact, *et cetera*.

The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws is a nonprofit organization formed in 1892 to create nonpartisan state legislation. Over 350 volunteer commissioners, including legislators, legislative staff, lawyers, judges, law professors, and others work together to draft laws ranging from the Uniform Commercial Code to acts on property, trust and estates, family law, criminal law and other areas where uniformity of state law is desirable.

This uniform act has been enacted by 24 states, including South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska and Iowa.

I have attached the full Act for background because it provides important useful comments that, among other things, provide legislators and legislatures information on the purposes of various sections or provisions and how such provisions should be interpreted in the future when a state enacts the Uniform Law. In addition, I have attached a Summary of the Act, which also is too lengthy to discuss in any detail, although you should find it helpful if you have time to review this Summary.

The Uniform Law Commission has provided a list of reasons supporting the adoption of this act and I have attached the same. Therefore, I will share with you a few of the highlights.

The Act allows for the long-term enforcement of clean-up controls (restrictions on certain uses, prohibitions on using wells, protection of concrete “caps,” maintenance of monitoring equipment, etc.) to be contained in a statutorily-defined agreement known as an “environmental covenant” which will be binding on subsequent purchasers of the property and be listed in the local land records.

The Act removes various legal obstacles to the use of such restrictions and lessens liability concerns of sellers and lenders associated with the

redevelopment and sale of “brownfields” while at the same time requiring state approval of the remediation and control plan as well as notice to surrounding landowners, local governments, and other parties in interest. In this manner the Act protects public health and ensures the economically viable reuse of the property in question.

- It helps return previously contaminated property to the stream of commerce, by allowing the owners of that property to engage in responsible risk-based cleanups and then transfer or sell the property subject to state-approved controls on its use.
- It provides a broad array of interested parties the ability to enforce the use and activity restrictions contained in an environmental covenant, helping to ensure those controls will remain in place and prevent secondary harms.
- It protects valid environmental covenants from being inadvertently extinguished by application of various common law doctrines, adverse possession, tax lien foreclosures, less-restrictive zoning changes, and marketable title statutes.
- It requires the Department of Environmental Quality to be a signatory to the covenant, and ensures that risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science, adequately protect human health and surrounding properties, and that notice of the covenant and associated controls is provided to affected third parties.
- It **does not** supplant or impose substantive cleanup standards or liability; rather it validates approved site-specific controls resulting from an environmental response project, and makes sure those controls are maintained as long as necessary to meet the approved objectives.

The Act was drafted with the participation of state and federal regulators, public and private landowners, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts.

One of the North Dakota Commission members is Law Professor Owen L. Anderson, formerly of the University of North Dakota Law School and the University of Oklahoma Law School, and now a Professor and Distinguished Oil and Gas Scholar at the University of Texas School of Law in the Kay Bailey Hutchinson Center for Energy Law & Business. Professor Anderson noted that the law is designed to protect the integrity of contaminated property and to determine liability for interference with such property and the Uniform Act certainly is superior to existing North Dakota law on such covenants.

Therefore, the North Dakota Uniform Law Commission respectfully asks the Senate Judiciary Committee for a “Do Pass” recommendation for House Bill No. 1079.

With that, unless you have questions I can answer, I will defer to testimony by the DEQ Director, Dave Glatt.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

- A Summary -

Virtually everywhere in America, state and local governments are struggling with the problem of brownfields – vacant, abandoned and underused sites with various forms and degrees of environmental contamination. Reclaiming many of these sites for beneficial uses is very difficult and very expensive. Total cleanup, if possible, would often cost much more than the market value of the property. However, if a legal mechanism can be developed for long term control of use and clean-up or remediation (the current term of art), some properties may be safely returned to use and may be bought and sold. Current real property law is inadequate. Various common-law doctrines and other legal rules often work against such long-term controls, a situation which undermines the use and marketability of contaminated property.

In 2003, the Uniform Law Commission promulgated the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA) to overcome the inadequate common law rules. The statutory legal mechanism it creates is called an “environmental covenant.” Covenants are generally recognized in the common law as a means of conveying restrictions on use of land. The environmental covenant relies on the common law base, but re-creates it for the specific purpose of controlling the use of contaminated real estate, perpetually if necessary, while allowing that real estate to be conveyed from one person to another subject to those controls.

An environmental covenant is a specific recordable interest in the real estate. It arises from an environmental response project that imposes activity and use limitations. Such a project must arise under an appropriate federal or state program or approval for cleanup of the property or closure of a waste management site. No environmental covenant is effective without the relevant agency signature. The interest is created in a specific instrument for the purpose. The instrument recites the controls and remediation requirements imposed upon the property. The rights under the covenant must be granted to a party or parties called the holders. The covenant is perpetual unless limited in time within the instrument. It runs with the land and does not have to be “appurtenant.” This means it cannot be extinguished when one owner transfers rights or interests in the property to another, no matter who the holders are.

Two principal policies are served by confirming the validity of environmental covenants. One is to ensure that land use restrictions, mandated environmental monitoring requirements, and a wide range of common engineering controls designed to control the potential environmental risk of residual contamination will be recorded in the land records and effectively enforced over time as a valid real property servitude. UECA reverses the variety of common law doctrines that cast doubt on such enforceability.

A second important policy served by UECA is the return of previously contaminated property, often located in urban areas, to the stream of commerce. The environmental and real property legal communities have often been unable to identify a common set of principles applicable to such properties. The frequent result has been that these properties do not attract interested purchasers and therefore remain vacant, blighted and unproductive. This is an undesirable

outcome for communities seeking to return once important commercial sites to productive use. Large numbers of contaminated sites, often known as brownfields, are unlikely to be successfully recycled until regulators, owners, responsible parties, affected communities, and prospective purchasers and their lenders become confident that environmental covenants will be properly drafted, implemented, monitored and enforced for so long as needed. UECA should encourage transfer of ownership and property re-use by offering a clear and objective process for creating, modifying or terminating environmental covenants and for recording these instruments which will appear in any title abstract for the property in question.

At the time UECA was promulgated, approximately half the states had laws providing for land use restrictions in some real estate form pertaining to environmental contamination. Those existing laws varied greatly in scope – some simply noted the need for land use restrictions, while others created tools similar to many of the legal structures envisioned by UECA. Most such acts applied only to cleanups under a state program. In contrast, UECA includes a number of provisions absent from most of those outdated state laws, including the act's applicability to both federal and state-led cleanups. It ensures that a covenant will survive despite tax lien foreclosure, adverse possession, and marketable title statutes. UECA also provides detailed provisions regarding termination and amendment of covenants, and includes important provisions on dealing with recorded interests that have priority over the new covenant. There is broad enforcement authority to make sure a covenant does govern the property. Holders are expected to enforce, but any party to the covenant and appropriate agencies may enforce as well. Further, UECA offers guidance to courts confronted with a proceeding that seeks to terminate such a covenant through eminent domain or the doctrine of changed circumstances.

Under UECA, the governmental regulators who sign an environmental covenant will serve to ensure that the risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science and that affected third parties have notice of the covenant and associated controls. The act specifies that persons with a recorded interest in the property or who are in possession of the property, together with local governments in which the property is located and any other person the agencies require, must be given notice of the covenant. Environmental covenants, and any associated amendments or terminations, must be recorded in the local land records.

It is important to note UECA does not supplant or impose substantive clean-up standards, either generally or in a particular case. The act assumes those standards will be developed in the prior regulatory process. Rather, UECA validates site-specific, environmental use restrictions that result from the environmental response project which an environmental covenant helps implement. Implicit in use controls is the fact that, despite best efforts, total cleanups of many contaminated sites are not possible, but property may be put to limited uses without risk to others, nonetheless. UECA also does not affect the liability of principally responsible parties for the cleanup or any harm caused to third parties by the contamination – rather it provides a method for minimizing the exposure of third parties to such risks and for owners and responsible parties to engage in long-term cleanup mechanisms.

The Uniform Environmental Covenants Act is an important tool in revitalizing inner cities and other areas where vacant and underused properties are preventing vital redevelopment and economic expansion. It was drafted with the active participation of federal and state

environmental regulators, public and private land holders, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts. Its uniform enactment nationwide will provide owners, especially owners with properties in multiple states, with the confidence to engage in long-term remediation strategies and use controls, and bring economic growth back to blighted sites and areas.

For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at (312) 450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.



WHY YOUR STATE SHOULD ADOPT THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT (UECA)

The **Uniform Environmental Covenants Act** allows for the long-term enforcement of clean-up controls (restrictions on certain uses, prohibitions on using wells, protection of concrete “caps,” maintenance of monitoring equipment, etc.) to be contained in a statutorily-defined agreement known as an “environmental covenant” which will be binding on subsequent purchasers of the property and be listed in the local land records. The purpose of this act is to remove various legal impediments to the use of such restrictions and to thereby lessen liability concerns of sellers and lenders associated with the redevelopment and sale of “brownfields” while at the same time requiring state approval of the remediation and control plan as well as notice to surrounding landowners, local governments, and other parties in interest. By ensuring such “institutional controls” are maintained and enforced, UECA helps fulfill the dual purposes of such restrictions – the protection of human health and the economically viable reuse of the property in question.

- UECA helps to return previously contaminated property to the stream of commerce, by allowing the owners of that property to engage in responsible risk-based cleanups and then transfer or sell the property subject to state-approved controls on its use.
- UECA gives a broad array of interested parties the ability to enforce the use and activity restrictions contained in an environmental covenant, thereby helping to ensure those controls will remain in place and prevent secondary harms.
- UECA protects valid environmental covenants from being inadvertently extinguished by application of various common law doctrines, adverse possession, tax lien foreclosures, less-restrictive zoning changes, and marketable title statutes.
- UECA requires the state environmental agency to be a signatory to the covenant, thereby ensuring that risk assessments and control mechanisms are based on sound science, adequately protect human health and surrounding properties, and that notice of the covenant and associated controls is provided to affected third parties.
- UECA does not supplant or impose substantive cleanup standards or liability; rather it validates approved site-specific controls resulting from an environmental response project, and makes sure those controls are maintained as long as necessary to meet the objective for which they were approved.

The **Uniform Environmental Covenants Act** is an important tool in revitalizing inner cities and other areas where vacant and underused properties are preventing vital redevelopment. It was drafted with the participation of state and federal regulators, public and private land owners, banking interests, environmentalists, and land use experts. Its enactment will provide the owners of contaminated land the confidence to invest in long-term remediation strategies and use controls, while at the same time protecting human health and allowing those properties to be developed and thus bring economic revitalization to blighted areas and sites.

For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at (312) 450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

drafted by the

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS

ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

and by it

APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED FOR ENACTMENT
IN ALL THE STATES

at its

MEETING IN ITS ONE-HUNDRED-AND-TWELFTH YEAR
WASHINGTON, DC

AUGUST 1-7, 2003

WITH PREFATORY NOTE AND COMMENTS

Copyright ©2003

By

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

September 27, 2018

DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

WILLIAM R. BREETZ, JR., University of Connecticut School of Law, Connecticut Urban
Legal Initiative, 35 Elizabeth Street, Room K-202, Hartford, CT 06105, *Chair*

MARION W. BENFIELD, JR., 10 Overlook Circle, New Braunfels, TX 78132

DAVID D. BIKLEN, 153 N. Beacon St., Hartford, CT 06105

STEPHEN C. CAWOOD, 108 ½ Kentucky Ave., P.O. Drawer 128, Pineville, KY 40977-0128

BRUCE A. COGGESHALL, One Monument Sq., Portland, ME 04101

FRANK W. DAYKIN, 2180 Thomas Jefferson Dr., Reno, NV 89509, *Committee on Style*

Liaison

THEODORE C. KRAMER, 45 Walnut St., Brattleboro, VT 05301

DONALD E. MIELKE, Ken Caryl Starr Centre, 7472 S. Shaffer Ln., Suite 100, Littleton, CO
80127

LARRY L. RUTH, 530 S. 13th St., Suite 110, Lincoln, NE 68508-2820, *Enactment Plan
Coordinator*

HIROSHI SAKAI, 3773 Diamond Head Circle, Honolulu, HI 96815

YVONNE L. THARPES, Legislature of the Virgin Islands, Capitol Building, P.O. Box 1690, St.
Thomas, VI 00804

MICHELE L. TIMMONS, Office of the Revisor of Statutes, 700 State Office Bldg., 100 Rev.
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., St. Paul, MN 55155

KURT A. STRASSER, University of Connecticut School of Law, 65 Elizabeth St., Hartford, CT
06105-2290, *Reporter*

EX OFFICIO

K. KING BURNETT, P.O. Box 910, Salisbury, MD 21803-0910, *President*

CARL H. LISMAN, 84 Pine St., P.O. Box 728, Burlington, VT 05402, *Division Chair*

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADVISOR

ROGER D. SCHWENKE, Carlton Fields, PA 1 Harbour Pl., 777 S. Harbour Is. Blvd., P.O. Box
3239, Tampa, FL 33602-5950

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

WILLIAM HENNING, University of Alabama School of Law, Box 870382, Tuscaloosa, AL
35487-0382, *Executive Director*

WILLIAM J. PIERCE, 1505 Roxbury Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, *Executive Director
Emeritus*

Copies of this Act may be obtained from:
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS
211 E. Ontario Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312/915-0195
www.nccusl.org

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prefatory Note.....	1
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE	6
SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS.....	6
SECTION 3. NATURE OF RIGHTS; SUBORDINATION OF INTERESTS.....	11
SECTION 4. CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.....	14
SECTION 5. VALIDITY; EFFECT ON OTHER INSTRUMENTS.....	20
SECTION 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAND-USE LAW.....	24
SECTION 7. NOTICE.....	26
SECTION 8. RECORDING.....	26
SECTION 9. DURATION; AMENDMENT BY COURT ACTION.....	28
SECTION 10. AMENDMENT OR TERMINATION BY CONSENT.....	31
SECTION 11. ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.....	36
[SECTION 12. REGISTRY; SUBSTITUTE NOTICE.].....	38
SECTION 13. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION.....	41
SECTION 14. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT.....	41
SECTION 15. SEVERABILITY.....	41

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

Prefatory Note

Environmental covenants - whether called “institutional controls”, “land use controls” or some other term - are increasingly being used as part of the environmental remediation process for contaminated real property. An environmental covenant typically is used when the real property is to be cleaned up to a level determined by the potential environmental risks posed by a particular use, rather than to unrestricted use standards. Such risk-based remediation is both environmentally and economically preferable in many circumstances, although it will often allow the parties to leave residual contamination in the real property. An environmental covenant is then used to implement this risk-based cleanup by controlling the potential risks presented by that residual contamination.

Two principal policies are served by confirming the validity of environmental covenants. One is to ensure that land use restrictions, mandated environmental monitoring requirements, and a wide range of common engineering controls designed to control the potential environmental risk of residual contamination will be reflected on the land records and effectively enforced over time as a valid real property servitude. This Act addresses a variety of common law doctrines - the same doctrines that led to adoption of the Uniform Conservation Easement Act - that cast doubt on such enforceability.

A second important policy served by this Act is the return of previously contaminated property, often located in urban areas, to the stream of commerce. The environmental and real property legal communities have often been unable to identify a common set of principles applicable to such properties. The frequent result has been that these properties do not attract interested purchasers and therefore remain vacant, blighted and unproductive. This is an undesirable outcome for communities seeking to return once important commercial sites to productive use.

Large numbers of contaminated sites are unlikely to be successfully recycled until regulators, potentially responsible parties, affected communities, prospective purchasers and their lenders become confident that environmental covenants will be properly drafted, implemented, monitored and enforced for so long as needed. This Act should encourage transfer of ownership and property re-use by offering a clear and objective process for creating, modifying or terminating environmental covenants and for recording these actions in recorded instruments which will be reflected in the title abstract of the property in question.

Of course, risk-based remediation must effectively control the potential risk presented by the residual contamination that remains in the real property and thereby protect human health and the environment. When risk-based remediation imposes restrictions on how the property may be used after the cleanup, requires continued monitoring of the site, or requires construction of permanent containment or other remedial structures on the site, environmental covenants are crucial tools to make these restrictions and requirements effective. Yet environmental covenants can do so only if their legal status under state property law and their practical enforceability are

assured, as this proposed Uniform Act seeks to do.

At the time this Act was promulgated, approximately half the states had laws providing for land use restrictions in conjunction with risk-based remedies. Those existing laws vary greatly in scope – some simply note the need for land use restrictions, while others create tools similar to many of the legal structures envisioned by this Act. Most such acts apply only to cleanups under a state program.

In contrast, this Act includes a number of provisions absent from most existing state laws, including the Act's applicability to both federal and state-led cleanups. For example, this Act expressly precludes the application of traditional common law doctrines that might hinder enforcement. It ensures that a covenant will survive despite tax lien foreclosure, adverse possession, and marketable title statutes. The Act also provides detailed provisions regarding termination and amendment of older covenants, and includes important provisions on dealing with recorded interests that have priority over the new covenant. Further, it offers guidance to courts confronted with a proceeding that seeks to terminate such a covenant through eminent domain or the doctrine of changed circumstances.

This Act benefited greatly during the drafting process from broad stakeholder input. As a result, the Act contains unique provisions designed to protect a variety of interests commonly absent in existing state laws. For example, the Act confers on property owners that grant an environmental covenant the right to enforce the covenant and requires their consent to any termination or modification. This should mitigate an owner's future liability concerns for residual contamination and encourage the sale and reuse of contaminated properties. And, following traditional real property principles, the Act validates the interests of lenders who hold a prior mortgage on the contaminated property, absent voluntary subordination.

It is important to emphasize that environmental covenants are but one tool in a larger context of environmental remediation regulation; remediation is typically overseen by a government agency enforcing substantial statutory and regulatory requirements. The covenant should be the crucial end result of that process - it may be used to ensure that the activity and use limitations imposed in the agency's remedial decision process remain effective, and thus protect the public from residual contamination that remains, while also permitting re-use of the site in a timely and economically valuable way.

Environmental remediation projects may be done in a widely diverse array of contamination fact patterns and regulatory contexts. For example, the remediation may be done at a large industrial operating or waste disposal site. In such a situation, the cleanup could be done under federal law and regulation, such as the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA") or the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"). Generally speaking, CERCLA and RCRA would also apply to remediation done at Department of Defense or Department of Energy sites that are anticipated to be transferred out of federal ownership.

In other situations, state law and regulation will be an effective regulatory framework for remediation projects. State law is given a role to play in the federal environmental policy

discussed above. Beyond this, state law may be the primary source of regulatory authority for many remediation projects. These may include larger sites and will often include smaller, typically urban, sites. In addition, many states authorize and supervise voluntary cleanup efforts, and these also may find environmental covenants a useful policy tool. With both state and federal environmental remediation projects, the applicable cleanup statutes and regulations will provide the basis for the restrictions and controls to be included in the resulting environmental covenants.

This Act does not supplant or impose substantive clean-up standards, either generally or in a particular case. The Act assumes those standards will be developed in a prior regulatory proceeding. Rather, the Act is intended to validate site-specific, environmental use restrictions resulting from an environmental response project that proposes to leave residual contamination in the ground in any of the different situations described above. Once the governing regulatory authority and the property owner have determined to use a risk-based approach to cleanup to protect the public from residual contamination, this Act supplies the legal infrastructure for creating and enforcing the environmental covenant under state law.

This Act does not require issuance of regulations. However, many state and federal agencies have developed implementation tools, including model covenants, statements of best practices, and advisory groups that include members of the real property and environmental practice bars as well as business and environmental groups. Developing and sharing such implementation tools and the advice of such advisory groups should support the effective implementation of the Act and is encouraged.

This Act does not address or change the larger context of environmental remediation regulation discussed above, and a number of aspects of that regulation should be noted here.

First, many contaminated properties are subject to the concurrent regulatory jurisdiction of both federal and state agencies. This Act does not address the exercise of such concurrent jurisdiction, and it is not intended to limit the jurisdiction of any state agency.

A specific issue arises with federal property that is not anticipated to be transferred to a non-federal owner. This Act takes no position regarding the question of whether remediation of such property is subject to State regulatory jurisdiction. In contrast, where federal property is transferred to a non-federal owner, state agencies will clearly have jurisdiction over environmental covenants on the transferred property where state environmental law so provides.

Second, potential purchasers of property subject to an environmental covenant should be aware that both state and federal environmental law other than this Act may authorize reopening the environmental remediation determination, even after the relevant statutory standards have been met on that site. While such reopeners are rare, they may be possible to respond either to newly-discovered contamination or new scientific knowledge of the risk posed by existing contamination. As a consequence, under existing environmental law, the then-current owner may have remediation liability. While the dampening effect of such potential liability on the willingness of potential purchasers to buy contaminated property is clear, the issue remains

important in the eyes of some interest groups. Federal law now provides protection for bona fide purchasers of such property under specified circumstances, and the law of some states may also afford some protection. However, this Act does not provide any such bona fide purchaser protection.

For these and other reasons, it is important that prospective purchasers of contaminated properties - particularly those successors who may buy some years after a clean-up has been completed - have actual knowledge of covenants at the time of purchase. Environmental covenants recorded pursuant to this Act will provide constructive notice of the covenant and in many circumstances recording will provide actual notice. However, to ensure that such persons have actual notice, a state or a local recording authority may wish to highlight the existence of environmental covenants in their communities with maps showing the location of properties subject to environmental covenants, similar to the kinds of maps commonly found in local land records offices to show the location of zoning districts or flood plains.

Legislative Notes

Non Participating Owner. This Act contemplates a situation where a risk based clean-up is agreed to by the regulatory agency and the parties responsible for the clean-up, potentially including the fee owner and the owners of other interests in the property. As a consequence of that agreement, the Act assumes those parties will each negotiate the terms of and then sign the covenant.

The Act assumes the owners of appropriate interests in contaminated property will be willing to sign the covenant. Cooperation is not always possible, however. State and federal regulatory systems make a number of parties, in addition to the current owner of a fee simple or some other interests, potentially liable for the cost of remediation of contaminated real property. As a result, a remediation project may proceed even though an owner is no longer present or interested in the property. In those circumstances, the remediation project would be conducted pursuant to regulatory orders and could be financed either by other liable parties or by public funds. However, an environmental covenant may still be a useful tool in implementing the remediation project even in these situations.

When an owner is either unavailable or unwilling to participate in the environmental response project, it may be appropriate to condemn and take a partial interest in the real property in order to be able to record a valid servitude on it. Under the law of some states, states have the power to take that owner's interest by condemnation proceedings, paying the value of the interest taken, and then enter an environmental covenant as an owner. Where there is substantial contamination, the property may have little or no market value. In some states the court would take the cost of remediation into account in establishing the fair market value of the interest taken. See, e.g., *Northeast Ct. Economic Alliance, Inc. v. ATC Partnership*, 256 Conn. 813, 776 A.2d 1068 (2001). Although effective implementation of this Act may require that the state have a power of condemnation, this Act does not provide a substantive statutory basis for that power, and the state must therefore rely on other state law. Each state considering adoption of this Act should ensure that such a condemnation power is available for this purpose.

Similarly, while this Act provides substantive law governing creation, modification, and termination of environmental covenants, it does not include special administrative procedures for these and does not change the remedial decision making process. Rather, the Act presumes that the state's general administrative law or any specific procedure governing the environmental response project would apply to these activities.

“Actual” versus “Constructive” Notice of Contamination. The primary goal of the Act is to present to the states a statute that fully integrates environmental covenants into the traditional real property system. It seeks to ensure the long-term viability of those covenants by, among other means, providing constructive notice of those covenants to the world through resort to the land recording system.

Beyond that goal, it is very important to provide actual knowledge of the remaining contaminated conditions that the environmental covenants are designed to control. A broad range of stakeholders—children and adults that might inadvertently gain access to the contamination, tenants on the property, owners, abutting neighbors, prospective buyers, lenders, government officials, title insurance companies, public health providers and others—will have a real personal and financial stake in knowing what properties in their communities suffer from contamination and the extent of the risks they confront. The fact that this law may provide legally sufficient knowledge of those conditions is no substitute for real information regarding those conditions.

The challenge of providing that information is beyond the scope of this Act. However, in analogous situations—the location of zoning districts, flood plain boundaries, utility easements, and dangerous street conditions, for example—governments have devised techniques to make the public aware of those conditions on a continuing basis. Techniques such as maps in recorders' offices, on-site signage and monuments and, increasingly, computer databases accessible to the public are examples of possible solutions. All such devices have fiscal implications and are best addressed on a local basis. Over the long term, however, the public will likely be well served by innovative solutions to these issues.

Legislative Policy. Finally, this Act does not include a section of policy and legislative findings, although some states may choose to use such a section. If such a section is desired, the Colorado Statute, C.S.R.A. §25-15-317, may be an appropriate model.

UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This [act] may be cited as the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS. In this [act]:

(1) “Activity and use limitations” means restrictions or obligations created under this [act] with respect to real property.

(2) “Agency” means the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] or any other state or federal agency that determines or approves the environmental response project pursuant to which the environmental covenant is created.

(3) “Common interest community” means a condominium, cooperative, or other real property with respect to which a person, by virtue of the person’s ownership of a parcel of real property, is obligated to pay property taxes or insurance premiums, or for maintenance, or improvement of other real property described in a recorded covenant that creates the common interest community.

(4) “Environmental covenant” means a servitude arising under an environmental response project that imposes activity and use limitations.

(5) “Environmental response project” means a plan or work performed for environmental remediation of real property and conducted:

(A) under a federal or state program governing environmental remediation of real property, including [insert references to state law governing environmental remediation];

(B) incident to closure of a solid or hazardous waste management unit, if the closure is conducted with approval of an agency; or

(C) under a state voluntary clean-up program authorized in [insert reference to

appropriate state law].

(6) “Holder” means the grantee of an environmental covenant as specified in Section 3(a).

(7) “Person” means an individual, corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, public corporation, government, governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, or any other legal or commercial entity.

(8) “Record”, used as a noun, means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

(9) “State” means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Comment

1. The following are examples of subsection (1) activity and use limitations:

(1) a prohibition or limitation of one or more uses of or activities on the real property, including restrictions on residential use, drilling for or pumping groundwater, or interference with activity and use limitations or other remedies,

(2) an activity required to be conducted on the real property, including monitoring, reporting, or operating procedures and maintenance for physical controls or devices,

(3) any right of access necessary to implement the activity and use limitations, and

(4) any physical structure or device required to be placed on the real property.

The specific activity and use limitations in any covenant will depend on the nature of the proceeding in the environmental response project that led to the covenant. For example, in a major environmental response project where the administrative process was conducted by either a state or federal agency, the activity and use limitations would generally be identified in the record of decision and then implemented in the environmental covenant pursuant to this Act. In contrast, in a voluntary clean-up supervised by privately licensed professionals, as authorized in some states, the activity and use limitations would not be developed by the agency during an administrative proceeding but by the parties themselves and their contracted professionals.

Nothing in this Act prevents the use of privately negotiated use restrictions which are recorded in the land records, without agency involvement: the validity of such covenants,

however, is not governed by this Act but by other law of the enacting state. *See* Section 5(d).

2. The governmental body with responsibility for the environmental response project in question is the agency under this Act. Generally, this agency will supply the public supervision necessary to protect human health and the environment in creating and modifying the environmental covenant.

In addition, as noted in Comment 1, the definition of “environmental response project” contemplates the possibility that the project may be undertaken pursuant to a voluntary clean-up program, where the actual determination of the sufficiency of the proposed clean-up is made by a private professional party, rather than an agency. In this case, the definition contemplates that an agency - typically, the state environmental agency - will nevertheless be asked to consent to the environmental covenant by signing it. Section 4 of the Act makes clear that the covenant is not valid under this Act unless an agency signs it. Section 3 of the Act makes clear that the mere signature of the agency, without more, means only that the agency has “approved” the covenant in order to satisfy the definitional requirements of definition (2) and the mandated contents of Section 4. That signature imposes no duties or obligations on the agency.

3. The agency, for purposes of this Act, may be either a federal government entity or the appropriate state regulatory agency for environmental protection.

Further, in some cases, the appropriate federal agency may be the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Defense as ‘lead agency’ under federal law, or another body.

4. Section 4 of the Act makes clear that an environmental covenant is valid if only one agency signs it. However, in many circumstances, both a federal and a state agency may have jurisdiction over the environmental contamination that led to the environmental response project. In this situation, the best practice may be for both federal and state agencies with jurisdiction over the contaminated property to sign the environmental covenant.

5. Definition (4) states that an environmental covenant is a “servitude”; the term generally refers to either a burden or restriction on the use of real property, or to a benefit that flows from the ownership of land, that in either case “runs with the land” - that is, the benefit or the burden passes to successive owners of the real property.

The law of servitudes is a long established body of real property law. The term is defined in §1.1 of the Restatement (3d) of Servitudes as follows: “(1) A servitude is a legal device that creates a right or an obligation that runs with land or an interest in land.” The Restatement goes on to provide that the forms of servitudes which are subject to that Restatement are “easements, profits, and covenants.”

This Act emphasizes that an environmental covenant is a servitude in order to implicate this full body of real property law and to sustain the validity and enforceability of the covenant. By first characterizing the environmental covenant as a servitude, the Act expressly avoids the argument that an environmental covenant is simply a personal common law contract between the

agency and the owner of the real property at the time the covenant is signed, and thus is not binding on later owners or tenants of that land.

6. The definition of “environmental covenant” also provides that the servitude is created to implement an environmental response project. An environmental response project may determine, in some circumstances, to leave some residual contamination on the real property. This may be done because complete cleanup is technologically impossible, or because it is either ecologically or economically undesirable. In this situation, the environmental response project may impose activity and use limitations to control residual risk that results from contamination remaining in real property. An environmental covenant is then recorded on the land records as required by Section 8 to ensure that the activity and use limitations are both legally and practically enforceable.

7. An “environmental response project” covered by definition (5) may be undertaken pursuant to authorization by one of several different statutes. Definition (5)(a) specifically covers remediation projects required under state law. However, the definition is written broadly to also encompass both current federal law, future amendments to both state and federal law, as well as new environmental protection regimes should they be developed. Without limiting this breadth and generality, the Act intends to reach environmental response projects undertaken pursuant to any of the following specific federal statutes:

- (1) Subchapter III or IX of the federal "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976", 42 U.S.C. sec. 6921 to 6939e and 6991 to 6991i, as amended;
- (2) Section 7002 or 7003 of the federal "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976", 42 U.S.C. sec. 6972 and 6973, as amended;
- (3) "Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980", 42 U.S.C. sec. 9601 to 9647, as amended;
- (4) "Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978", 42 U.S.C. sec. 7901 et seq., as amended;
- (5) "Toxic Substances Control Act", 15 U.S.C. 2601 to 2692, as amended;
- (6) "Safe Drinking Water Act", 42 U.S.C. 300f to 300j-26, as amended;
- (7) "Atomic Energy Act", 42 U.S.C. 2011 et. sec., as amended.

8. Definition (5)(C) extends the Act’s coverage to voluntary remediation projects that are undertaken under state law. Environmental covenants that are part of voluntary remediation projects may serve both the goal of environmental protection and the goal of facilitating reuse of the real property. However, approval of these projects by a governmental body or other authorized party ensures that the project serves these goals. Even though preparation of the clean-up plan and supervision of the work may be undertaken by private parties, this Act requires that covenants undertaken as part of a formal voluntary clean-up program must be approved by the agency as evidenced by the agency’s signature on the covenant, in order to be effective under this Act.

9. Some states authorize properly certified private parties to supervise remediation to pre-existing standards and certify the cleanup. For example, in Connecticut and Massachusetts, these are “licensed site professionals”. *See, e.g.,* M.G.L. ch. 21A §19; 310 CMR 40.1071;

C.G.S. §§22a-133o, 22a-133y. Supervision and certification by statutorily-authorized parties is intended to accomplish the same public function as supervision and certification by the governmental entity. Thus, these environmental response projects are also covered by this definition.

10. Under definition (5)(C), environmental response projects may include specific agreements between an owner and the agency for remediation that go beyond prevailing requirements. Alternatively, an owner may choose to contract with a potential purchaser for additional use restrictions in an instrument that does not purport to come within this Act; *see* Section 5(d). Because the owner may have residual liability for the site, even after remediation and transfer to a third party for redevelopment, the owner may require further restrictions as a condition of creating the environmental covenant and eventual reuse of the real property.

11. The definition of “holder” is in definition (6). As the practice of using environmental covenants continues to grow, new entities may emerge to serve as holders. This Act does not intend to limit this process. A holder may be any person under the broad definition of this Act, including an affected local government, the agency, or an owner. The identity of an individual holder must be approved by the agency and an owner as part of the process of creating an environmental covenant, as specified in Section 4. A holder is authorized to enforce the covenant under Section 11. A holder has the rights specified in Section 4 of this Act and may be given additional rights or obligations in the environmental covenant. Under Section 8(a), a recording officer should index an environmental covenant in the grantee index under the name of the person identified as the holder in the covenant.

Section 3(a) makes clear that a holder’s interest is an interest in real property. Some environmental enforcement agencies are not authorized by their enabling legislation to own an interest in real property after the environmental remediation is completed. As a consequence, those agencies may not be entitled to serve as holders under the Act. In those cases where an agency wishes to be certain that a viable holder exists, a private entity may serve this purpose, acting, for example by contract, in accordance with the agency’s direction.

More generally, the nature of a holder’s interest in the real property may influence whether its rights and duties with respect to the real property are likely to lead to potential liability for future environmental remediation, should such remediation become necessary. Under CERCLA, an “owner” is liable for remediation costs; *see* 42 U.S.C.A. 9607(a)(1). Unfortunately, the definition of “owner” in the statute is circular and unhelpful in evaluating whether a holder is potentially liable under it. 42 U.S.C.A. 9601(20).

In general, a holder’s right to enforce the covenant under Section 11 should be considered comparable to the rights covered in an easement and, thus, should not lead to a determination that the holder is liable as an “owner” under CERCLA. The two cases that have considered this question have found that the parties which held the easements were not CERCLA “owners”. Long Beach Unified School District v. Dorothy B. Godwin California Living Trust, 32 F.3d 1364 (9th Cir. 1994); Grand Trunk RR. V. Acme Belt Recoating, 859 F. Supp. 1125 (W.D. MI 1994). In each case, the court reasoned that the circular definition of owner meant that the

term's most common meaning would prevail. The common law's distinction between an easement holder and the property owner was then applied to find the easement holder not to be an "owner" for purposes of this statute. In each of these cases, the party that held the easement had not contributed to contamination on the property. The amendments to CERCLA Section 9601(35), Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-118, 115 Stat. 2360 (2002) (HR 2869, 107th Cong. 1st Session), added the term "easement" to the definition of parties which are in a "contractual relationship" under CERCLA. However, this does not affect whether the easement holder will be held to be a CERCLA "owner".

Where the holder or another person has more extensive rights than enforcement, a careful analysis will be required. The CERCLA liability cases typically emphasize that a party that exercises the degree of control over a site equivalent to the control typically exercised by an owner of the site will be held liable as an "owner". Under this approach, for example, lessees have been held liable as owners when their control over the site approximated that which an owner would have. *See, e.g., Delaney v. Town of Carmel*, 55 F. Supp. 2d 237 (S.D.N.Y. 1999); *U.S. v. A & N Cleaners and Launderers*, 788 F. Supp. 1317 (S.D.N.Y. 1990); *U.S. v. S.C. Dept. of Health and Env. Control*, 653 F. Supp. 984 (D.C.S.C. 1984.) Accordingly, a holder contemplating extensive control over the site should consider potential "owner" liability carefully.

CERCLA liability also extends to an "operator" of the site (42 U.S.C.A. 9607(a)(1)), and the case law interpreting this definition emphasizes that a party is liable as an operator if it has a high degree of control over the operating decisions and day to day management at the site. Thus, for example, a party that held an easement could be liable as an operator if its degree of control met this standard. A holder will, in general, have only control authority over the site related to effective enforcement of the environmental covenant and does not typically need more extensive day to day control. However, this will not likely be true in all cases.

SECTION 3. NATURE OF RIGHTS; SUBORDINATION OF INTERESTS.

(a) Any person, including a person that owns an interest in the real property, the agency, or a municipality or other unit of local government, may be a holder. An environmental covenant may identify more than one holder. The interest of a holder is an interest in real property.

(b) A right of an agency under this [act] or under an environmental covenant, other than a right as a holder, is not an interest in real property.

(c) An agency is bound by any obligation it assumes in an environmental covenant, but an agency does not assume obligations merely by signing an environmental covenant. Any other person that signs an environmental covenant is bound by the obligations the person assumes in

the covenant, but signing the covenant does not change obligations, rights, or protections granted or imposed under law other than this [act] except as provided in the covenant.

(d) The following rules apply to interests in real property in existence at the time an environmental covenant is created or amended:

(1) An interest that has priority under other law is not affected by an environmental covenant unless the person that owns the interest subordinates that interest to the covenant.

(2) This [act] does not require a person that owns a prior interest to subordinate that interest to an environmental covenant or to agree to be bound by the covenant.

(3) A subordination agreement may be contained in an environmental covenant covering real property or in a separate record. If the environmental covenant covers commonly owned property in a common interest community, the record may be signed by any person authorized by the governing board of the owners' association.

(4) An agreement by a person to subordinate a prior interest to an environmental covenant affects the priority of that person's interest but does not by itself impose any affirmative obligation on the person with respect to the environmental covenant.

Comment

Subsection (a) confirms that the holder holds an interest in real property, thus distinguishing that right from a personal or contractual right that does not run with the land. The definition of 'holder' in Section 2, departing from traditional real property concepts, makes clear that the holder may be the agency or the owner, thus making it possible for the owner to be both grantor and grantee.

Subsection (a) also makes clear that if the agency chooses to be the holder, the agency will thereby hold an interest in the real property. Otherwise, subsection (b) provides that the agency's interest in the covenant as a consequence of signing the covenant or having a right to enforce it under this Act is not an interest in real property.

Subsection (c) validates and confirms any contractual obligations that an agency may

assume in an environmental covenant. So, for example, if the agency were to agree to authorize certain activities on the property, to undertake periodic inspections of the site or to provide notice of particular actions to specified persons, those undertakings and obligations would be enforceable against the agency in accordance with their terms by parties adversely affected by any breach.

At the same time, subsection (c) also makes clear that the mere act of signing the covenant in order to signify the agency's 'approval' of the covenant, which is required by the Act as a condition of its effectiveness under this Act, is not an assumption of obligations and the agency has not thereby exposed itself to any liability. The agency manifests its approval of an environmental covenant by signing it. Likewise, subsection (c) makes this same principle clear for any other person that signs an environmental covenant; the rights and obligations of that person are established by other law and by the terms of the covenant and not merely by the fact that the person signed the covenant.

Subsection (d) restates and clarifies traditional real property rules regarding the effect of an environmental covenant on prior recorded interests. The basic rule remains that pre-existing prior valid and effective interests – "First in time, first in right" – remain valid. As § 7.1 of the Restatement (3d) of Property: Mortgages states:

"A valid foreclosure of a mortgage terminates all interests in the foreclosed real estate that are junior [that is, later in time] to the mortgage being foreclosed....Foreclosure does not terminate interests ...that are senior...."

At the same time, it is not uncommon for interested parties to re-order the priorities among them by agreement in order to accommodate the economic interests of various parties. The usual device used to re-order priorities is a so-called 'subordination' agreement. Again, this section tracks the outcome suggested in The Restatement (3d) of Property: Mortgages. Section 7.7 of the Restatement provides in pertinent part that:

A mortgage, by a declaration of its mortgagee, [that is, the lender] may be made subordinate in priority to another interest in the mortgaged real estate, whether existing or to be created in the future....A subordination that would materially prejudice the mortgagor [that is, the owner of the real estate] or the person whose interest is advanced in priority is ineffective without the consent of the person prejudiced.

The impact of the newly recorded environmental covenant on the priorities of other lien holders is sufficiently important that the Act emphasizes this issue both in this section and in Sections 8(b) and 9(c). In all these instances, the Act provides that the usual rules of priorities are

preserved, except in the case of foreclosure of tax liens.

Thus, in preparing an environmental covenant, it might be advisable for the agency to identify all prior interests, determine which interests may interfere with the covenant protecting human health and the environment, and then take steps to avoid the possibility of such interference. The agency may do this by, for example, having the parties obtain appropriate subordination of prior interests, as a condition to the agency's approval of the environmental covenant.

The combined effect of Sections 3, 8 and 9 creates a curious "circular" lien problem, where (1) foreclosure of a 2003 municipal tax lien would terminate a 2000 pre-existing mortgage (the usual outcome), but (2) that same foreclosure would not affect the environmental covenant created in 2002 under this Act; while (3) foreclosure of the 2000 pre-existing mortgage would terminate the 2002 environmental covenant (again, the usual rule), but (4) not the 2003 municipal tax lien (also, the usual rule). Circular liens, however, are not unique to this situation.

SECTION 4. CONTENTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.

(a) An environmental covenant must:

(1) state that the instrument is an environmental covenant executed pursuant to [insert statutory reference to this [act].]

(2) contain a legally sufficient description of the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) describe the activity and use limitations on the real property;

(4) identify every holder;

(5) be signed by the agency, every holder, and unless waived by the agency every owner of the fee simple of the real property subject to the covenant; and

(6) identify the name and location of any administrative record for the environmental response project reflected in the environmental covenant.

(b) In addition to the information required by subsection (a), an environmental covenant may contain other information, restrictions, and requirements agreed to by the persons who signed it, including any:

(1) requirements for notice following transfer of a specified interest in, or concerning proposed changes in use of, applications for building permits for, or proposals for any site work affecting the contamination on, the property subject to the covenant;

(2) requirements for periodic reporting describing compliance with the covenant;

(3) rights of access to the property granted in connection with implementation or enforcement of the covenant;

(4) a brief narrative description of the contamination and remedy, including the contaminants of concern, the pathways of exposure, limits on exposure, and the location and extent of the contamination;

(5) limitation on amendment or termination of the covenant in addition to those contained in Sections 9 and 10; and

(6) rights of the holder in addition to its right to enforce the covenant pursuant to Section 11.

(c) In addition to other conditions for its approval of an environmental covenant, the agency may require those persons specified by the agency who have interests in the real property to sign the covenant.

Comment

1. Subsection (a)(2) of this section requires that the covenant contain a “legally sufficient description” of the “real property” subject to the covenant. While these terms are familiar to real property practitioners, it may be useful to describe precisely what is required by this section.

First, a description of the real property that is “legally sufficient” will depend upon the practice of the enacting state. The purpose of such a requirement, for the real property practitioner, will be to assure that the particular parcel subject to the covenant will be properly indexed in the land records and thus readily located during the course of a title search. This, in turn, will enable a buyer, lender or other interest holder to be confident of what they own or hold as security.

The most commonly used legal descriptions of land are: (1) a metes and bounds

description - that is, a description that begins with reference to a known point on the surface of the earth, followed by references to distances and angles from that point to other monuments or terminals that mark the outer boundaries of the parcel; (2) reference to a recorded map or survey, that contains a “picture” of the metes and bounds description; (3) reference to a particular parcel number on a governmental grid system; and (4) a coordinates reference system, derived from a Global Positioning System or other mapping tool. These, and other generally obsolete forms of legal description [e.g., “starting at the black oak tree in the pasture, then running along a stone wall to Bloody Creek, then generally south and west along the creek to a dirt road, then back to the tree where you started, being the same 50 acres, more or less, conveyed to my father by Lisman”] may all serve the same purpose, and would meet the requirement of being “legally sufficient.”

In contrast, as described in Comment 11 below, more precise measurements may be very useful for identifying precisely the “geospatial” location of sub-surface contaminants.

Second, the “real property” that is subject to the covenant may be narrowly or broadly defined, depending on the wishes of the parties. It may be, for example, that only a 3 acre portion of a 5,000 acre ranch is contaminated; in such a case, it may be unnecessary to describe all 5000 acres of real property as being subject to the covenant.

Alternatively, in a remote location, it may be that the 3 acre contaminated parcel owned by one person may be reached only by crossing a private road located on a 5000 acre ranch owned by another person. In such a case, a careful property description will want to include reference to the easement or other access right across the land owned by another person.

It is important to recognize, however, that real property is a three-dimensional concept (or a four-dimensional concept when one considers time as a dimension). A legal description of a particular parcel of real property which has only perimeter boundaries and no upper and lower boundaries encompasses both the surface of the earth within those boundaries, the airspace above the surface, all the dirt and minerals below the surface and all spaces within that volume of space that may be filled with water. Thus, in appropriate cases, a title searcher will need to be sensitive to cases where interests in the “real property” or “real property” have been sold or leased which leave the owner with less than all of the real property. A ten-year lease of the entire parcel, for example, represents a time-defined “boundary” to the owner’s interest in the real property in question. An agency seeking to identify all the interests in the parcel in order to secure their approval of a covenant will therefore want to ensure that a title search identifies all these interests.

2. This Act does not provide the standards for environmental remediation nor the specific activity and use limitations to be used at a particular site. Those will be provided by the state or federal agency based on other state and federal law governing mandatory and voluntary cleanups. This Act contemplates that those standards will then be incorporated into the environmental response project, which, in turn, will call for activity and use restrictions that can be implemented through creation of an environmental covenant. This section addresses creation of the environmental covenants.

3. Ordinarily, an environmental covenant will be created only by agreement between the agency and the owner. If there is a holder other than the agency or the owner, both the agency and the owner must approve the holder, and the holder must agree to the terms of the covenant. The agency may refuse to agree to an environmental covenant if it does not effectively implement the activity and use limitations specified in the environmental response project.

Where no owner is available or willing to participate in the environmental response project, it may be necessary for the agency to condemn and take an interest sufficient to record an environmental covenant on the property where it has the power to do so. This Act does not contain independent condemnation authority for the agency. Alternatively, in some states, there may be a basis for an agency to require an owner to cooperate with the implementation of the covenant as a regulatory matter.

4. This Act recognizes that there may be situations in which there is more than one fee simple owner. For example, Husband and Wife may own Blackacre as tenants in common, joint tenants, or tenants of the entirety. In all of these configurations of ownership, both Husband and Wife are owners of Blackacre and both must sign an environmental covenant unless the agency waives this requirement.

Similarly, it is common practice in mining states, such as Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, for the fee ownership of the mineral interests to be conveyed separate and apart from the fee ownership of the remaining parcel. Thus, under the conventional real property practices of these states, there may be two separate fee ownership interests in the same “parcel” of real property, and each owner must sign the environmental covenant unless this requirement is waived. It may be that those two owners of different interests in the same parcel have an agreement between them prohibiting separate conveyances of interests in the land without permission of the other. However, if that agreement does not appear of record, it would not run with the land, would likely not be binding on the agency [in the absence of the agency’s actual knowledge] and thus not affect the validity of a covenant signed by one of the owners with respect to that owner’s interest in the real estate.

5. In addition to the parties specified in Section 4(a)(5), other persons may wish to sign the environmental covenant and, in any event, the agency may require their signature as a condition of approving the covenant. (See Section 4(c)). Under current law, persons other than the owner may be liable for cleanup of the contamination, including contingent future liability if further cleanup is needed or personal injury claims are brought. These could be parties which previously used the property or whose waste was disposed of on the property. Such a person may have liability for some or all of the cost of the environmental response project and may thus have a compelling interest in signing the covenant so as to be informed of future enforcement, modification and termination.

6. Section 4(a)(5) also authorizes the agency to waive the requirement that the covenant be signed by the owner of the fee simple. The Act contemplates that such waivers should be rare because in most situations the covenant can be effective only if the fee owner’s interest is subject to the covenant. However, in some circumstances the fee owner may have transferred most or all of the economic value of the property to the holder of another interest, either permanently or for

the time period during which the covenant's restrictions are needed. Consider, for example, the situation in which the contamination remaining presents environmental risks for only twenty years and the property is subject to a ninety-nine year lease. In this case, it is critical that the owner of the leasehold interest be a party to the covenant so its interest will be subject to it. However, in this situation, the fee owner's participation is not essential for the covenant to protect human health and the environment. If the fee owner is unavailable or unwilling to participate, the agency might choose to waive its signature. Of course, such a situation, when the likely duration of the covenant is both short and clearly known, is likely to be exceptional.

7. A holder is the grantee of the environmental covenant and the Act requires that there be a holder for a covenant to be valid and enforceable. Under Section 5(b)(9), the grantee may also be the grantor, who is the owner of the property and who might remain a holder upon sale of the property, or the agency. In addition to enforcement rights, the holder may be given specific rights or obligations with respect to future implementation of the environmental covenant. These could include, for example, the obligation to monitor groundwater or maintain a cap or containment structure on the property. Such rights and obligations will be specified in the environmental covenant and, like any obligations, would be enforceable against the holder if the holder failed to satisfy its obligations.

8. Section 4(a)(5) requires an agency to sign the covenant. In some states it may be necessary to amend the state agency's enabling statute to empower it to so sign.

9. Section 4(a)(6) requires the covenant to disclose the "name and location of any administrative record" for the underlying environmental response project. Typically, this information will require a docket or file number, identifying names of the parties, and an indication of the agency office in which the record of decision or other administrative record has been retained. In those cases where a state-wide registry is maintained, the registry also requires this information. In the case of voluntary clean-ups, of course, there may not be an administrative record.

Section (4) (b) is a permissive provision intended by the breadth of its provisions ("...may contain other information ...agreed to by the persons who signed it...") to encourage the agency and the other parties to include provisions in the particular covenant that are tailored to the specific needs of that project. This may well be accomplished in order to maximize the likelihood that the covenant, when properly implemented and monitored, will protect human health and the environment.

Persons dealing with this Act must recognize that no statute and no commentary can fully contemplate all the possibilities that are likely to arise in implementation of this Act. This issue permeates this subsection. In (b)(1), for example, the text contemplates the possibility that the agency may, in a particular case, require an owner or other persons to notify the agency before, among other things, that party applies for "...building permits." The suggested language is not intended to exclude notice of any other type of work permit that might trigger a violation of an environmental covenant, such as, for example, drilling or excavation permits.

10. Section 4(b)(4) suggests that, in an appropriate case, the agency may wish to provide

a summary of the contamination on the site and the remedial solutions that have been identified. From a public health perspective, this may be very useful. The reference to “pathways of exposure” requires a statement that, for example, the contaminant might be of danger if it comes in contact with skin, if breathed, or only if ingested.

11. Section 4(b)(4) also suggests that, in an appropriate case, the agency may require the covenant to contain not only a legally sufficient description of the real property subject to the covenant (as mandated under section 4(a)(2)) but also the ‘location of the contamination.’”

One way of identifying such location is by the concept of “geospatial” location as defined by the Federal Geographic Data Committee of the U.S. Geological Survey. Such an identification would define the location with geospatial data, which the Committee defines as follows:

Geospatial Data: Information that identifies the geographic location and characteristics of natural or constructed features and boundaries on the Earth. This information may be derived from, among other things, remote sensing, mapping, and surveying technologies. Statistical data may be included in this definition....

Depending on the nature of the contamination and the size of the parcel subject to the covenant, a description of the “geospatial location” of the contamination and the legal boundary description of the real property parcel on which those contaminants are located may be very different, and the kinds of information required to usefully describe the “location” of the contamination may also differ. As a simple example, it may be appropriate to use grid coordinates and projected elevations below ground level to define the upper and lower levels of a groundwater contamination plume, together with sensing or other data that projects the mobility of that plume over time, in order to accurately provide useful information that a simple metes and bounds description could not convey.

12. Subsection (b)(5) contemplates that the environmental covenant may impose additional restrictions on amendment or termination beyond those required by this Act. For example, in some circumstances the owner or another party who may have contingent residual liability for further cleanup of the real property subject to the environmental covenant, may seek further restrictions in the covenant to protect against this contingent liability.

13. Subsection (c) confirms that the agency is under no obligation to approve a particular environmental covenant by signing it. This may be particularly significant in those cases where the agency was unable to secure subordination of prior interests in the real property which is proposed to be subject to the covenant. If a prior security or other interest is not subordinated to the environmental covenant, and then is foreclosed at some later time, under traditional real property law that foreclosure would extinguish or limit an environmental covenant. Since such an outcome is antithetical to the policies

underlying this Act, the Act contemplates that the agency may, before agreeing to the covenant, require subordination of these interests. At the time of creation of the environmental covenant, the agency must determine whether the prior interest presents a realistic threat to the covenant's ability to protect the environment and human health. Section 3 of the Act makes clear that by subordinating its interest, an owner of a prior interest does not change its liability with respect to the property subject to the environmental covenant. Any such liability of a subordinating party would arise by operation of other law and not under this Act.

Subsection (c) contemplates that there are many circumstances that might cause an agency, in the exercise of its regulatory discretion as defined in other law, either to refuse to sign a covenant in the form presented, or to agree to sign it only upon satisfaction of specified conditions. The listing of the following examples is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

Example 1: As a condition of signing the covenant, the agency requires the owner to provide an abstract of title of the property to be subjected to the covenant. If the owner declines to do so, the agency may reasonably be expected to decline to approve the covenant, since it will have insufficient evidence of the priority of its new covenant.

Example 2: The owner provides the title abstract, which discloses that the property to be subjected to the covenant is presently subject to a first mortgage for \$5 million. The agency's decision to condition its approval on the first lender's willingness to subordinate to the covenant would plainly be appropriate.

Example 3: The agency's policies require that an independent company regularly engaged in the business of monitoring and enforcing environmental covenants on behalf of the agency be named as 'holder' in the covenant. The owner's refusal to agree to such a provision would justify an agency's refusal to approve the covenant.

SECTION 5. VALIDITY; EFFECT ON OTHER INSTRUMENTS.

(a) An environmental covenant that complies with this [act] runs with the land.

(b) An environmental covenant that is otherwise effective is valid and enforceable even if:

(1) it is not appurtenant to an interest in real property;

(2) it can be or has been assigned to a person other than the original holder;

(3) it is not of a character that has been recognized traditionally at

common law;

(4) it imposes a negative burden;

(5) it imposes an affirmative obligation on a person having an interest in the real property or on the holder;

(6) the benefit or burden does not touch or concern real property;

(7) there is no privity of estate or contract;

(8) the holder dies, ceases to exist, resigns, or is replaced; or

(9) the owner of an interest subject to the environmental covenant and the holder are the same person.

(c) An instrument that creates restrictions or obligations with respect to real property that would qualify as activity and use limitations except for the fact that the instrument was recorded before the effective date of this [act] is not invalid or unenforceable because of any of the limitations on enforcement of interests described in subsection (b) or because it was identified as an easement, servitude, deed restriction, or other interest. This [act] does not apply in any other respect to such an instrument.

(d) This [act] does not invalidate or render unenforceable any interest, whether designated as an environmental covenant or other interest, that is otherwise enforceable under the law of this state.

Comment

1. Subsection (a), when considered with the common law, makes clear that environmental covenants will be binding not only on the persons who originally negotiate them but also on subsequent owners of the property and others who hold an interest in the property, such as tenants, so long as those owners and others have actual or constructive knowledge of the covenant.

To be binding on future owners who may not have actual knowledge of the covenant, the Act requires that the covenant comply with all provisions of the Act.

Section 8(a) of this Act requires the covenant to be recorded. The Act then states the usual real property rule that a recorded instrument “runs with the land” and binds all who have an interest in it.

2. Recording requirements are an important means by which the law protects ‘bona fide purchasers’ - BFP’s - who acquire property without knowledge of its conditions. Even in the absence of recording a document on the land records, the common law has long held that those who have actual knowledge of the document take title subject to the document. The BFP, on the other hand, is bound at common law only by an instrument affecting the real property to the extent the BFP has constructive knowledge of the document.

Importantly, a BFP is charged with constructive knowledge of the land records. In some respects, one of the fundamental tensions between traditional real property law and environmental law is the change in this rule, by which environmental law seeks to impose liability on “innocent” purchasers of contaminated property who take without knowledge of the property’s condition and may have no practical means of learning of its condition. To the extent this Act tracks traditional real property practice by requiring recorded covenants, this tension may be considerably lessened.

3. Subsection (b) and its comments are modeled on Section 4 of the Uniform Conservation Easement Act. One of the Environmental Covenant Act’s basic goals is to remove common law defenses that could impede the use of environmental covenants. This section addresses that goal by comprehensively identifying these defenses and negating their applicability to environmental covenants.

This Act’s policy supports the enforceability of environmental covenants by precluding applicability of doctrines, including older common law doctrines, that would limit enforcement. That policy is broadly consistent with the Restatement of the Law Third of Property (Servitudes), including §2.6 and chapter 3. For specific doctrines see §§ 2.4 (horizontal privity), 2.5 (benefited or burdened estates), 2.6 (benefits in gross and third party benefits), 3.2 (touch and concern doctrine), 3.3 (rule against perpetuities), and 3.5 (indirect restraints on alienation).

Subsection (b)(1) provides that an environmental covenant, the benefit of which is held in gross, may be enforced against the grantor or his successors or assigns. By stating that the covenant need not be appurtenant to an interest in real property, it eliminates the requirement in force in some states that the holder of an easement must own an interest in real property (the “dominant estate”) benefited by the easement.

Subsection (b)(2) also clarifies existing law by providing that a covenant may be enforced by an assignee of the holder. Section 10(c) of this Act specifies that assignment to a new holder will be treated as a modification and Section 10 governs modification of environmental covenants.

Subsection (b)(3) addresses the problem posed by the existing law’s recognition

of servitudes that served only a limited number of purposes and that law's reluctance to approve so-called "novel incidents". This restrictive view might defeat enforcement of covenants serving the environmental protection ends enumerated in this Act. Accordingly, subsection (b)(3) establishes that environmental covenants are not unenforceable solely because they do not serve purposes or fall within the categories of easements traditionally recognized at common law or other applicable law.

Subsection (b)(4) deals with a variant of the foregoing problem. Some applicable law recognizes only a limited number of "negative easements" – those preventing the owner of the burdened real property from performing acts on his real property that he would be privileged to perform absent the easement. Because a far wider range of negative burdens might be imposed by environmental covenants, subsection (b)(4) modifies existing law by eliminating the defense that an environmental covenant imposes a "novel" negative burden.

Subsection (b)(5) addresses the opposite problem – the potential unenforceability under existing law of an easement that imposes affirmative obligations upon either the owner of the burdened real property or upon the holder. Under some existing law, neither of those interests was viewed as a true easement at all. The first, in fact, was labeled a "spurious" easement because it obligated an owner of the burdened real property to perform affirmative acts. (The spurious easement was distinguished from an affirmative easement, illustrated by a right of way, which empowered the easement's holder to perform acts on the burdened real property that the holder would not have been privileged to perform absent the easement.)

Achievement of environmental protection goals may require that affirmative obligations be imposed on the burdened real property owner or on the covenant holder or both. For example, the grantor of an environmental covenant may agree to use restrictions and may also agree to undertake affirmative monitoring or maintenance obligations. In addition, the covenant might impose specific engineering or monitoring obligations on the holder, which may be for a profit corporation, a charitable corporation or trust holder. In all these cases, the environmental covenant would impose affirmative obligations and Subsection (b)(5) makes clear that the covenant would not be unenforceable solely because it is affirmative in nature.

Subsections (b)(6) and (b)(7) preclude the touch and concern and privity of estate or contract defenses, respectively. They have traditionally been asserted as defenses against the enforcement of covenants and equitable servitudes.

Subsection (b) (8) addresses the possibility that the holder may have died or for other reason fails to exist. Failure of the holder ought not invalidate the covenant and Sections 10(c) and (d) authorize replacement of a holder in various circumstances.

Subsection (b) (9) addresses the case where an owner of a contaminated parcel may agree to remedy an existing condition and may further agree to serve as holder in order to perform the necessary tasks. Under this Act, the owner may be willing to do so

because Section 4 of the Act requires that a holder be named and the owner may not be inclined to create an interest in a stranger. Under these circumstances, the owner's name would appear as both the grantor and the grantee in the land records, and this outcome ought not invalidate the covenant.

Subsection (b) identifies the principal common law doctrines that have been applied to defeat covenants such as those created by this Act. Drafters in individual states may wish to consider whether references to other common law or statutory impediments of a similar nature ought to be added to this subsection.

Subsection (c) addresses the treatment of instruments recorded before the date of this Act that seek to accomplish the purposes of environmental covenants under this Act. It seeks to validate such instruments, in a limited way, by specifying that the defenses covered in subsection (b), or the fact that the instrument was identified as something other than an environmental covenant, will not make prior covenants unenforceable. Beyond negating these specific defenses, however, this Act does not apply to those prior covenants. If the parties to a prior covenant wish to have the other benefits of this Act for that covenant, they must re-execute the covenant in a manner which satisfies the requirements of this Act.

Section (d) is a general savings clause for other interests in real property and other agreements concerning environmental remediation which are not covered under this Act. It disavows the intent to invalidate any interest created either before or after the Act which does not comply with the Act but which otherwise may be valid under the state's law. Nor does the Act intend, in any way, to validate or invalidate an action taken by a person to remediate contamination that is taken without formal governmental oversight or approval. A recorded instrument that does not satisfy the requirements of this Act does not come within the scope of this Act; it does not enjoy the protections of this Act and must be evaluated under other law of the state.

For example, the Act is clear that its requirements apply only to land use restrictions placed on real property pursuant to an "environmental response project" as that term is defined in the Act. If private parties choose to use conventional deed restrictions or other devices to place further activity and use restrictions on a parcel, nothing in this Act would affect that contractual arrangement either to insulate it from attack as invalid under that state's other law or to invalidate it under this law.

SECTION 6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAND-USE LAW. This [act] does not authorize a use of real property that is otherwise prohibited by zoning, by law other than this [act] regulating use of real property, or by a recorded instrument that has priority over the environmental covenant. An environmental covenant may prohibit or

restrict uses of real property which are authorized by zoning or by law other than this [act].

Comment

This section clarifies that this Act does not displace other restrictions on land use laws, including zoning laws, building codes, sanitary sewer or subdivision requirements and the like. Restrictions under those laws apply unchanged to real property covered by an environmental covenant.

Where other law, including either a state or federal environmental response project, requires structures or activities in order to perform the environmental remediation, the status of those requirements is likely to be determined by that other law and not by this Act. Thus, for example, where the environmental covenant is implementing an environmental response project under federal CERCLA law, a federal appellate court has held that the federal law authorizing the environmental response project preempts a conflicting city ordinance. U.S. v. City and County of Denver, 100 F.3d 1509 (10th Cir. 1996).

Clearly, the large and complex body of zoning and land use law and the law of environmental regulation supplement the provisions of this Act. In appropriate cases, a court will be called upon to articulate the interrelationship of this Act and those laws, and the Act does not attempted to articulate all those outcomes. On the other hand, certain obvious examples may be helpful in understanding this interplay.

First, the Act contemplates that an environmental covenant might, for example, prohibit residential use on a parcel subject to a covenant. Under conventional real property principles, without references to this Act, such a prohibition or restriction in an environmental covenant will be valid even if other real property law, including local zoning, would authorize the use for residential purposes.

Alternatively, a covenant might, at the time it is recorded, permit both retail use and industrial use on a vacant parcel of contaminated real property while prohibiting residential use. Assuming all retail and industrial uses were permitted by local zoning at the time the covenant is recorded, the municipality might, before construction begins, change that zoning to bar industrial use. If such a zone change is otherwise valid under state law, nothing in this Act would affect the municipality's ability to "down zone" the parcel.

If, on the other hand, an industrial use was existing and ongoing at the time the covenant was recorded, and an effort was then made to prohibit that use by ordinance, such state law doctrines as "vested rights" or non-conforming uses, rather than this Act, would govern the validity of the zoning action.

SECTION 7. NOTICE.

(a) A copy of an environmental covenant shall be provided by the persons and in the manner required by the agency to:

(1) each person that signed the covenant;

(2) each person holding a recorded interest in the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) each person in possession of the real property subject to the covenant;

(4) each municipality or other unit of local government in which real property subject to the covenant is located; and

(5) any other person the agency requires.

(b) The validity of a covenant is not affected by failure to provide a copy of the covenant as required under this section.

Comment

This section contemplates that the agency will normally require that the final signed environmental covenant be sent to affected parties. In addition to the obvious persons who should be notified, in an appropriate case, the agency might require notice to abutting property owners. These persons are likely to have been directly involved in any major administrative proceeding, but in other cases, such as a voluntary clean-up, they may have no knowledge of the existing conditions on abutting land.

In any event, the extent and manner of giving notice rests in the discretion of the agency, and the statute imposes an affirmative duty on the persons required to provide that notice to comply.

Subsection (b) provides that failure to provide a copy of the covenant does not invalidate the covenant. Such a failure will not prevent the covenant from protecting human health and the environment and thus need not invalidate the covenant. The remedy for such a failure would be provided by other law.

SECTION 8. RECORDING.

(a) An environmental covenant and any amendment or termination of the

covenant must be recorded in every [county] in which any portion of the real property subject to the covenant is located. For purposes of indexing, a holder shall be treated as a grantee.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in Section 9(c), an environmental covenant is subject to the laws of this state governing recording and priority of interests in real property.

Comment

Subsection (a) confirms that customary indexing rules apply to the covenant. Since the owner is granting the enforcement right to a holder, all the owners' names would appear in the grantor index and the holder's name would appear in the grantee index.

In those states where a tract or another recording system other than a grantor/grantee index is used, this section should be revised as appropriate.

The Act assumes that all parties will wish to record the environmental covenant and accordingly makes the state's recording rules apply. As between the parties, however, the effectiveness of the covenant does not depend on whether the covenant is recorded. A signed but unrecorded covenant, under traditional real property law, binds the parties who sign it and, generally, those who have knowledge of the covenant.

The Act makes clear that, as with all recorded instruments, an environmental covenant takes priority under the normal rules of "First in time, First in Right." *See* The Restatement of The Law Third Property–Mortgages § § 7.1 and 7.3. In that sense, the covenant does not enjoy the same priority afforded real property tax liens, because of the substantial constitutional impediment such a change in priority would likely create.

However, the Act departs in important ways from the consequences of the normal priority and other traditional rules. For example, under Section 9, foreclosure of a tax lien cannot extinguish an environmental covenant. *See* Section 9(c).

Finally, in those cases where the holder's interest is transferred to a successor holder, the assignment of that interest will be recorded, and the usual grantor/grantee indexing rules would apply. Note, however, that under Section 10(d), the assignment would be treated as an amendment of the covenant.

Recording of an environmental covenant pursuant to the law of this state provides the same constructive notice of the covenant as the recording or any other instrument

provides of an interest in real property.

SECTION 9. DURATION; AMENDMENT BY COURT ACTION.

(a) An environmental covenant is perpetual unless it is:

(1) by its terms limited to a specific duration or terminated by the occurrence of a specific event;

(2) terminated by consent pursuant to Section 10;

(3) terminated pursuant to subsection (b);

(4) terminated by foreclosure of an interest that has priority over the environmental covenant; or

(5) terminated or modified in an eminent domain proceeding, but only if:

(A) the agency that signed the covenant is a party to the proceeding;

(B) all persons identified in Section 10(a) and (b) are given notice of the pendency of the proceeding; and

(C) the court determines, after hearing, that the termination or modification will not adversely affect human health or the environment.

(b) If the agency that signed an environmental covenant has determined that the intended benefits of the covenant can no longer be realized, a court, under the doctrine of changed circumstances, in an action in which all persons identified in Section 10(a) and (b) have been given notice, may terminate the covenant or reduce its burden on the real property subject to the covenant. The agency's determination or its failure to make a determination upon request is subject to review pursuant to [insert reference to appropriate administrative procedure act].

(c) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a) and (b), an environmental covenant may not be extinguished, limited, or impaired through issuance of a tax deed, foreclosure of a tax lien, or application of the doctrine of adverse possession, prescription, abandonment, waiver, lack of enforcement, or acquiescence, or a similar doctrine.

(d) An environmental covenant may not be extinguished, limited, or impaired by application of [insert reference to state Marketable Title and Dormant Mineral Interests statutes].

Comment

1. Subject to the other provisions in this Act, environmental covenants are intended to be perpetual, as provided in subsection (a). A covenant may be limited by its terms as provided in this Section, or amended or terminated under Section 10. Alternatively, in the limited circumstances described in this Section it may be modified in an eminent domain proceeding which meets the requirements of Subsection (a)(5). With concurrence of the agency, an environmental covenant may also be terminated in a judicial proceeding asserting “changed circumstances” as provided in Subsection (b).

2. Subsection (a)(5) provides special requirements to modify or terminate an environmental covenant by an exercise of eminent domain. The rationale for these special requirements is that an exercise of eminent domain may result in a change of use for real property. Such a change must ensure that it does not increase environmental risk related to the real property.

The Act does not attempt to resolve all the many complex issues likely to arise when one government agency seeks to condemn an environmental covenant imposed by another agency pursuant to an agreement with a current or former owner of the property. For example, eminent domain may result in a change of use of that property. If the changed use requires termination of the covenant’s existing activity and use limitations, and thus additional clean-up of the property, complex questions of liability and financial responsibility may arise. Alternatively, state law may already address questions of which governments have or do not have authority to condemn real property, or who are necessary or indispensable parties. State statutes are also likely to have so-called “quick take” provisions, a well developed Administrative Procedures Act, and other important provisions for aspects of condemnation proceedings beyond the scope of this Act.

Section 9(a)(5) has specific requirements for an exercise of eminent domain that modifies or terminates an environmental covenant. The applicability of this Act’s

eminent domain requirements to an eminent domain action under federal law will be determined by that law.

On the other hand, if the eminent domain proceeding were to go forward without the need to terminate or amend the environmental covenant, the existing covenant would remain in place and then the approval required by this subsection of the Act would not apply.

3. Subsection (b) imposes two specific requirements for a judicial change in an environmental covenant under the doctrine of changed circumstances. The first requires agency approval of such an application. The second requires that all parties to the covenant be given notice of the proceeding. This will allow those parties to protect their interests in the proceeding, including their interests arising from contingent future liability.

The Act intends that a court, in considering this section, would apply the doctrine of changed circumstances in its traditional sense – that is, as a proposed modification of the covenant to reduce or eliminate its burden. This section does not provide a substitute procedure for modifying a covenant to increase the burden on the real property. Such an outcome would be antithetical to the careful balancing of interests embedded in the Act. It would also be inconsistent with the expectations of owners and legally liable parties who have entered into the covenant with an expectation that the burden would not be increased except pursuant to the procedures set out in this Act.

4. Subsection (c) provides that environmental covenants are not extinguished by later tax foreclosure sales, or by a range of potential common law and statutory impairments. As a matter of public policy, these new forms of covenants seek to protect human health and the environment and, presumably, the contamination of the real property that led to the activity and use limitations would still be present if the covenant were extinguished. Accordingly, the impairment of those limitations as a consequence of application of tax lien foreclosure or other doctrines would likely result in greater exposure to health risk. Thus termination of that protection to serve other public policies of governments seems inconsistent.

In contrast, to avoid any suggestion of impairment of contract, the Act confirms that prior mortgages and other lien holders, upon foreclosure, may extinguish a subsequent covenant that was not subordinated. The lien holder in that case, of course, would still be faced with the physical condition of the property and the agency would have whatever regulations and rights against such an owner that state and federal law afforded.

5. While this section imposes statutory constraints on the authority of the court to act in the first instance, the Act does not restrict application of other procedural and administrative law to judicial supervision of agency conduct. Thus, if a court were to determine that an agency has acted in violation of its statutory obligations in considering whether to approve a modification or termination of an environmental covenant, that

conduct would be itself be subject to judicial scrutiny under other law of that state.

Where an environmental covenant applies to real property that is otherwise subject to one of the doctrines listed in Subsection (c), circumstances may arise in which the protections of the covenant are not needed. For example, rights gained by adverse possession would be limited by the environmental covenant's restrictions where a house had been inadvertently placed on real property subject to an environmental covenant that precluded residential use. In a case such as these, modification of the covenant can be sought pursuant to Section 10. Seeking such a modification will ensure that appropriate consideration will be given to residual environmental risks.

The basic policy of this Act to ensure that environmental covenants survive impairment is consistent with the broad policy articulated in the Restatement of the Law of Property (Servitudes) Third, §7.9.

States that do not have a Marketable Record Title Act or a Dominant Mineral Interests Act will not need subsection (d). States that do have either or both of these acts may choose to put this exception in the respective statute rather than in this Act.

The exception to the Marketable Record Title Act and the Dormant Mineral Interests Act in optional (d) is analogous to exceptions commonly made for conservation and preservation servitudes. Restatement of the Law of Property Third (Servitudes) § 7.16 (5) (1998). It is based on the public importance of ensuring continued enforcement of environmental covenants to protect human health and the environment. For states adopting the registry of environmental covenants to be kept by the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] under Section 12 of this Act, the cost of extending title searches to this registry should be low.

If there is any question whether a specific environmental covenant is exempt from the requirements of the Marketable Record Title Act or the Dominant Mineral Interests Act, the agency should comply with that Act by re-recording the covenant within the relevant act's specified statutory period. This will ensure that the covenant is not extinguished under either of these acts.

Finally, the fact that the Act specifies that notice of either an eminent domain proceeding or an action to apply the doctrine of changed circumstances be given to persons identified in Section 10 does not mean that other persons might not also be entitled to notice of the action or to intervene as parties in the action under other legal principles. Other state law may require such notice and this Act does not affect such other, additional notice requirements.

SECTION 10. AMENDMENT OR TERMINATION BY CONSENT.

(a) An environmental covenant may be amended or terminated by consent only if

the amendment or termination is signed by:

(1) the agency;

(2) unless waived by the agency, the current owner of the fee simple of the real property subject to the covenant;

(3) each person that originally signed the covenant, unless the person waived in a signed record the right to consent or a court finds that the person no longer exists or cannot be located or identified with the exercise of reasonable diligence; and

(4) except as otherwise provided in subsection (d)(2), the holder.

(b) If an interest in real property is subject to an environmental covenant, the interest is not affected by an amendment of the covenant unless the current owner of the interest consents to the amendment or has waived in a signed record the right to consent to amendments.

(c) Except for an assignment undertaken pursuant to a governmental reorganization, assignment of an environmental covenant to a new holder is an amendment.

(d) Except as otherwise provided in an environmental covenant:

(1) a holder may not assign its interest without consent of the other parties;

(2) a holder may be removed and replaced by agreement of the other parties specified in subsection (a); and

(3) a court of competent jurisdiction may fill a vacancy in the position of holder.

Comment

1. A variety of circumstances may lead the parties to wish to amend an environmental covenant to change its activity and use limitations or to terminate the

covenant.

Subsection (a) specifies the parties that must consent to the amendment. Subsection (a)(3) reaches a party that originally signed the covenant whether or not it was an owner of the real property. Such parties might typically be ones which were liable for some or all of the environmental remediation specified in the environmental response project, including contingent liability for future remediation. This provision is intended to apply to successors in interest to the party which originally signed the covenant where the successor continues to be subject to the contingent liability under the environmental response project.

Some of the original parties to the covenant may have signed the covenant because they have contingent liability for future remediation should it become necessary. The extension of that liability to successor businesses is a complex subject controlled by the underlying state or federal environmental law creating the liability. See Blumberg, Strasser and Fowler, The Law of Corporate Groups: Statutory Law, 2002 Annual Supplement, §18.02 and §18.02.4 (Aspen, 2002) and Blumberg and Strasser, The Law of Corporate Groups: Statutory Law—State §§ 15.03.2 and 15.03.3 (Aspen, 1995). Where the party that originally signed the covenant has been merged into or otherwise become part of another business entity for purposes of future cleanup liability, subsection (a)(3) is intended to require the consent of that successor entity rather than the consent of the original party.

2. In considering the potential liability of successor businesses, as discussed above, it is important to understand the dual chains of successors that a particular circumstance presents – (1) successors to ownership of the business that originally caused the contamination; and (2) successors to owners of the contaminated real property. Particularly when contamination occurred many years ago, those chains of successors may be very different.

Consider this hypothetical – although very typical – situation:

Real Property Ownership In 1925, Peter Plating, Inc. built a factory on a 3-acre lot in Hartford, CT and commenced its business, which was to apply chromium plating to coffee pots on that site. Customary business practice at the time was to discharge the exhausted chromium into “sumps” - holes dug in the ground, and filled with large stones. Peter Plating did this for 25 years.

In 1950, Peter Plating closed its Hartford plating operation, and sold the land and factory to Rabbit Warehouses, Inc. Rabbit used the factory for 25 years as a storage facility, and then sold the factory in 1975 to Ernie Entrepreneur, an individual, who bought the land with the proceeds of a first mortgage from First Local Bank.

Ernie used the factory for light manufacturing until 1985. He also leased part of the site to Acme Auto Repair, Inc. Acme dumped used oil and degreasers into its own sump on the lot. At some unknown date, Acme ceased operations.

In 1985, after Ernie learned of the contamination, he transferred ownership of the land to a corporation – Ernie, Inc. Ernie and his wife owned all the stock of the new corporation. In 1986, Ernie ceased operations, abandoned the factory, and moved with his family to an island off North Carolina. Ernie, Inc. was later administratively dissolved under state law for failure to file its annual reports.

First Local Bank started foreclosure in 1986, learned of the contamination, and withdrew the foreclosure action because of its reluctance to be in the chain of title. The Bank still holds the mortgage, but long ago wrote off the debt on its books.

Real property taxes have not been paid since 1984. City officials started to foreclose for unpaid taxes, but when they learned of the contamination, they, like First Local Bank, decided not to foreclose.

In 2002, the City demolished the factory as a safety measure, put a fence around it and put a \$200,000 demolition lien on the property. Today, the site is abandoned, and neighborhood children play games on the lot after crawling under the fence. Clean-up costs are estimated at \$1.6 million; a “clean” 1.5-acre lot in this run-down neighborhood recently sold for \$50,000.

The traditional “chain of title” doctrine in real property suggests that successive owners and operators of the real property, beginning with the original owner or tenant that caused contamination of the real property, may all have potential liability. In chronological order, they include: (1) Peter Plating, Inc.; (2) Rabbit Warehousing, Inc. (3) Ernie Entrepreneur, individually; (4) Acme Auto Repair, Inc.; and (5) Ernie, Inc.

Stock and Asset Ownership Aside from the successor real property ownership, we must also consider the successor ownership of the business that caused the contamination. Assume that 100% of Peter Plating’s stock was acquired by a publicly-held corporation, Jefferson, Inc., in 1950. The parent corporation moved the plating business to a southern state, which is why the Hartford business closed. In 1970, Jefferson sold off the plating assets, but no stock, to Hiccup, NA, a publicly traded British corporation. Both Jefferson and Hiccup are still in business.

This chain of stock and asset sales should result in at least one and perhaps two additional “successors” whose role in the transaction may require further analysis.

Assume this Act had been in effect in 1940, and Peter Plating, Inc. had signed the original environmental covenant. If the agency wishes in 2003 to amend the 1940 covenant, it will be important to determine who must sign on behalf of Peter Plating – the person who originally signed the covenant in 1940 – as required by subsection 10 (a) (3).

3. Note also that Ernie, Inc. – the current owner – has abandoned the property and moved out of state. Neither this corporation nor Ernie Entrepreneur, as an individual, is likely to cooperate in signing a new covenant today or an amendment to an

original covenant that was signed in 1940. This may pose practical difficulties in satisfying the requirements of Section 10)(a)(2).

4. In order to secure the consents required by this section, it is likely that the agency will require the party seeking the amendment to provide notice to the parties whose consent is required by the statute.

5. Note that this section does not require the consent of intermediate owners of the real property – in our example, if the original owner in 1940 was Peter Plating, and the current owner is Ernie, Inc., then Rabbit Warehouses, Inc., would not be required to approve an amendment to the covenant. Rabbit would have been bound by the covenant when it bought the parcel in 1975. Since there is no allegation that Rabbit took any action in violation of the covenant, and Rabbit conveyed the property to Ernie without retention of any interest in the property, Rabbit would not be affected by the covenant and therefore need not sign the amendment.

6. Finally, the covenant may be amended or terminated with respect only to a portion of the real property that was originally subject to the covenant. Thus, for example, if a covenant originally covered 100 acres of real property and as a result of remediation activity, 50 acres of the site eventually became completely free of contamination and pose no further environmental risk, the parties might agree to terminate the activity and use limitations on the cleaned up 50 acres while leaving the covenant in place on the remaining land.

7. As provided in Section 11(b), this Act does not limit the agency's regulatory authority under other law to regulate an environmental response project and the agency may be well advised to consider the implication of this provision in drafting a specific environmental covenant. Thus, for example, if new science suggested a need for additional monitoring or remediation at a contaminated site beyond that mandated in a recorded environmental covenant applicable to that site, the agency's authority to require that additional work would depend on other law, while its authority to impose the remediation cost on other parties may depend both on that law and on the terms of any prior agreements the agency may have executed with potentially liable parties.

Under this Act, however, the agency would be prevented from administratively releasing or amending real property covenants without approval of the parties designated in this section. Given the potential legal liability of the parties in the two chains of title who may be affected by an amendment to or termination of the covenant, this is an appropriate outcome.

However, over time, it may not be practical to identify the original parties or their corporate successors in order to secure their consent. Section 10(a)(3) provides a judicial mechanism by which the need for absent parties' consent may be avoided.

The same section highlights the possibility that the agency might seek the agreement of the original parties to future amendments of the covenant, without the need

for later consent. Such a waiver might be attractive to original parties, depending on the extent to which the agency was willing to hold original parties harmless from the liability that might otherwise accrue from a claimed injury following a use once prohibited by the original covenant, and depending also on the overall cost of the transaction.

Where there is a change in either the current knowledge of remaining contamination or the current understanding of the environmental risks it presents, the agency may conclude that the environmental response project should be changed or new regulatory action taken. The agency's ability to take such action is contemplated by §11(b) but, in the absence of consent, is not governed by this Act.

The agency may wish to consider whether the following parties have a sufficient interest in a particular proposal to make notice of the proposed amendment to them advisable:

- (1) All affected local governments;
- (2) The state regulatory agency for environmental protection if it is not the agency for this environmental response project;
- (3) All persons holding an interest of record in the real property;
- (4) All persons known to have an unrecorded interest in the real property;
- (5) All affected persons in possession of the real property;
- (6) All owners of the fee or any other interests in abutting real property and any other property likely to be affected by the proposed modification;
- (7) All persons specifically designated to have enforcement powers in the covenant; and
- (8) The public.

The agency may also wish to consider whether the notice should include any of the following:

- (1) New information showing that the risks posed by the residual contamination are less or greater than originally thought;
- (2) Information demonstrating that the amount of residual contamination has diminished; and
- (3) Information demonstrating that one or more activity limitations or use restrictions is no longer necessary.

SECTION 11. ENFORCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.

(a) A civil action for injunctive or other equitable relief for violation of an environmental covenant may be maintained by:

- (1) a party to the covenant;

(2) the agency or, if it is not the agency, the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection];

(3) any person to whom the covenant expressly grants power to enforce;

(4) a person whose interest in the real property or whose collateral or liability may be affected by the alleged violation of the covenant; or

(5) a municipality or other unit of local government in which the real property subject to the covenant is located.

(b) This [act] does not limit the regulatory authority of the agency or the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] under law other than this [act] with respect to an environmental response project.

(c) A person is not responsible for or subject to liability for environmental remediation solely because it has the right to enforce an environmental covenant.

Comment

1. Subsection (a) specifies which persons may bring an action to enforce an environmental covenant.

2. Importantly, the Act seeks to distinguish between the expanded rights granted to enforce the covenant in accordance with its terms, and actions for money damages, restitution, tort claims and the like.

This Act confers standing to enforce an environmental covenant on persons other than the agency and other parties to the covenant because of the important policies underlying compliance with the terms of the covenant. Thus, for example, in the case of a covenant approved by a federal agency on real property which has been conveyed out of federal ownership, the Act confers standing on a state agency to enforce the covenant, even though the agency may not have signed it. Further, a local affected government is empowered to seek injunctive relief to enforce a covenant to which it may not be a party. In both cases, absent this Act, those state and municipal agencies might not have standing to enforce a covenant, and might simply be relegated to seeking standing under other law.

Similarly, the mandated ‘holder’ has a statutory right to enforce the covenant under this section, since the holder must be a party to the covenant. Over time, the holder may come to play a significant role in the monitoring and enforcement process.

On the other hand, the Act does not provide any authority for a citizens' suit to enforce a covenant, although other law may authorize such suits. This Act does not affect that other law.

3. The Act does not authorize any claims for damages, restitution, court costs, attorneys' fees or other such awards. Standing to bring such claims, and the bases for any such cause of action, must be found, if at all, under other law. At the same time, while this action does not authorize any such cause of action, it does not bar them if available under other law.

4. Subsection (b) recognizes that in many situations the statutes authorizing an environmental response project will provide substantial authority for governmental enforcement of an environmental covenant in addition to rights specified in the environmental covenant. For example, EPA could bring a civil action to enforce an environmental covenant at a Superfund site under Section 106(a) of CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. § 9606, or to enforce an environmental covenant at a RCRA facility under Section 7003 of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. § 6973.

[SECTION 12. REGISTRY; SUBSTITUTE NOTICE.

(a) The [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency] shall [establish and maintain a] [maintain its currently existing] registry that contains all environmental covenants and any amendment or termination of those covenants. The registry may also contain any other information concerning environmental covenants and the real property subject to them which the [state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency] considers appropriate. The registry is a public record for purposes of [insert reference to State Freedom of Information Act].

(b) After an environmental covenant or an amendment or termination of a covenant is filed in the registry [established][maintained] pursuant to subsection (a), a notice of the covenant, amendment, or termination that complies with this section may be recorded in the land records in lieu of recording the entire covenant. Any such notice

must contain:

(1) a legally sufficient description and any available street address of the real property subject to the covenant;

(2) the name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property, the agency, and the holder if other than the agency;

(3) a statement that the covenant, amendment, or termination is available in a registry at the [insert name and address of state regulatory agency for environmental protection, secretary of state, or other appropriate state officer or agency], which discloses the method of any electronic access; and

(4) a statement that the notice is notification of an environmental covenant executed pursuant to [insert statutory reference to this [act]].

(c) A statement in substantially the following form, executed with the same formalities as a deed in this state, satisfies the requirements of subsection (b):

“1. This notice is filed in the land records of the [political subdivision] of [insert name of jurisdiction in which the real property is located] pursuant to, [insert statutory reference to Section 12 of the Uniform Environmental Covenants Act].

2. This notice and the covenant, amendment or termination to which it refers may impose significant obligations with respect to the property described below.

3. A legal description of the property is attached as Exhibit A to this notice. The address of the property that is subject to the environmental covenant is [insert address of property] [not available].

4. The name and address of the owner of the fee simple interest in the real property on the date of this notice is [insert name of current owner of the property and the

owner's current address as shown on the tax records of the jurisdiction in which the property is located].

5. The environmental covenant, amendment or termination was signed by [insert name and address of the agency].

6. The environmental covenant, amendment, or termination was filed in the registry on [insert date of filing].

7. The full text of the covenant, amendment, or termination and any other information required by the agency is on file and available for inspection and copying in the registry maintained for that purpose by the [insert name of state regulatory agency for environmental protection] at [insert address and room of building in which the registry is maintained]. [The covenant, amendment or termination may be found electronically at [insert web address for covenant].”]

Comment

1. This section should be used only by states that require creation of a registry of environmental covenants pursuant to this optional Section. At the time this Act was promulgated, Section 101 of CERCLA had recently been amended to encourage states to create registries of sites where remediation work had been completed; *see* Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act, Pub. L. No. 107-118 § 128(b)(1)(C) (2002). The Act anticipates that in those states that choose to create such a registry for federal law purposes, this section would prove useful in integrating local land recording systems with a single, state-wide registry.

2. The notice specified in this Section may be recorded in the land records in lieu of recording the environmental covenant. However, such a notice should be authorized only if the registry is established and the environmental covenant is recorded there. Where there is no separate registry, the environmental covenant must be recorded in the land records and this notice would not be used.

3. A description of the property under subsection (b)(1) may include identification by latitude/longitude coordinates. Note also that a description of the location of the contamination itself on the site may require considerably more detail than the description of the real property subject to the covenant; *see* the discussion of this subject in the comments to Section 4.

4. The web address required to be contained in the notice by subsection (c)(7) should reflect the most direct means of identifying the full covenant and accompanying information. As appropriate, the address may require a specific internet address, page or name reference, document number or other unique identifying name, number or symbol.

A registry created under this optional section could be self-funding, in the same way that the corporate records departments of most Secretaries of State offices and the land recording offices of most counties and municipalities are self-funding.]

SECTION 13. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION. In applying and construing this uniform act, consideration must be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law with respect to its subject matter among states that enact it.

SECTION 14. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT. This [act] modifies, limits, or supersedes the federal Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. Section 7001 et seq.) but does not modify, limit, or supersede Section 101(c) of that Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001(c), or authorize electronic delivery of any of the notices described in Section 103(b) of that Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7003(b).

SECTION 15. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this [act] or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of this [act] which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this [act] are severable.




A Few Facts about
THE UNIFORM ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANTS ACT

PURPOSE: The Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA) provides clear rules for a perpetual real estate interest – an environmental covenant – to regulate the use of brownfields when real estate is transferred from one owner to another.

ORIGIN: Completed by the Uniform Law Commission in 2003.

APPROVED BY: American Bar Association, ABA Section on Real Property, Trust & Estate Law.

ENACTED BY:



For further information about UECA, please contact ULC Chief Counsel Benjamin Orzeske at 312-450-6621 or borzeske@uniformlaws.org.