



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR, REGION 10
510 Hickam Ave., Bldg 250 Bay A,
Travis AFB, CA 94535**

April 6, 2017

Representatives Zach Fansler and Justin Parish
Co-Chairs, House Community & Regional Affairs
Alaska State Legislature
State Capitol Rooms 416 and 432
Juneau, AK 99801

Subject: Department of Defense Supplemental Comments on Alaska Senate Bill 64

Dear Representatives Fansler and Parish:

As the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Regional Environmental Coordinator for Region 10, which includes the State of Alaska, I would like to respond to some of the testimony and other inputs that have been presented during the Alaska Senate's Committee Hearings discussing Senate Bill 64 and clarify some of the previously expressed positions.

The purpose of the DoD comments on Alaska Senate Bill 64 submitted on March 3, 2017, was not to avoid DoD's cleanup responsibilities under the various applicable environmental statutes. The DoD's intent was to request reconsideration of language in the bill that attempts to require the transfer of real property interests that DoD is not authorized to convey. The DoD remains committed to the responsible and effective cleanup standards identified in the governing administrative documents that would be identified under draft Section 46.04.340's provision entitled "Notice of activity and use limitation." We recognize the importance of the legislature's desire to ensure these clean-up standards are clearly conveyed to future potential property owners in an easily accessible manner. In furtherance of this intent, the DoD would be supportive of a "pure" notice standard similar to the "Notices of Environmental Contamination (Deed Notice)" that are currently voluntarily made under Attachment 1's guidance document from the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) entitled "*Guidance On Using Institutional Controls in Oil and Other Hazardous Substance Cleanups.*"

The applicable federal government memorandum that describes the legal prohibition we previously referred to in our March 3, 2017, letter is from the General Services Administration (GSA) and is entitled "*Restrictive Covenants on Non-excess Property.*" It is included as Attachment 2. In this memo, GSA's Director of Redeployment Services stated that landholding agencies, such as the DoD, do not have the authority to place "use restrictions" or other "restrictive covenants" on property in their inventory, as under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, "GSA was given the exclusive authority to manage the utilization and disposal of real property. (40 U.S.C. §§ 471, et seq.)." The memo goes on to state

that “property” is defined under the act to “include ‘any interest in property’ (40 U.S.C. § 472(d))” and identifies that “GSA’s regulations (41 C.F.R. § 101-47, 103-12(a)) define ‘real property’ to include ‘any interest in land’.”¹

While there have been some minor changes to the applicable regulations, the general prohibition contained within the statutes and regulations mentioned in the GSA memorandum remain the same- the DoD and its components lack the legal authority to grant the interests in land contemplated by SB 64, which includes notices of activity and use limitations because the bill does not clearly distinguish activity and use limitations from environmental covenants. This is a U.S. Coast Guard concern as well. This concern is particularly relevant to Alaska, as the vast majority of lands under the control of the Armed Forces of the United States in the state are public lands that have been temporarily withdrawn and reserved for military use by statute, by the U.S. Department of the Interior, or by Executive Order. Some of the lands have overlapping withdrawals involving more than one Federal agency, such as Womens Bay on Kodiak Island. Much of the public land inventory in Alaska is public domain land under Federal jurisdiction, title to which has been held solely and continuously by the United States since 1867 based on the original Treaty of Cession rather than a Deed or Patent and may pose legal and practical difficulties with the recordation requirements specified in Alaska Senate Bill 64. We suggest that the State Legislature and Governor’s Office confer with the Department of the Interior to obtain its views on Alaska Senate Bill 64 before the bill progresses further in the legislative process.

We believe SB 64 could be edited to be consistent with the previously mentioned laws and DoD’s policy implementing them. Specifically, the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) Manual (DoD Manual 4715.20), Enclosure 3, paragraph 4.b(17) states: “The DoD has no authority to grant a real property interest for an environmental land use control (e.g., an environmental covenant) on an installation, but may record an environmental notice provided for under State law if the notice does not constitute a real property interest.”

If the proposed language of SB 64 is amended to similarly reflect language from the aforementioned voluntary “Notices of Environmental Contamination (Deed Notice)” that are currently recorded, such that it is consistent with the DERP Manual’s land use control limitation, our concerns with SB 64 would be largely resolved. However, for the reasons stated above, we would still need to ensure the Department of the Interior has no objections to the recording of an environmental notice on public lands that have been withdrawn and reserved for military use.

In furtherance of the effort to implement legally acceptable language from both the DoD and the State of Alaska’s standpoint, we recommend you consider the following edits:

Sec 46.04.390(5) “notice of activity and use limitation” means notice of a restriction or obligation with respect to real property that was created in an environmental response project

¹ I note that the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 citations in the GSA memorandum to 40 U.S.C. 471, et.seq., and 40 USC 472(d) are now out of date. 40 USC 471, et seq. is now 40 USC 101, et seq. and 40 USC 472(d) is now 40 USC 102(9). Similarly, GSA changed its regulations after the memo was published from the Federal Property Management Regulations to the Federal Management Regulations and 41 CFR 101-47.103 was re-codified during this transition in the CFRs as 41 CFR 102-71.20.

decision document and filed in accordance with AS 46.04.300-46.04.390. A notice of activity and use limitation does not constitute a servitude arising under an environmental response project and a recorded notice of activity and use limitation does not constitute a real property interest.

Sec. 46.04.340(d) A notice of activity and use limitation must remain in place for current or future landowners until otherwise addressed pursuant to AK 46.04.340(e).

Sec. 46.04.340(i) In response to a petition from the owner of the real property with any notice of activity and use limitation recorded in accordance with this section, the department may authorize the notice of activity and use limitation to be replaced by an environmental covenant for that property. The department may condition its authorization and approval of the termination of the notice of activity and use limitation on the terms of the notice of activity and use limitation, department approval and acceptance, and the effective recording of the environmental covenant.

The DoD is committed to working with the State of Alaska and its agencies on environmental clean-up and other issues. With respect to this issue in particular, we understand that the language presented above may not be acceptable and that the short legislative season in Alaska does not allow for much further time to coordinate. However, if the State of Alaska would like to continue its dialogue with the DoD in order to craft mutually acceptable language, we would be happy to work together towards this goal in the hopes that it could then be presented during the next legislative season. Please feel free to contact my office if you have any questions, need any additional information, or would like to establish any further coordination. I can be reached at (707) 424-8290, or by email at robert.shirley.2@us.af.mil.

Sincerely,



ROBERT SHIRLEY
DoD Regional Environmental Coordinator
Region 10

Attachments

1. ADEC Guidance Document, *Guidance On Using Institutional Controls in Oil and Other Hazardous Substance Cleanups*, 32 pages, dated February 2011.
2. GSA Memorandum, *Restrictive Covenants on Non-excess Property*, 2 pages, dated October 16, 1998.

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

DIVISION OF SPILL PREVENTION AND RESPONSE CONTAMINATED SITES PROGRAM



GUIDANCE ON USING INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS IN OIL AND OTHER HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUPS

February 2011

PURPOSE: This guidance is for use by Contaminated Sites Program staff to evaluate whether institutional controls (ICs) are necessary when responding to a release of oil or other hazardous substances. The guidance describes various types of ICs that may be used, and the basic steps in creating, removing, and tracking them. It may also assist other parties in understanding the role of ICs in the cleanup process.

BACKGROUND:


Alaska's Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Control regulations (18 AAC 75) and Underground Storage Tank regulations (18 AAC 78) establish cleanup requirements for responding to contamination caused by releases of oil or other hazardous substances. Institutional controls may be necessary to protect human health and the environment during the investigation and cleanup stages. In other cases, institutional controls are applied to closed sites with residual oil or other hazardous substances remaining above levels that would otherwise allow for unrestricted future land or water use. If the land or water uses change, the institutional controls may need to be modified to assure the cleanup remains protective.

APPLICABILITY:

This guidance will be used by staff when evaluating ICs as a component of cleanup plans and oil and hazardous substance cleanup decisions under 18 AAC 75, Article 3, and 18 AAC 78.

This guidance may be revised or updated from time to time to account for regulatory and policy revisions.

APPROVAL:



Steve Bainbridge, Contaminated Sites Program Manager

February 14, 2011
Date

Contributing authors: John Halverson, Bill Janes, Evonne Reese, and Sally Schlichting

GUIDANCE ON USING INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS IN OIL AND OTHER HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUPS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | DISCLAIMER | 1 |
| 2 | WHAT ARE INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS AND WHY DO WE NEED THEM? | 1 |
| 2.1 | PROPRIETARY CONTROLS..... | 2 |
| 2.2 | GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLS | 2 |
| 2.3 | ENFORCEMENT-RELATED CONTROLS | 2 |
| 2.4 | INFORMATIONAL DEVICES | 2 |
| 3 | WHAT ARE SOME EXAMPLES OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL MECHANISMS? | 3 |
| 3.1 | EQUITABLE SERVITUDES AND EASEMENTS..... | 3 |
| 3.2 | LOCAL ORDINANCES/ZONING | 3 |
| 3.3 | ADMINISTRATIVE OR COMPLIANCE ORDER BY CONSENT | 3 |
| 3.4 | SIGNED DEC AGREEMENT | 4 |
| 3.5 | DEED RESTRICTION | 4 |
| 3.6 | RECORDED NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION (DEED NOTICE)..... | 4 |
| 3.7 | IC LAYERING | 4 |
| 3.8 | SOME COMMON EXAMPLES OF SITE-SPECIFIC CONTROLS AND CONDITIONS | 4 |
| 4 | HOW ARE DIFFERENT IC MECHANISMS USED? | 5 |
| 5 | HOW ARE ICS APPLIED TO LANDS OWNED BY THE GOVERNMENT? | 6 |
| 6 | ARE THERE SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR ICS ON ALASKA NATIVE LANDS? | 6 |
| 7 | WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS? | 6 |
| 8 | DURING WHAT POINT IN THE CLEANUP PROCESS SHOULD ICS BE CONSIDERED? | 7 |
| 9 | HOW DOES DEC MANAGE INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS? | 8 |
| 10 | WHAT HAPPENS IF A PARTY DOES NOT COMPLY WITH AN IC CONDITION? | 9 |
| | APPENDIX A - LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS | 10 |
| | APPENDIX B - INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE - SOIL | 12 |
| | APPENDIX C - INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE - GROUNDWATER | 13 |
| | APPENDIX D - EQUITABLE SERVITUDE TEMPLATE | 14 |
| | APPENDIX E – EQUITABLE SERVITUDE - FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS | 23 |
| | APPENDIX F – NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION (NEC) – LUST | 25 |
| | APPENDIX G - NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION (NEC) – CS | 27 |
| | APPENDIX H – RP INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING AN NEC | 29 |

GUIDANCE ON USING INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS IN OIL AND OTHER HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CLEANUPS

1 Disclaimer

This document was developed in accordance with 18 AAC 75 and 18 AAC 78 and does not constitute rulemaking by the State of Alaska. This guidance does not create any rights or benefits, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity, by any person. DEC may take action at variance with this guidance.

2 What are institutional controls and why do we need them?

The Environmental Protection Agency's Superfund Program defines ICs as non-engineered instruments, such as administrative and legal controls, that help minimize the potential for human exposure to contamination and/or protect the integrity of the remedy.

The State of Alaska interprets ICs as both engineered controls and administrative and legal controls. Alaska Administrative Code at 18 AAC 75.375 defines institutional controls to include:

- The requirement for and maintenance of physical measures, such as fences and signs, to limit an activity that might interfere with cleanup or result in exposure to a hazardous substance at the site;
- The requirement for and maintenance of engineering measures, such as liners and caps, to limit exposure to a hazardous substance;
- Restrictive covenants, easements, deed restrictions, or other measures that would be examined during a routine title search, and that limit site use or site conditions over time or provide notice of any residual contamination; and
- A zoning restriction or land use plan by a local government with land use authority.

Institutional controls may be thought of as both the legal or administrative instrument (IC mechanism) and the attached site-specific requirements or conditions. For example, a compliance order (IC mechanism) may contain the requirement to maintain an engineered control, such as a concrete cap over contaminated soil. ICs can be further categorized into four main types: proprietary controls, governmental controls, enforcement and permit tools with IC components, and informational devices. These general categories are discussed here. Within each category, there are a number of instruments that may be employed which are further detailed in Section 3.0.

2.1 *Proprietary Controls*

Proprietary controls are generally created pursuant to state and tribal law to prohibit activities that may compromise the effectiveness of the response action or restrict activities or future resource use that may result in unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. The most common examples of proprietary controls are easements and covenants.

2.2 *Governmental Controls*

Governmental controls impose restrictions on land use or resource use, using the authority of a government entity. Typical examples of governmental controls include zoning; building codes; state, tribal, or local ground water use regulations; and commercial fishing bans and sports/recreational fishing limits posed by federal, state and/or local resources and/or public health agencies. In many cases, federal landholding agencies, such as the Department of Defense, possess the authority to enforce ICs on their property. At active federal facilities, land use restrictions may be addressed in Base Master Plans, facility construction review processes, facility digging permit systems, and/or the facility well permitting systems.

2.3 *Enforcement-Related Controls*

Enforcement and permit tools with IC components are legal tools, such as administrative orders, permits, Federal Facility Agreements (FFAs) and Consent Decrees (CDs), that limit certain site activities or require the performance of specific activities (e.g., to monitor and report on an IC's effectiveness). They may be issued unilaterally or negotiated.

2.4 *Informational Devices*

Informational devices provide information or notification to local communities that residual or contained contamination remains on site. As such, the site manager and site attorney should make sure to provide language that clearly conveys the purpose of the informational device. Two common informational devices in Alaska include the contaminated sites on-line database and a Notice of Environmental Contamination filed at the State Records Office.

Institutional controls play an important role in site remedies because they reduce exposure to contamination by limiting land or resource use and guide human behavior at a site while allowing re-development and land transfers to proceed. Institutional controls may be used in a temporary fashion to help protect human health and the environment during the cleanup process. They may also be used for long-term protection of human health and the environment at sites where cleanup has been completed and residual contamination remains above levels that allow for unrestricted land use.

Institutional controls are tools to manage risk, but they do not eliminate risk entirely.

3 What are some examples of institutional control mechanisms?

3.1 *Equitable Servitudes and Easements*

Equitable servitudes and easements (*proprietary controls*) are written instruments through which a property owner transfers an interest in the property to another party. In other words, the interest “runs with the land.” Equitable servitudes and easements are useful because they can be written to include a wide or narrow range of specific provisions, detailed requirements and prohibitions. They are legally enforceable against current and future owners of the affected land; readily identifiable during title searches; and can be crafted so that DEC has a right to access the property to verify the effectiveness of remedies. They may also contain provisions which allow for modifications or termination of the requirements through a recorded release and cross-referencing to the earlier recorded document. See [Appendices D and E](#) for a template and instructions for completing an Equitable Servitude Agreement.

Equitable servitudes and easements can be difficult and time-consuming to negotiate and execute. Moreover, the (DNR) is the state agency designated to hold the property interest negotiated through a servitude agreement, and must assign a “management right” to DEC. For these reasons, equitable servitudes and easements are used very judiciously and at higher risk sites only.

3.2 *Local Ordinances/Zoning*

Parties can work with local government, such as a municipality, to establish land or resource use limitations through *government controls* such as ordinances or zoning. This may be a helpful option where there are multiple parcels or landowners involved, such as large groundwater contaminant plumes. However, ordinances and zoning may change as politics and economic factors fluctuate and may initially require a time-consuming process with uncertain results. Any zoning or ordinances specifically created or modified to affect contaminated sites should include language that requires notification to and concurrence from DEC prior to any subsequent modifications or waivers.

3.3 *Administrative or Compliance Order by Consent*

These “orders” or *enforcement tools* are essentially contracts between DEC and the subject party in which the parties agree to particular requirements and/or prohibitions. It is important to remember these agreements are only enforceable against the parties identified in the agreement. Administrative or compliance orders can be implemented and modified fairly easily. Any such agreement should also require a notification to DEC prior to any land transfer or lease, as the agreement may not apply to subsequent landowners.

3.4 *Signed DEC Agreement*

An agreement and signature page often accompanies each cleanup complete decision (with ICs) issued. Failure to comply with the terms of the agreement may result in the department reopening the site for further action. The agreement can be used as a stand-alone mechanism for lower risk sites, or used in combination with more robust IC mechanisms described above.

3.5 *Deed Restriction*

Language can be crafted in a quitclaim deed in which the property “grantor,” in order to protect its long-term interests, stipulates certain use restrictions or other conditions to the “grantee.” This mechanism may be particularly suitable when a public land parcel with residual contamination is transferred to private ownership.

3.6 *Recorded Notice of Environmental Contamination (Deed Notice)*

Alaska land is divided into 34 recording districts. A state recorder’s office in each district is where land-related documents may be recorded for public notice and researched for title searches. Anyone can record a document with a recorder’s office, as long as the document fulfills certain regulatory and statutory technical criteria. Thus, notices of contamination, cleanup or other such notices may be recorded in the appropriate recording district(s), with reference to the property’s legal description so that it may be cross-referenced (See [Appendix A](#) for detail on legal descriptions). Recorded notices are *informational devices* that simply provide notice to interested parties; they do not transfer a property interest and, beyond providing notice, are not legally binding upon anyone. Notices cannot restrict land use or create any duties. They should not be used when an enforceable IC is needed. When drafting a notice, it is crucial that the information in the notice is correct, specific, and factual. Notices cannot be removed from the recorder’s office. In order to terminate the effect of a notice, a second notice must be recorded which cross-references the earlier-recorded notice. See [Appendices F, G and H](#) for deed notice templates and instructions.

3.7 *IC Layering*

Using more than one type of IC mechanism (called IC layering) may help assure that a remedy remains protective throughout the years. For example, a compliance order may be negotiated with a current landowner, an equitable servitude and easement may be established, and local zoning may be used to ensure coordination with land use planners.

3.8 *Some Common Examples of Site-specific Controls and Conditions*

Below are a few examples of site-specific controls and conditions

- Fencing or signs to prevent people from entering an area of contamination
- Capping residual contamination with clean soil or other material
- Prohibiting excavation without prior DEC approval
- Groundwater or surface water use restrictions
- Signs posted to warn the public of the contamination issues
- Commercial/industrial land usage only (no 24-hour occupancy)

4 How are different IC mechanisms used?

The type of legal or administrative instrument employed generally depends on the level of risk posed and expected future land use. Appendices B and C provide quick reference guides for applying certain types of ICs, depending on soil and groundwater conditions at the site. Detailed examples are provided below.

- *Direct contact and inhalation cleanup levels are not achieved throughout the top 15 feet of soil. (e.g., 18 AAC 75.340(j))* - May warrant an enforceable mechanism such as an equitable servitude and easement if it involves a limitation on future land use. Based on the volume of contaminated soil, type of contaminant and how accessible it is, an informational mechanism such as a deed notice may be appropriate.
- *Groundwater cleanup levels (18 AAC 75.345 Table C) not achieved and groundwater is a current or potential future drinking water source (e.g., 18 AAC 75.350(a)(2)(C) and 18 AAC 78.620)* – Typically warrants an equitable servitude or another enforceable mechanism, unless an alternative drinking water supply is being used (such as the mandated use of a public water system).
- *Groundwater cleanup levels (18 AAC 75.345 Table C or method 4) not achieved and groundwater is **not** a current or potential future drinking water source (e.g., 18 AAC 75.350(a)(2)(C) and 18 AAC 78.620)* – ICs may be unnecessary; more typically, an informational IC mechanism may be warranted. The need for (and type of) ICs in these situations also depends on the current or potential future use of the aquifer for purposes other than drinking water (such as aquaculture). Institutional controls may be needed in these situations to account for potential human and ecological exposure and surface water quality concerns, including the potential for de-watering activities.

Land use is restricted to commercial/industrial (e.g., under 18 AAC 75.340(d) method 3 or 4) – Typically warrants an equitable servitude agreement unless land use controls (such as zoning restrictions) are already in place.

- *Cleanup includes capping, covering or leaving contaminants in place (e.g., 18 AAC 75.375(d)(2) and 18 AAC 78.625(d)(1) and (2))* - May warrant either an enforceable mechanism (i.e., equitable servitude or compliance order) or an informational mechanism (i.e., deed notice) depending on the volume of contaminated soil remaining, the type and concentration of contaminant(s) and accessibility to them. An IC will normally be required if concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbon in soil to a depth of 15 feet exceed the maximum allowable levels in 18 AAC 75.341 Table B2.

- *Alternative point of compliance for groundwater approved under 18 AAC 75.345(e)* - May involve a range of mechanisms, from simple notices to enforceable controls depending on the specific circumstances.
- *Cleanup to the approved cleanup levels is determined impracticable (e.g., 18 AAC 75.325(f)(1))* - May involve a range of mechanisms, from simple notices to enforceable controls based on the potential risk posed by the remaining contaminants.

5 How are ICs applied to lands owned by the government?

For federal properties, a notice of environmental contamination may be recorded in state and federal land status plats. Compliance agreements may be developed. Land management plans may be utilized to provide notice of contamination or restrict specific activities. Other tools may be appropriate. Each federal facility must be researched individually to determine what formal orders or agreements it is governed under and by whom. At federal facilities, ICs will need to be developed through close coordination between DEC, the Department of Law (DOL) and the federal agency.

DEC staff should consult with landowners/managers, responsible parties and (DOL) to develop appropriate ICs for state-owned lands. Interagency memorandums of agreement or understanding may be an efficient method to achieve some land use planning between the agencies. Also, it is important to check with DNR to see if the subject property is within one of its area, regional or local use plans so that any IC documents that the government agencies create remain consistent with any existing plan. Such agreements or other notices can be recorded in the DNR land records.

6 Are there special considerations for ICs on Alaska Native lands?

Lands possessed or selected by tribes, villages, or corporations under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (See 43 U.S.C. § 1613) are not precluded from carrying institutional controls. However, like any landowner, Alaska Native entities must agree to whether an institutional control will be placed on property they own or whether they are willing to accept transfer of lands that have contamination-related restrictions on future development. In cases where institutional controls may be proposed by responsible parties for native lands, DEC staff should engage the appropriate Alaska Native entities in these decisions.

7 Who is responsible for institutional controls?

The responsibility for maintaining and paying the costs associated with ICs typically rests with the responsible person (RP). However, deciding which IC to use and drafting of any necessary documents must be discussed, reviewed and approved by DEC before being established. DEC project managers should always consult with DOL when considering enforceable ICs. Informational ICs generally do not need DOL input.

8 During what point in the cleanup process should ICs be considered?

If cleanup plans are developed based on an assumption that there will be limitations on future land use, or if contamination above approved cleanup levels is expected to remain in place following the cleanup, the need for ICs should be evaluated and addressed as early as possible in the site characterization and cleanup processes. Problems have arisen in the past when ICs have been added at the end of a cleanup and landowner reluctance was identified too late. An RP may have the impression that ICs are an easy, cost-effective substitute for a more complete cleanup. However, careful analysis of the steps necessary, the costs and the long-term liabilities and other implications involved in creating and maintaining ICs may prove differently.

When using an IC in a cleanup, DEC project managers must work with RPs to ensure the following basic steps are addressed:

- Clearly identify the objectives behind the ICs;
- Gather the relevant and necessary information:
 - Confirm the correct and accurate legal description of the property, copies of the prior conveyance(s) of the subject property may be helpful. (See [Appendix A- Legal Descriptions](#));
 - For equitable servitudes, conduct a “pre-litigation” or “attorney’s” title search to ensure that all parties with an interest in the subject land, including mortgage holders, holders of existing easements, lien holders, etc. are identified (the responsible party can perform this, or DEC could do so and then cost recover);
 - Find out how the property is zoned and whether any land use ordinances or other land management plans apply to the land;
 - Gather documentation including site and vicinity maps, drawn to scale and showing the extent and type of the remaining contamination, buildings and other site characteristics, and property boundaries; and
 - If the IC is only intended to address a portion of the property described in the legal description, the IC needs to clearly identify the affected portion; for large parcels of land this could include having the affected area surveyed.
- Briefly review the site background and preferred IC choices with DOL when considering or using enforceable ICs. For equitable servitudes, the draft documents should be reviewed by DOL before being shared with parties outside DEC; in addition, DOL may need to contact DNR at this point if it appears an interest in land will be transferred to the State (equitable servitude) (note,

sufficient time must be provided to DNR to review and process such documents, depending on the complexity of the legal description(s) this may require several weeks);

- If a site will be limited to industrial or commercial land use (18 AAC 75.340(e)(3)(a)), public participation is necessary, including consultation with any existing local zoning authority;
- Current and long-term costs for developing, maintaining and enforcing ICs should be included in any evaluation of cleanup alternatives;
- Any IC and associated cleanup plan should include language indicating that if the ICs are found to be ineffective, it may be necessary to reevaluate the cleanup and additional cleanup may be required; and
- Remember that layering more than one IC can help assure that a cleanup will remain protective and that potential exposure remains controlled.

9 How does DEC manage institutional controls?

CSP project managers should:

- Require that a copy of any recorded document or certified copy of any document, ordinance, zoning law, contract, order, relevant section of a land use plan, etc. used as an IC be provided to DEC for inclusion in the project file, and attached electronically in the database closure documents;
- Provide a copy of all completed enforceable IC documents to DOL;
- Ensure that any document created contains information to assist with future cross-referencing, such as an accurate legal description, parties' full names and addresses, date of creation/signing, reference the date and name of relevant DEC reports, plans and regulations, the site tracking number (database ID number), and DOL file number, if applicable;
- Use the Task Tracker module in the contaminated sites database to document and track all aspects of the ICs;
- Require regular (i.e. annual, two-year, five-year, etc.) IC compliance reporting;
- Notify relevant local government agencies and utilities of the ICs, including land use planning and zoning agencies; and
- Provide documentation affecting groundwater use restrictions or determinations to DEC's Drinking Water Program and DNR for water rights management.

Institutional controls are managed long-term by the CSP's IC Unit. Staff assigned to the IC Unit periodically evaluate sites closed with ICs to ensure they are functioning as intended, conduct IC site inspections, and recommend non-compliance enforcement actions to DEC management.

10 What happens if a party does not comply with an IC condition?

Enforcement options for non-compliance with IC conditions should be evaluated on a site-specific basis in consultation with DEC management. In the event of continued non-compliance, a site may be re-opened and further response actions required (or taken by DEC) in order to protect human health and the environment.

APPENDIX A - LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS

It is important that property law notices and equitable servitudes uniquely and precisely identify the property affected. This is important for at least two reasons: so the subject documents will actually provide notice during a standard title search and so there is no confusion about what property is affected. As discussed above, the responsible person must request an Attorney's (or Pre-Litigation) Title Report from a title company. The Recorder's Office does not prescribe a particular format for any legal description; rather they index the document based on the information provided by the customer and the office's internal business rules for indexing.

In the past, the grantor/grantee index was the only official index to recorded documents. Historically, the location index was maintained only as a courtesy index and contained many gaps and omissions over the years. In 1996, the location index was mandated by statute as an official index and all documents containing a legal description that are capable of being indexed are indexed into the location index as well as into the grantor/grantee index. Title companies regularly pick up all available information from recording office records, regardless of where the documents appear in the index. In January 1999, the Recorder's Office began utilizing a new indexing system with additional search capabilities, which will continue to expand.

Generically speaking, the Recorder's Office location index accommodates subdivided lands as well as sectionalized land described by aliquot parts. The following indicates how the different types of descriptions are indexed into the public record:

Subdivided lands: Lot, block, tract and/or apt/unit plus complete subdivision name, preferably including a reference to the plat number for that subdivision plat and recording district. (Searchers will find it easier to locate documents indexed with a plat number than with only a subdivision name reference.)

Section land: Section, township, range and meridian, including any aliquot parts or metes and bounds descriptions within a section. Full quarter/quarter sections are separately indexed into the system but descriptions constituting lands other than quarter/quarter sections are indexed under an additional legal field.

If a survey number is provided (U.S. Survey, U. S. Mineral Survey (U.S.M.S), Alaska State Land Survey, etc.) the survey number is indexed into the system. If a lot, block and/or tract are identified within a survey, it is also indexed. If a document contains both a survey and a plat number, it is indexed under the plat number only. If a document contains a survey and a townsite reference, it is indexed only under the survey. Indexing generally defaults to a survey number, but additional information should be included within the document as applicable to more fully identify the parcel.

If a description contains a metes and bounds reference, the above indexing rules apply as normal, and a reference to metes and bounds (M/B) is also entered into the index to alert researchers to look at the actual document for more information.

Every document submitted for recording should contain a reference to the recording district in which the property lies. If a description falls within multiple districts, the customer should consider recording in all affected districts to ensure the broadest possible notice of the recording.

Note that if there are typographical or other errors in the description contained on the document, the erroneous information will become part of the indexed data.

APPENDIX B - INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE - SOIL

| Residual Contaminant Concentrations | Representative contaminant levels greater than human health levels (Table B direct contact or inhalation) or site-specific ecological risk levels | Representative contaminant levels between the most conservative default cleanup levels and human health levels (Table B direct contact or inhalation); ecological risk mitigated or controlled | Representative contaminant concentrations below the most stringent level for the applicable precipitation zone |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Implementation Mechanism or Instrument | Generally enforceable: Equitable servitude, restrictive covenant, management right assignment, compliance order by consent. On-line availability of <i>cleanup complete</i> determination, other decision documents and land and activity use control details; default “reopener” and soil disposal notification conditions articulated in <i>cleanup complete</i> determination | Generally not needed; in some cases informational controls such as a deed notice or other informational mechanism may be used if concerned about relocation of contaminated soil to a sensitive area. On-line availability of <i>cleanup complete</i> determination and any condition details; default “reopener” and soil disposal notification conditions articulated in <i>cleanup complete</i> determination | Generally no IC’s: On-line availability of <i>cleanup complete</i> determination; default “reopener” and soil disposal notification conditions articulated in <i>cleanup complete</i> determination |
| Monitoring and Reporting | Annual scheduled monitoring and reporting periods tracked on the DEC database, possibly combined with DEC inspections | Variable monitoring and reporting requirements, based on individual site circumstances, tracked on the DEC database; DEC inspections infrequent or unnecessary | Generally none |
| | | | |

APPENDIX C - INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE - GROUNDWATER

| Residual Contaminant Concentrations | Representative contaminant levels above Table C – current or potential drinking water aquifer | Representative contaminant levels above Table C – not a current or potential drinking water aquifer | Representative contaminant concentrations below Table C |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Implementation Instrument or Mechanism | Generally enforceable: Equitable servitude and management right assignment; restrictive covenant;; compliance order by consent; local ordinance requiring public water supply use; enforceable land use plan. On-line availability of <i>cleanup complete</i> determination, other decision documents and land and activity use control detail; default “reopener” and groundwater disposal notification conditions articulated in <i>cleanup complete</i> determination | Generally informational: Deed notice or other informational mechanism depending on site specific circumstances; in some cases ICs may be unnecessary. On-line availability of <i>cleanup complete</i> determination and condition details; default “reopener” and groundwater disposal notification conditions articulated in <i>cleanup complete</i> determination | No IC’s: On-line availability of <i>cleanup complete</i> determination; default “reopener” and groundwater disposal notification conditions articulated in <i>cleanup complete</i> determination |
| Monitoring and Reporting | Annual scheduled monitoring and reporting periods, possibly combined with DEC inspections | Variable monitoring and reporting requirements based on individual site circumstances; notification of proposed industrial or other uses or dewatering activities; DEC inspections infrequent or unnecessary | None |

APPENDIX D - EQUITABLE SERVITUDE TEMPLATE

PLEASE SEE THE “EQUITABLE SERVITUDE TEMPLATE FAQs” FOR ASSISTANCE IN FINALIZING THIS DOCUMENT

EQUITABLE SERVITUDE [AND EASEMENT] [AND RIGHT OF ENTRY] [AS 34.17.010 - AS 34.17.060]

This Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry] (hereinafter “Instrument”) is made between _____, by [Name(s) and Addresses(s) of any entities with an existing fee interest in the subject property], as grantors (hereinafter, with [its] successors and assigns, “Grantor[s]”), and the State of Alaska (whose address is State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources, Division of Mining, Lands, and Water Realty Services Section, 3601 “C” Street, Suite 960, Anchorage, Alaska 99503), as grantee (hereinafter, with its assigns, “Grantee”), for good and valuable consideration.

WHEREAS, Grantor is the [owner of] certain real property subject to this Instrument (hereinafter the “Property”) [if there is more than one Grantor, identify each Grantor and identify interest in the property] which is more particularly described below:

[Legal description: the responsible person must pay for an Attorney (or “Pre-Litigation”) Title Search from a title company, which should contain a legal description. NOTE: the title company merely supplies a description derived from the title record, which is not necessarily the definitive legal description. In addition, add identifying and descriptive information regarding the location of the contamination (such as a map, site survey or diagram) if it is a portion of the property.]

WHEREAS, the Property was subject to a release of oil or another hazardous substance regulated under [18 AAC 75 or 18 AAC 78] and [a risk-based cleanup level and site closure/a soil and/or groundwater cleanup level determination under 18 AAC (check exact section and add date of current regulation) that is less stringent than a residential cleanup level, or a determination under 18 AAC 75.350 (date) that groundwater is not a current or potential future drinking water source].

WHEREAS, in lieu of a more comprehensive cleanup, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (along with its successor in administrative function or assigns hereinafter “ADEC”) has determined, and Grantor has agreed that, the recording of this Instrument is necessary as an institutional control as part of [name and date of spill plan/report, UST #] and 18 AAC [check exact section and add date of current regulation]; [may also add additional paragraphs giving background: when Property was contaminated and with what, information regarding ADEC’s evaluation, assumptions and risk-level established]; and

WHEREAS, the requirements, rights, covenants, conditions, prohibitions and restrictions of this Instrument (hereinafter “Provisions”) are intended to protect human health, safety, and welfare and the environment [and maintain (and/or enhance) water quality (conservation easement statutory language)].

NOW, THEREFORE, pursuant to the laws of Alaska, [including AS 34.17.010 - AS 34.17.060 and the common law,] Grantor does hereby grant and convey to Grantee forever, with warranties of title, subject to conditions, restrictions and limitations of record, an equitable servitude [and easement][and right of entry] over the Property of the nature and character and to the extent set forth below.

1. Prohibited Activities:

Unless otherwise specifically authorized in writing by the ADEC, the activities listed below are prohibited.

SAMPLE LANGUAGE:

a. Any action at or use of the Property, including, without limitation, subsurface utility repairs, construction or excavation activities, that interferes with or impairs the integrity of, or is reasonably likely to interfere with, or impair the integrity of [result in the creation of additional exposure pathways that increase the risk to human health, safety or welfare or to the environment][groundwater monitoring wells or other . . .][structures, systems, procedures or devices constructed or implemented at the Property, except that in case of an emergency requiring an immediate response, necessary action may begin immediately on the condition that ADEC is notified by Grantor in writing within _____ hours . . . [and necessary steps are undertaken by Grantor within ____days to reestablish ADEC approved (groundwater wells, systems, procedures, devices . . . constructed or implemented at the Property.)] [including but not limited to excavation, drilling, scraping, flooding or erosion . . .][NOTE: that unless all easement holders, such as underground utilities, agree to this document, they will not be subject to this limitation.]

b. Any use of groundwater at the Property, by extraction through wells or other means, which use involves consumption or other beneficial use of groundwater. [This prohibition shall not apply to the extraction of groundwater associated with temporary dewatering activities related to construction development, or the installation of sewer or utilities at the Property. . . .] [dewatering would likely not be considered a beneficial use of the groundwater; may need to specifically address dewatering and the need to properly manage and discharge the wastewater (if a type of groundwater use is allowed, reconcile with broad prohibitions above)].

c. The following operations and uses:

1. residential use of any type [definition? For example, the definition found in 18 AAC 75.990.]
2. agricultural use of any type [definition?]

d. [Constructing a new structure with a basement.]

e. [Soil excavation within the area where (residual soil contamination exists or where wastes are capped and left in place) as shown in the attached site (diagram/survey)].

f. Soil excavation or movement of soil off-site, as required by 18 AAC 75.325(i)(1) and (2) [add date of latest reg revision].

g. [Flooding the property by water diversion or snow stockpiles which saturate the soils and result in upward migration of pollution.]

2. Required Activities

Unless otherwise specifically authorized in writing by ADEC, the activities listed below are required.

a. Grantor shall install and maintain [the applicable engineering controls, such as a cap, as described by an attached agreement (i.e., a cleanup, monitoring and/or maintenance plan).]

3. Right of Entry

During reasonable hours, after reasonable notice and subject to reasonable security requirements, ADEC and its Agents shall have the right to enter in, on, upon, over and across any portion of the Property to determine whether the Provisions herein have been or are being complied with. Violation of, or reasonable suspicion of the violation of, any of the Provisions herein, shall give ADEC and its Agents the right, privilege, and license to enter in, on, upon, over, and across any portion of the Property and to investigate, abate, mitigate or cure such violation, at the expense of Grantor, provided written notice of the violation is given to Grantor, describing what activity is necessary to investigate or correct the violation and Grantor fails to cure the violation within a time specified in such notice. Such activities include but are not limited to the right to store, move, and remove equipment and supplies; construct, operate, maintain, alter, repair and remove devices for the monitoring, containment and treatment of contamination in soil, air and water; investigate and collect samples; excavate and remove waste, pollutants, hazardous substances, contaminated soils, contaminated waste; deposit uncontaminated soil; and the performance of any other activity which may be reasonably necessary and incident to ADEC's investigation and response. Any such entry by ADEC or its Agents shall not be deemed a trespass or any other wrongful entry or remaining on the Property, and Grantee shall not be subject to liability to Grantor for such entry or any action taken to investigate, abate, mitigate or cure a violation. ADEC and its Agents shall be considered invitees on the property and the Grantor shall make every reasonable effort to inform ADEC and its Agents of hazards or hazardous areas to prevent personal injury.

4. General Provisions:

a. This Instrument is for the benefit of Grantee and conveys the perpetual right to Grantee, acting through ADEC and contractors, employees, agents and authorized representatives acting on ADEC's behalf (herein, "Agents"), to enforce and implement the Provisions herein. Nothing herein shall be deemed to create in any third party the right to enforce this Instrument.

b. All real estate, lots, parcels, or portions thereof located within or on the Property, and any lease, conveyance, or transfer covering or describing any part thereof or interest therein, shall be subject to the Provisions herein. By acceptance of such conveyance or transfer, each lessee, transferee or grantee and each of their heirs, successors, transferees or assigns agrees with Grantor and each other to be bound by the Provisions herein.

c. Nothing in this Instrument shall be construed as preventing Grantor from [i.e., properly maintaining or repairing any existing or future monitoring wells, engineering controls or cleanup equipment that is specifically authorized in writing by ADEC . . .]

d. The Provisions herein shall run with the land in perpetuity and shall be binding upon Grantor.

e. Nothing in this Instrument shall relieve Grantor from liability for injuries occurring on, or resulting from [his/her/their] activities on the Property, for which Grantor would otherwise ordinarily be liable. Grantor shall be liable for and shall indemnify and hold Grantee harmless from liability for injuries and damage which

arise because of its status as Grantee. Grantor shall also indemnify Grantee for all costs, including attorneys' fees, which arise from its status as Grantee.

f. Grantor hereby covenants to and with Grantee that Grantor is lawfully seized of the surface estate [, in fee simple,] of the Property, has good and lawful right and power to sell and convey the same, that the same is free and clear of encumbrances, except as specified herein and as of record, and that Grantor will forever warrant and defend the equitable servitude [and easement][and right of entry] conveyed to Grantee by this Instrument against the claims and demands of all persons.

g. To the maximum extent permitted by law, the Provisions herein shall not be subject to waiver or abandonment due to non-enforcement or violation of this Instrument or any of the Provisions herein on all or any portion of the Property. No waiver of the breach of any of the Provisions herein shall constitute a waiver of a subsequent breach of the same Provision or any other Provision. No right of action shall accrue for or on account of the failure of any person to exercise any right created by this Instrument nor for imposing any Provision which may be unenforceable.

h. This Instrument may be enforced by Grantors or Grantee in a court of law. The interpretation and performance of this Instrument shall be governed by the laws of Alaska.

i. Upon violation of any of the Provisions herein, Grantee may seek any available legal or equitable remedy to enforce this Instrument and shall be entitled to recover damages for violations of the Provisions herein to the public or to the environment protected herein under applicable federal or state law.

j. Any notice, demand, request, consent, approval, or communication that a party desires or is required to give another shall be in writing and shall either be served personally or sent by first class mail, postage prepaid, addressed as follows:

To Grantor:

[Name and Address]

To Grantee:

Director, Division of Mining, Land and Water
Realty Services Section
Dept. of Natural Resources
3601 "C" Street, Suite 960
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

With a copy to:

[ADEC Contact Person
Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
Appropriate office address]

k. The determination that any Provision herein, or its application to any person or circumstance, is invalid shall not affect any other Provision herein or its application and the other Provisions herein shall remain in full force and effect.

l. Any general rule of construction to the contrary notwithstanding, this Instrument shall be construed so as to affect the purpose for which it was granted to Grantee. Any ambiguities shall be resolved in a manner that best accomplishes the purpose of this Instrument.

m. Grantor shall notify ADEC at least ten (10) days before the effective date of any conveyance, grant, gift, or other transfer, in whole or in part, of Grantor's interest in the Property. Grantor shall include in any instrument conveying any interest in any portion of the Property, including but not limited to deeds, leases and mortgages, a notice which is in substantially the following form:

NOTICE: The interest conveyed hereby is subject to an Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry] dated _____, 20____, recorded in the public land records on _____, 20____, in book _____, page _____, of the _____ Recording District [(s) repeat as necessary], Alaska, in favor of, and enforceable by, the State of Alaska.

n. Grantor shall notify ADEC within ten (10) days prior to Grantor's petitioning for or filing of any document initiating a rezoning of the Property under _____ zoning code or any successor code.

o. This Equitable Servitude [and Easement] [and Right of Entry] does not impose liability on the State of Alaska nor does it make the State of Alaska a responsible party under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act or AS 46.03 or similar federal or state statutes, regulations or local ordinances.

5. Termination

This Instrument shall be vacated and shall be of no further force and effect upon the recordation in the Recording District, _____ Judicial District, State of Alaska by ADEC of a Notice of Vacation of Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry]. ADEC shall execute and record a Notice of Vacation of Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry] at such time as it, in its sole discretion, determines that the prohibited and required activities and other provisions of this Instrument are no longer necessary for the protection of human health, safety, welfare and the environment. The Notice of Termination of Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry] shall be executed by ADEC and state that ADEC has determined that the prohibited and required activities and other provisions of the Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry] are no longer necessary for the protection of human health, safety and welfare and the environment and further state that the Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry] is hereby vacated. If Grantor requests a termination of this Instrument, any costs incurred by ADEC in reviewing a potential termination shall be paid by Grantor.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF Grantor and Grantee have set their hand on the dates written below. This Equitable Servitude [and Easement][and Right of Entry] is effective on the date of the last acknowledged signature.

[Identify Grantor]

By: _____

(Signature)

(Typed or printed name)

Its:

GRANTOR’S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

[Example for an individual]

STATE OF _____)
) ss.
_____JUDICIAL DISTRICT)

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on this ____ day of _____, _____, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of _____, duly commissioned and sworn as such, personally appeared _____, to me known and known to be the person [she/he] represented [her/himself] to be, and the same identical person who executed the above and foregoing EQUITABLE SERVITUDE [AND EASEMENT][AND RIGHT OF ENTRY] freely and voluntarily for the uses and purposes therein mentioned

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, the day and year first above written.

(Signature)

(Typed or printed name)

Notary Public in and for the State of _____
residing at _____.
My commission expires:_____

(SEAL)

GRANTOR’S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

[Example for an individual signing for corporation]

STATE OF _____)
) ss.
_____ JUDICIAL DISTRICT)

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on this ____ day of _____, _____, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of _____, duly commissioned and sworn as such, personally appeared _____, to me known and known to be the _____, and the person who executed the above and foregoing EQUITABLE SERVITUDE [AND EASEMENT][AND RIGHT OF ENTRY] on behalf of the _____, and who acknowledged to me that [she/he] signed the same as the _____, in the name of and for and on behalf of the _____, freely and voluntarily and by authority of its - _____ for the uses and purposes therein mentioned and on oath stated that [she/he] was authorized to execute said instrument.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal, the day and year first above written.

(Signature)

(Typed or printed name)

Notary Public in and for the State of _____
residing at _____.
My commission expires: _____

(SEAL)

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY OF _____ CORPORATION
(Example for Corporate Grantor Acknowledgment)

I, the undersigned, to hereby certify the following:

1. I am now the duly elected, qualified and acting Secretary of the ____ Corporation [brief mention of what laws the corp. exists and is organized under].
2. Attached as Exhibit ____ are true and correct copies of (i) the Articles of Incorporation of the Corporation, which were filed with the State of Alaska on [date]; (ii) [list any amendments to or restated articles and filing date]. [Review articles which are in] full force and effect as of the date of this Certificate of Secretary and have not been revoked, modified, altered, or amended in any way.
3. Attached as Exhibit ____ is a true and correct copy of [any board and/or shareholder resolution or other authorizing mechanisms for the conveyance at issue in this Instrument; the approval percentage and existence of a quorum].

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal of the Corporation this ___ day of _____, _____.

_____ [Name], Secretary
_____ Corporation

[SEAL]
Confirmed and approved;

[Name], President
_____ Corporation

ACCEPTANCE

Pursuant to AS 38.05.035(a)(12), [check exact section and add date of statute] the State of Alaska hereby accepts this EQUITABLE SERVITUDE [AND EASEMENT][AND RIGHT OF ENTRY] conveying to the State of Alaska, its successors in administrative function and assigns, the interests in the Property described therein as an Institutional Control, pursuant to 18 AAC _____ and 18 AAC _____, [add exact section and date of regulation] to be managed and enforced by ADEC pursuant to a Management Right Assignment between ADEC and the Alaska Department of Natural Resources, to protect human health, safety, and welfare, and the environment [and to enhance or maintain water quality (conservation easement language)].

STATE OF ALASKA, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

By: _____

Director
Division of Mining, Land and Water

Location Index:

_____, Section _____,
Township _____, Range _____,
Seward Meridian, Alaska

NO CHARGE- STATE BUSINESS
AFTER RECORDING RETURN TO:
[Assigned DOL Attorney]

State of Alaska
Department of Law
Environmental Section
1031 Fourth Ave., Suite 200
Anchorage, AK 99501

I:\HsiehE\IC & Land Notices\Equitable Servitude Template.doc
2/26/04

APPENDIX E – EQUITABLE SERVITUDE - FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Purpose

The purpose of this Manual is to give some background and assistance in using the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation's (DEC) Division of Spill Prevention and Response Equitable Servitude Template to create an enforceable, legal instrument. Whether to use an equitable servitude as part of a cleanup plan is addressed in the DEC's "Guidance on Using Institutional Controls in Oil and Other Hazardous Substance Cleanups."

Background

The Equitable Servitude Template was created by DEC, in conjunction with the Alaska Department of Law (DOL). The purposes of the Template include:

- assisting in streamlining the equitable servitude drafting process;
- lending consistency to the equitable servitudes created under this program; and
- providing interested parties notice of the type and form of equitable servitude created under this program.

Why Does the Template have Alternative Titles?

The Template has alternative titles depending upon the content and intent of the instrument created. If the instrument references Alaska's conservation easement statutes (see below), the instrument will be titled, "Equitable Servitude and Easement, AS 34.17.010 – AS 34.17.060," with "easement" referring both to the conservation easement and providing notice of a right of entry provision in the instrument, as easements traditionally referred to rights such as entry and access to the subject land. If the conservation statutes are not referenced, the instrument will be titled, "Equitable Servitude and Right of Entry."

Conservation Easements Under AS 34.17

Equitable servitudes and easements are created by a long history of court cases, or "common law." However, Alaska Statute Title 34 Chapter 17 also allows for the creation of a "conservation easement" under certain circumstances, including the protection of natural, scenic, or open spaces or maintenance of air or water quality. *See*, AS 34.17.060(1). Thus, where the purposes of the equitable servitude are consistent with AS 34.17, they may be referenced in the instrument to lend an additional measure of legal foundation. In order to determine whether the conservation easement statutes are appropriate for a particular site, DEC staff should seek the DOL assistance.¹

Which Provisions May be Altered?

The Template is generally comprised of two types of provisions. One type of provision relates to site-specific information, such as identifying the parties involved, site history, requirements and prohibitions; the second type of provision relates to the legal specifics of the instrument, such as waiver, termination and enforceability.

Site-Specific Provisions: DEC staff, together with the responsible person, landowner and DOL should work together to draft provisions relating to site-specific information. These site-specific provisions are found in the opening pages of the Template and Section I, Prohibited Activities and Section 2, Required Activities.

¹ Each equitable servitude project should be assigned to a specific DOL attorney who can assist in the drafting and recording process. Once an attorney is assigned, they will be the DOL contact for all questions and issues which may arise for the particular equitable servitude.

Form Legal Provisions: Provisions addressing such general topics as Right of Entry and termination of the instrument, waiver, etc. are legal provisions which have been drafted specifically for the Template by the DOL. These provisions cannot be revised by either DEC staff or other interested parties. If DEC staff or interested parties have a concern regarding a provision, DEC staff must contact DOL and discuss whether alternative language may be used. These provisions are generally found in Section 3, Right of Entry and Section 4, General Provisions.

Altering the Provisions After the Instrument is Recorded: Section I, Prohibited Activities, and Section 2, Required Activities, may be altered by a specific, written authorization by DEC, as stated in the Section I and 2 opening paragraphs. Other provisions may be altered by DEC recording an addendum to the equitable servitude; an addendum must be drafted in cooperation with DOL.

The Role of the Alaska Department of Natural Resources

Creating an equitable servitude not only involves DEC and DOL staff, it also depends directly upon the approval and involvement of the Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR). DEC does not have the statutory ability to accept interests in land, such as an equitable servitude creates. Thus, DNR has conditionally agreed to act as a receptor of equitable servitude interests created under this DEC program. Because of this important role, DNR must review and approve any equitable servitude or related instrument which DEC wishes to record. Depending upon the site and, more specifically, how well legal descriptions are researched and drafted, a DNR review may be a brief or extremely complex process. In order to streamline this agency cooperation, the following guidelines must be followed:

DEC staff and private parties must contact the DOL if they have questions or concerns. They should not contact DNR directly; such contact will not assist the process;

DEC staff should inform DOL as soon as they believe it is likely they will use an equitable servitude as part of a cleanup plan. DOL will, in turn, notify DNR so that DNR staff may plan their schedules and resources and so that DNR may make any concerns known at that time so that any potential issues are dealt with early on in the process;

Consult DEC's Guidance on Using Institutional Controls in Oil and Other Hazardous Substances, "A Note About Legal Descriptions," when researching and preparing a legal description of the subject property.

EMH/2004/SGS updated 2011

APPENDIX F – NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION (NEC) – LUST

NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION

Recording District: **Anchorage** **Official State Business – No Charge²**

As required by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Grantee³, pursuant to 18 AAC 78.625 (insert property owners and all holders of property interest), Grantor, as the owner [and operator] of the subject property, hereby provides public notice that the property located at: _____, Alaska, 99 __, and more particularly described as follows:

(provide complete legal description including all plat numbers that may apply if available.),

has been subject to a discharge or release and subsequent cleanup of oil or other hazardous substances, regulated under 18 AAC 78, as amended October 2006. This release and cleanup are documented in the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) contaminated sites database at http://www.dec.state.ak.us/spar/csp/db_search.htm under Hazard ID number (insert Hazard ID).

ADEC reviewed and approved, subject to this and other institutional controls, the cleanup as protective of human health, safety, welfare, and the environment. No further cleanup is necessary at this site unless new information becomes available that indicates to ADEC that the site may pose an unacceptable risk to human health, safety, welfare, or the environment. ADEC determined, in accordance with 18 AAC 78.090 - 276 corrective action rules, that site cleanup has been performed to the maximum extent practicable even though residual (describe contaminant(s) remaining, e.g. fuel-contaminated soil and/or groundwater) exists on-site. Further cleanup was determined to be impracticable because (describe rationale for determination, i.e., the remaining contaminated soil is beneath a building or other site structure, within fractured bedrock and further cleanup was not practicable, etc.).⁴

Attached is a site survey or diagram drawn to scale that shows the property boundaries, locations of existing structures, the area that has been cleaned up, the approximate location and extent of remaining soil and/or groundwater contamination and the locations where confirmation soil samples were collected.

(Include the IC details here, copied and pasted from the closure letter, ensuring they are the same as listed in the IC tracker details. For example:

1. DEC shall be notified before any new groundwater wells are drilled at this site.
2. Signs and fencing shall be placed around the contaminated area and maintained to prevent access.

Alternatively, could cite the closure letter attached to this NEC.) In the event that the remaining contaminated soil becomes accessible (by the building or other structure being removed or through some other action that fits the site circumstances), or other information becomes available which indicates that the site may pose an unacceptable risk to human health, safety, welfare or the environment, the land owner and/or operator are required under 18 AAC 78.220 to notify ADEC and evaluate the environmental status of the contamination in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; further site characterizations and cleanup may be necessary under 18 AAC 78, Article 2.

² Only needed if ADEC is filing the NEC. If filed by the RP or their consultant, they'll have to pay the regular fee.

³ ADEC is always the grantee and the current property owner is the grantor even if we file the NEC for the property owner.

⁴ The closure letter can be included as part of the NEC. If this is the case, very little specific detail is required here.

In the future, if soil is removed from the site or groundwater is brought to the surface (for example to dewater in support of construction) it must be characterized and managed following regulations applicable at that time. Pursuant to 18 AAC 78.274 (b), DEC approval is required prior to moving soil or groundwater that is, or has been, subject to 18 AAC 78, Article 2.

This notice remains in effect until a written determination from ADEC is recorded that states that soil [and/or groundwater] at the site has been shown to meet the most stringent soil cleanup levels in method two of 18 AAC 75.340 [and/or groundwater meets the cleanup levels in Table C in 18 AAC 75.345] and that off-site transportation of soil [and/or groundwater] is not a concern.

Please return original copy of this notice to the address below:

Signature: _____ (landowner)

Printed Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

(Notarization seal)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ____ day of _____,
20__.

Notary Public in and for the State of _____

My commission expires: _____

Note: Please refer to 11 AAC 05.010 (a)(14) for the required fee. The information requested on this form should be typed or legibly printed in English. Any attachments or exhibits must not exceed 8.5" x 14". This form is intended to comply with the recording requirements of AS 40.17.030 and 11 AAC 06.040, please double-check recording requirements.

APPENDIX G - NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION (NEC) – CS

NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION

Recording District: **Anchorage** **Official State Business – No Charge**⁵

As required by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Grantee,⁶ pursuant to 18 AAC 75.375 (insert property owners and all holders of property interest), Grantor, as the owner [and operator] of the subject property, hereby provides public notice that the property located at: _____, Alaska, 99___, and more particularly described as follows:

(provide complete legal description including all plat numbers that may apply, if available.),

has been subject to a discharge or release and subsequent cleanup of oil or other hazardous substances, regulated under 18 AAC 75, Article 3, as amended October 9, 2008. This release and cleanup are documented in the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) contaminated sites database at http://www.dec.state.ak.us/spar/csp/db_search.htm under Hazard ID number (insert Hazard ID).

ADEC reviewed and approved, subject to this and other institutional controls, the cleanup as protective of human health, safety, welfare, and the environment. No further cleanup is necessary at this site unless new information becomes available that indicates to ADEC that the site may pose an unacceptable risk to human health, safety, welfare, or the environment. ADEC determined, in accordance with 18 AAC 75.325 – 390 site cleanup rules, that cleanup has been performed to the maximum extent practicable even though residual (describe contaminant(s) remaining, e.g. fuel-contaminated soil and/or groundwater) exists on-site. Further cleanup was determined to be impracticable because (describe rationale for determination, i.e., the remaining contaminated soil is beneath a building or other site structure, within fractured bedrock and further cleanup was not practicable, etc.).⁷

Attached is a site survey or diagram drawn to scale that shows the property boundaries, locations of existing structures, the area that has been cleaned up, the approximate location and extent of remaining soil and/or groundwater contamination and the locations where confirmation soil samples were collected.

(Include the IC details here, copied and pasted from the closure letter, ensuring they are the same as listed in the IC tracker details. For example:

1. DEC shall be notified before any new groundwater wells are drilled at this site.
2. Signs and fencing shall be placed around the contaminated area and maintained to prevent access.

Alternatively, could cite the closure letter attached to this NEC.) In the event that the remaining contaminated soil becomes accessible (by the building or other structure being removed or through some other action that fits the site circumstances), or other information becomes available which indicates that the site may pose an unacceptable risk to human health, safety, welfare or the environment, the land owner and/or operator are required under 18 AAC 75.300 to notify ADEC and evaluate the environmental status of the contamination in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; further site characterizations and cleanup may be necessary under 18 AAC 75.325-.390.

Pursuant to 18 AAC 75.325(i)(1) and (2), DEC approval is required prior to moving soil or groundwater that is, or has been, subject to the cleanup rules found at 18 AAC 75.325-.370. At this site, in the future, if soil is removed from the site or groundwater is brought to the surface (for example to dewater in support of construction) it must be characterized and managed following regulations applicable at that time.

⁵ Only needed if ADEC is filing the NEC. If filed by the RP or their consultant, they will have to pay the regular fee.

⁶ ADEC is always the grantee and the current property owner is the grantor even if we file the NEC for the property owner.

⁷ The closure letter can be included as part of the NEC. If this is the case, very little specific detail is required here.

This NEC remains in effect until a written determination from ADEC is recorded that states that soil [and/or groundwater] at the site has been shown to meet the most stringent soil cleanup levels in method two of 18 AAC 75.340 [and/or groundwater meets the cleanup levels in Table C in 18 AAC 75.345] and that off-site transportation of soil [and/or groundwater] is not a concern.

This document will be filed in the Anchorage recording district.

Please return original copy of this NEC to the address below:

Signature(s): _____ (landowner(s) and holders of property interest)

Printed Name(s): _____

Mailing Address(s): _____

(Notarization seal)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ____ day of _____,
20__.

Notary Public in and for the State of _____

My commission expires: _____

Note: Please refer to 11 AAC 05.010 (a)(14) for the required fee. The information requested on this form should be typed or legibly printed in English. Any attachments or exhibits must not exceed 8.5" x 14". This form is intended to comply with the recording requirements of AS 40.17.030 and 11 AAC 06.040, please double-check recording requirement.

APPENDIX H – RP INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING AN NEC

Responsible party information and instructions for completing a Notice of Environmental Contamination

A Notice of Environmental Contamination (NEC) is a deed notice, which provides information to interested parties regarding oil or hazardous substance contamination on a property; it does not transfer a property interest and is not legally binding upon anyone. Notices cannot restrict land use or create any duties.

Alaska is divided up into recording districts and each district has a state recorder's office where documents may be recorded for public notice and researched for title searches. Notices of contamination, cleanup or other such notices may be recorded in the appropriate recording district(s), with reference to the property's legal description so that it may be cross-referenced.

The correct recording district for filing, document preparation and other information regarding recording a deed notice can be found at the Recorder's Office website at the URL: <http://www.dnr.state.ak.us/ssd/recoff/default.cfm>

Complete the necessary information found in the NEC. The text in parentheses, highlighted in gray, needs to be customized with text appropriate to the particular site's conditions. (Once customized text is added the highlighting, comments, and parentheses should be removed.)

When drafting a notice, it is crucial that the information is correct, specific, and factual. The deed notice should include as much legal description information as possible, including plat, block, and lot numbers. In some cases a property may reside within several different plats. In this case all plat numbers should be included.

If you have any questions regarding the NEC content, please contact the DEC site project manager.

Once you have the NEC template completed with the appropriate information and after the DEC project manager approves the contents, have the form notarized, attach the closure letter and file the documents at the appropriate recorder's office.

There is a filing fee of \$20.00 for the first page and \$5.00 for each subsequent page.

The Recorder's Office will only accept documents that have a 2 inch top margin and 1 inch bottom and side margins on the first page and all other pages should have 1 inch margins on all sides.

After recording the notice, the original stamped deed notice will be returned to you in a few weeks.

A copy of the recorded notice must be submitted to the DEC project manager as soon as possible.



OCT 16 1998

GSA Public Building Service

MEMORANDUM FOR REGIONAL DIRECTORS – 1PR, 4PR, 7PR, 9PR

FROM:

JOHN Q. MARTIN
DIRECTOR
REDEPLOYMENT SERVICES DIVISION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Q. Martin", written over the typed name and title.

SUBJECT:

Restrictive Covenants on Non-excess Property

This memorandum clarifies the General Services Administration's (GSA) policy regarding restrictive covenants on real property by landholding agencies.

This issue has caused confusion and has created obstacles to the efficient and effective disposal of excess and surplus real property. Therefore it is essential that this issue be clarified and a consistent approach taken to these actions. This letter applies to GSA regional officials involved in the disposal of Federal real property and to all landholding executive agencies. This memorandum is effective immediately.

Recently, GSA has been approached by several military services requesting assistance with State environmental regulators. In the course of continuing military operations at specific installations, the Department of Defense (DOD) has been required to perform certain environmental remediation. These remediation actions require the final approval of the State regulators. In some states, the State regulators have demanded that DOD place use restrictions or other covenants on the property. These restrictions are intended to run with the land and restrict future owners of the property to specific uses. At this time, the installations in question are in continual use and are not being evaluated as potentially excess property.

At the same time, GSA is aware that other agencies have agreed to restrictive covenants on property in their inventory. These include historic preservation restrictions which have been agreed to by the landholding agency during negotiation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as these acts apply to the decision to excess the property.

GSA does not believe landholding agencies have the authority to place such restrictions on property in their inventory. GSA views such restrictive covenants as disposals of real property. Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (Property Act) GSA was given the exclusive authority to manage the utilization and disposal of real property (40 U.S.C. §§ 471, et seq). The Property Act defines "property" to include "any interest in

property" (40 U.S.C. § 472(d)). GSA's regulations (41 C.F.R. § 101-47.103-12(a)) define "real property" to include "any interest in land". Therefore, unless the landholding agency has specific authority to dispose of such property rights, the landholding agency must request GSA to dispose of these real property rights or request a delegation of disposal authority from GSA.

Generally, covenants restricting the future use of property are evaluated during the disposal process carried out by GSA. Therefore, where property is expected to be reported excess, GSA will usually deny the request from the landholding agency and evaluate any necessary restrictions during the disposal process. If there are special circumstances that demand agreement on use restrictions prior to being evaluated in the disposal process, GSA will review the request on a case-by-case basis. GSA's evaluation will consider the impact any restrictions may have on the future disposition of the property, the ability to use the property for its highest and best use (as determined by GSA), the economic impact of the requested restrictions, the legal requirement to place such a restriction on the property, and/or the enforceability of the requested restriction.

GSA is particularly concerned about requests to restrict the future use of property when the landholding agency does not contemplate declaring the property excess in the near future. GSA is doubtful as to the necessity, desirability or legal enforceability of placing restrictions on property that will remain in the Government's inventory. Questions as to how such restrictions will be enforced, and by whom, while the property is still an active Government facility are raised by these requests. Further, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for GSA to accurately determine the impact such restrictions may have on the future disposal of the property when immediate disposal of the property is not being contemplated. Therefore, GSA will deny all requests for land use restrictions on fully utilized property unless the requesting landholding agency can demonstrate the unique and extreme circumstances which would overcome GSA's objections to the placing of such restrictions on the property.

Official File – PRD

Readers – PR, PRD, PRP, PRA, Brooks, Chase, Flowers, Kelly, Mandell, Martin, Shoats, Butterworth LR

H:\RestCove.doc

PRD:JohnQ.Martin:10/16/1998:AW