

GETTY REALTY CORP /MD/
Form 10-Q
July 26, 2018

UNITED STATES

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-Q

(Mark One)

QUARTERLY REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT
OF 1934

For the quarterly period ended June 30, 2018

OR

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT
OF 1934

For the transition period from _____ to _____

Commission file number: 001-13777

GETTY REALTY CORP.

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Its Charter)

Maryland 11-3412575
(State or Other Jurisdiction of (I.R.S. Employer

Incorporation or Organization) Identification No.)

Two Jericho Plaza, Suite 110

Jericho, New York 11753-1681

(Address of Principal Executive Offices) (Zip Code)

(516) 478-5400

(Registrant's Telephone Number, Including Area Code)

Not Applicable

(Former Name, Former Address and Former Fiscal Year, if Changed Since Last Report)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, smaller reporting company, or an emerging growth company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer," "smaller reporting company," and "emerging growth company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer Smaller reporting company

(Do not check if
a smaller
reporting

Non-accelerated filer company) Emerging growth company

If an emerging growth company, indicate by check mark if the registrant has elected not to use the extended transition period for complying with any new or revised financial accounting standards provided pursuant to Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act). Yes No

The registrant had outstanding 40,390,478 shares of common stock as of July 26, 2018.

GETTY REALTY CORP.

FORM 10-Q

INDEX

	Page
<u>PART I—FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>	
Item 1. <u>Financial Statements (Unaudited)</u>	1
<u>Consolidated Balance Sheets as of June 30, 2018 and December 31, 2017</u>	1
<u>Consolidated Statements of Operations for the Three and Six Months Ended June 30, 2018 and 2017</u>	2
<u>Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the Six Months Ended June 30, 2018 and 2017</u>	3
<u>Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements</u>	4
Item 2. <u>Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	21
Item 3. <u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u>	33
Item 4. <u>Controls and Procedures</u>	33
<u>PART II—OTHER INFORMATION</u>	
Item 1. <u>Legal Proceedings</u>	35
Item 1A. <u>Risk Factors</u>	37
Item 5. <u>Other Information</u>	37
Item 6. <u>Exhibits</u>	38
<u>Signatures</u>	39

PART I—FINANCIAL INFORMATION

ITEM 1. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

GETTY REALTY CORP.

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

(Unaudited)

(in thousands, except per share amounts)

	June 30, 2018	December 31, 2017
ASSETS:		
Real estate:		
Land	\$619,750	\$589,497
Buildings and improvements	396,329	379,785
Construction in progress	2,392	1,682
	1,018,471	970,964
Less accumulated depreciation and amortization	(141,159)	(133,353)
Real estate, net	877,312	837,611
Investment in direct financing leases, net	88,138	89,587
Notes and mortgages receivable	34,244	32,366
Cash and cash equivalents	18,208	19,992
Restricted cash	1,179	821
Deferred rent receivable	35,853	33,610
Accounts receivable, net of allowance of \$1,760 and \$1,840, respectively	2,989	3,712
Prepaid expenses and other assets	57,358	55,055
Total assets	\$1,115,281	\$1,072,754
LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY:		
Borrowings under credit agreement, net	\$86,863	\$154,502
Senior unsecured notes, net	324,351	224,656
Environmental remediation obligations	61,828	63,565
Dividends payable	13,025	12,846
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	62,545	63,490
Total liabilities	548,612	519,059
Commitments and contingencies	—	—
Shareholders' equity:		
Preferred stock, \$0.01 par value; 20,000,000 and 10,000,000 shares authorized, respectively; unissued	—	—
Common stock, \$0.01 par value; 100,000,000 and 60,000,000 shares authorized, respectively; 40,262,274 and 39,696,110 shares issued and outstanding, respectively	403	397
Additional paid-in capital	620,183	604,872
Dividends paid in excess of earnings	(53,917)	(51,574)

Total shareholders' equity	566,669	553,695
Total liabilities and shareholders' equity	\$1,115,281	\$1,072,754

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

GETTY REALTY CORP.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

(Unaudited)

(in thousands, except per share amounts)

	Three Months Ended June		Six Months Ended June 30,	
	30, 2018	2017	2018	2017
Revenues:				
Revenues from rental properties	\$ 29,022	\$ 24,365	\$ 57,307	\$ 48,261
Tenant reimbursements	4,461	3,924	7,529	6,917
Interest on notes and mortgages receivable	759	748	1,522	1,507
Total revenues	34,242	29,037	66,358	56,685
Operating expenses:				
Property costs	6,429	5,251	11,363	10,061
Impairments	831	914	3,259	4,382
Environmental	1,442	429	2,689	(112)
General and administrative	3,855	3,673	7,442	7,166
Allowance (recoveries) for uncollectible accounts	(119)	(71)	7	61
Depreciation and amortization	5,907	4,394	11,501	8,787
Total operating expenses	18,345	14,590	36,261	30,345
Operating income	15,897	14,447	30,097	26,340
Gain (loss) on dispositions of real estate	3,016	507	3,665	176
Other income, net	224	3,876	588	4,111
Interest expense	(5,314)	(4,279)	(10,365)	(8,359)
Earnings from continuing operations	13,823	14,551	23,985	22,268
Discontinued operations:				
Earnings (loss) from discontinued operations	(283)	555	(413)	2,542
Net earnings	\$ 13,540	\$ 15,106	\$ 23,572	\$ 24,810
Basic earnings per common share:				
Earnings from continuing operations	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.59	\$ 0.64
Earnings (loss) from discontinued operations	(0.01)	0.02	(0.01)	0.07
Net earnings	\$ 0.33	\$ 0.43	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.71
Diluted earnings per common share:				
Earnings from continuing operations	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.59	\$ 0.64
Earnings (loss) from discontinued operations	(0.01)	0.02	(0.01)	0.07
Net earnings	\$ 0.33	\$ 0.43	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.71
Weighted average common shares outstanding:				
Basic	39,901	34,634	39,806	34,594
Diluted	39,914	34,634	39,817	34,594
Dividends declared per common share	\$ 0.32	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.64	\$ 0.56

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

GETTY REALTY CORP.

CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

(Unaudited)

(in thousands)

	Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2018	2017
CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES:		
Net earnings	\$23,572	\$24,810
Adjustments to reconcile net earnings to net cash flow provided by operating activities:		
Depreciation and amortization expense	11,501	8,787
Impairment charges	3,977	4,651
(Gain) loss on dispositions of real estate	(3,665)	(176)
Deferred rent receivable	(2,243)	(1,746)
Allowance (recoveries) for uncollectible accounts	7	61
Accretion expense	1,308	1,795
Amortization of above-market and below-market leases	(359)	(228)
Amortization of loan origination costs	403	384
Stock-based compensation	848	655
Changes in assets and liabilities:		
Accounts receivable	94	22
Prepaid expenses and other assets	(139)	(3,688)
Environmental remediation obligations	(5,153)	(13,239)
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities	599	(304)
Net cash flow provided by operating activities	30,750	21,784
CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES:		
Property acquisitions	(55,308)	(17,800)
Capital expenditures	(68)	(6)
Addition to construction in progress	(1,092)	(694)
Proceeds from dispositions of real estate	1,576	1,918
Deposits for property acquisitions	(280)	(611)
Amortization of investment in direct financing leases	1,448	1,200
(Issuance) of notes and mortgages receivable	(140)	-
Collection of notes and mortgages receivable	1,577	758
Net cash flow (used in) investing activities	(52,287)	(15,235)
CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES:		
Borrowings under credit agreement	50,000	20,000
Repayments under credit agreement	(115,000)	(60,000)
Proceeds from senior unsecured notes	100,000	50,000
Payment of loan origination costs	(3,347)	(157)
Payments of cash dividends	(24,981)	(18,941)
Payments in settlement of restricted stock units	—	(1,193)
Proceeds from issuance of common stock, net - ATM	13,714	5,860

Other	(275)	(40)
Net cash flow provided by (used in) financing activities	20,111	(4,471)
Change in cash, cash equivalents and restricted cash	(1,426)	2,078
Cash, cash equivalents and restricted cash at beginning of period	20,813	13,194
Cash, cash equivalents and restricted cash at end of period	\$19,387	\$15,272
Supplemental disclosures of cash flow information		
Cash paid during the period for:		
Interest	\$9,911	\$7,740
Income taxes	246	93
Environmental remediation obligations	4,545	7,520
Non-cash transactions:		
Dividends declared but not yet paid	13,025	9,827
Issuance of notes and mortgages receivable related to property dispositions	\$3,313	\$432

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these consolidated financial statements.

NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(Unaudited)

NOTE 1. — DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS

Getty Realty Corp. (together with its subsidiaries, unless otherwise indicated or except where the context otherwise requires, “we,” “us” or “our”) is the leading publicly-traded real estate investment trust (“REIT”) in the United States specializing in the ownership, leasing and financing of convenience store and gasoline station properties. As of June 30, 2018, we owned 854 properties and leased 78 properties from third-party landlords. These 932 properties are located in 30 states across the United States and Washington, D.C. Our properties are operated under a variety of nationally recognized brands including 76, BP, Citgo, Conoco, Exxon, Getty, Gulf, Mobil, Shell, Sunoco and Valero. Our company was originally founded in 1955 and is headquartered in Jericho, New York.

NOTE 2. — ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of Presentation

The consolidated financial statements include the accounts of Getty Realty Corp. and its wholly-owned subsidiaries. The accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (“GAAP”). We do not distinguish our principal business or our operations on a geographical basis for purposes of measuring performance. We manage and evaluate our operations as a single segment. All significant intercompany accounts and transactions have been eliminated. Certain reclassifications have been made to prior period amounts in order to conform to current period presentation.

Unaudited, Interim Consolidated Financial Statements

The consolidated financial statements are unaudited but, in our opinion, reflect all adjustments (consisting of normal recurring accruals) necessary for a fair statement of the results for the periods presented. These statements should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and related notes in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017.

Use of Estimates, Judgments and Assumptions

The consolidated financial statements have been prepared in conformity with GAAP, which requires management to make estimates, judgments and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the consolidated financial statements and revenues and expenses during the period reported. Estimates, judgments and assumptions underlying the accompanying consolidated financial statements include, but are not limited to, real estate, receivables, deferred rent receivable, direct financing leases, depreciation and amortization, impairment of long-lived assets, environmental remediation costs, environmental remediation obligations, litigation, accrued liabilities, income taxes and the allocation of the purchase price of properties acquired to the assets acquired and liabilities assumed. Application of these estimates and assumptions requires exercise of judgment as to future uncertainties and, as a result, actual results could differ materially from these estimates.

Real Estate

Real estate assets are stated at cost less accumulated depreciation and amortization. For acquisitions of real estate which are accounted for as business combinations, we estimate the fair value of acquired tangible assets (consisting of land, buildings and improvements) “as if vacant” and identified intangible assets and liabilities (consisting of leasehold interests, above-market and below-market leases, in-place leases and tenant relationships) and assumed debt. Based on these estimates, we allocate the estimated fair value to the applicable assets and liabilities. Fair value is determined based on an exit price approach, which contemplates the price that would be received from the sale of an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. We expense transaction costs associated with business combinations in the period incurred. Acquisitions of real estate which do not meet the definition of a business are accounted for as asset acquisitions. The accounting model for asset acquisitions is similar to the accounting model for business combinations except that the acquisition costs are capitalized and allocated to the individual assets acquired and liabilities assumed on a relative fair value basis. See Note 11 for additional information regarding property acquisitions.

We capitalize direct costs, including costs such as construction costs and professional services, and indirect costs associated with the development and construction of real estate assets while substantive activities are ongoing to prepare the assets for their intended use. The capitalization period begins when development activities are underway and ends when it is determined that the asset is substantially complete and ready for its intended use.

When real estate assets are sold or retired, the cost and related accumulated depreciation and amortization is eliminated from the respective accounts and any gain or loss is credited or charged to income. We evaluate real estate sale transactions where we provide

seller financing to determine sale and gain recognition in accordance with GAAP. Expenditures for maintenance and repairs are charged to income when incurred.

Direct Financing Leases

Income under direct financing leases is included in revenues from rental properties and is recognized over the lease terms using the effective interest rate method which produces a constant periodic rate of return on the net investments in the leased properties. The investments in direct financing leases are increased for interest income earned and amortized over the life of the leases and reduced by the receipt of lease payments. We consider direct financing leases to be past-due or delinquent when a contractually required payment is not remitted in accordance with the provisions of the underlying agreement. We evaluate each account individually and set up an allowance when, based upon current information and events, it is probable that we will be unable to collect all amounts due according to the existing contractual terms and the amount can be reasonably estimated.

We review our direct financing leases at least annually to determine whether there has been an other-than-temporary decline in the current estimate of residual value of the property. The residual value is our estimate of what we could realize upon the sale of the property at the end of the lease term, based on market information and third-party estimates where available. If this review indicates that a decline in residual value has occurred that is other-than-temporary, we recognize an impairment charge. There were no impairments of any of our direct financing leases during the three and six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017.

When we enter into a contract to sell properties that are recorded as direct financing leases, we evaluate whether we believe that it is probable that the disposition will occur. If we determine that the disposition is probable and therefore the property's holding period is reduced, we record an allowance for credit losses to reflect the change in the estimate of the undiscounted future rents. Accordingly, the net investment balance is written down to fair value.

Notes and Mortgages Receivable

Notes and mortgages receivable consists of loans originated by us in conjunction with property dispositions and funding provided to tenants in conjunction with property acquisitions and capital improvements. Notes and mortgages receivable are recorded at stated principal amounts. We evaluate the collectability of both interest and principal on each loan to determine whether it is impaired. A loan is considered to be impaired when, based upon current information and events, it is probable that we will be unable to collect all amounts due under the existing contractual terms. When a loan is considered to be impaired, the amount of the loss is calculated by comparing the recorded investment to the fair value determined by discounting the expected future cash flows at the loan's effective interest rate or to the fair value of the underlying collateral, if the loan is collateralized. Interest income on performing loans is accrued as earned. Interest income on impaired loans is recognized on a cash basis. We do not provide for an additional allowance for loan losses based on the grouping of loans, as we believe that the characteristics of the loans are not sufficiently similar to allow an evaluation of these loans as a group for a possible loan loss allowance. As such, all of our loans are evaluated individually for impairment purposes. There were no impairments related to our notes and mortgages receivable during the three and six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017.

Revenue Recognition and Deferred Rent Receivable

On January 1, 2018, we adopted ASU 2014-09, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606), ("Topic 606") using the modified retrospective method applying it to any open contracts as of January 1, 2018. The new guidance provides a unified model to determine how revenue is recognized. To determine the proper amount of revenue to be recognized, we perform the following steps: (i) identify the contract with the customer, (ii) identify the performance obligations within the contract, (iii) determine the transaction price, (iv) allocate the transaction price to the

performance obligations and (v) recognize revenue when (or as) a performance obligation is satisfied. We concluded that our revenue consists of rental income from leasing arrangements, which is specifically excluded from the standard, and thus had no material impact on our consolidated financial statements or notes to our consolidated financial statements as of June 30, 2018.

Minimum lease payments from operating leases are recognized on a straight-line basis over the term of the leases. The cumulative difference between lease revenue recognized under this method and the contractual lease payment terms is recorded as deferred rent receivable on our consolidated balance sheets. We reserve for a portion of the recorded deferred rent receivable if circumstances indicate that a tenant will not make all of its contractual lease payments during the current lease term. We make estimates of the collectability of our accounts receivable related to revenue from rental properties. We analyze accounts receivable and historical bad debt levels, customer creditworthiness and current economic trends when evaluating the adequacy of the allowance for doubtful accounts. Additionally, with respect to tenants in bankruptcy, we estimate the expected recovery through bankruptcy claims and increase the allowance for amounts deemed uncollectible. If our assumptions regarding the collectability of accounts receivable prove incorrect, we could experience write-offs of the accounts receivable or deferred rent receivable in excess of our allowance for doubtful accounts.

The present value of the difference between the fair market rent and the contractual rent for above-market and below-market leases at the time properties are acquired is amortized into revenues from rental properties over the remaining terms of the in-place leases. Lease termination fees are recognized as other income when earned upon the termination of a tenant's lease and relinquishment of space in which we have no further obligation to the tenant.

The sales of nonfinancial assets, such as real estate, are to be recognized when control of the asset transfers to the buyer, which will occur when the buyer has the ability to direct the use of or obtain substantially all of the remaining benefits from the asset. This generally occurs when the transaction closes and consideration is exchanged for control of the property. During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we disposed of six properties, in separate transactions, which resulted in an aggregate gain of \$3,665,000, included in gain on dispositions of real estate, on our consolidated statements of operations.

Impairment of Long-Lived Assets

Assets are written down to fair value when events and circumstances indicate that the assets might be impaired and the projected undiscounted cash flows estimated to be generated by those assets are less than the carrying amount of those assets. Assets held for disposal are written down to fair value less estimated disposition costs.

We recorded impairment charges aggregating \$1,160,000 and \$3,977,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, respectively, and \$914,000 and \$4,651,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2017, respectively, in continuing and discontinued operations. Our estimated fair values, as they relate to property carrying values, were primarily based upon (i) estimated sales prices from third-party offers based on signed contracts, letters of intent or indicative bids, for which we do not have access to the unobservable inputs used to determine these estimated fair values, and/or consideration of the amount that currently would be required to replace the asset, as adjusted for obsolescence (this method was used to determine \$2,338,000 of the \$3,977,000 in impairments recognized during the six months ended June 30, 2018) and (ii) discounted cash flow models (this method was used to determine \$104,000 of the \$3,977,000 in impairments recognized during the six months ended June 30, 2018). During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we recorded \$1,535,000 of the \$3,977,000 in impairments recognized due to the accumulation of asset retirement costs as a result of changes in estimates associated with our estimated environmental liabilities which increased the carrying values of certain properties in excess of their fair values.

The estimated fair value of real estate is based on the price that would be received from the sale of the property in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. In general, we consider multiple internal valuation techniques when measuring the fair value of a property, all of which are based on unobservable inputs and assumptions that are classified within Level 3 of the Fair Value Hierarchy. These unobservable inputs include assumed holding periods ranging up to 15 years, assumed average rent increases of 2.0% annually, income capitalized at a rate of 8.0% and cash flows discounted at a rate of 7.0%. These assessments have a direct impact on our net income because recording an impairment loss results in an immediate negative adjustment to net income. The evaluation of anticipated cash flows is highly subjective and is based in part on assumptions regarding future rental rates and operating expenses that could differ materially from actual results in future periods. Where properties held for use have been identified as having a potential for sale, additional judgments are required related to the determination as to the appropriate period over which the projected undiscounted cash flows should include the operating cash flows and the amount included as the estimated residual value. This requires significant judgment. In some cases, the results of whether impairment is indicated are sensitive to changes in assumptions input into the estimates, including the holding period until expected sale.

Fair Value of Financial Instruments

All of our financial instruments are reflected in the accompanying consolidated balance sheets at amounts which, in our estimation based upon an interpretation of available market information and valuation methodologies, reasonably approximate their fair values, except those separately disclosed in the notes below.

The preparation of consolidated financial statements in accordance with GAAP requires management to make estimates of fair value that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of assets and liabilities at the date of the consolidated financial statements and revenues and expenses during the period reported using a hierarchy (the “Fair Value Hierarchy”) that prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure the fair value. The Fair Value Hierarchy gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1 measurements) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs (Level 3 measurements). The levels of the Fair Value Hierarchy are as follows: “Level 1” – inputs that reflect unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities that we have the ability to access at the measurement date; “Level 2” – inputs other than quoted prices that are observable for the asset or liability either directly or indirectly, including inputs in markets that are not considered to be active; and “Level 3” – inputs that are unobservable. Certain types of assets and liabilities are recorded at fair value either on a recurring or non-recurring basis. Assets required or elected to be marked-to-market and reported at fair value every reporting period are valued on a recurring basis. Other assets not required to be recorded at fair value every period may be recorded at fair value if a specific provision or other impairment is recorded within the period to mark the carrying value of the asset to market as of the reporting date. Such assets are valued on a non-recurring basis.

Environmental Remediation Obligations

We record the fair value of a liability for an environmental remediation obligation as an asset and liability when there is a legal obligation associated with the retirement of a tangible long-lived asset and the liability can be reasonably estimated. Environmental remediation obligations are estimated based on the level and impact of contamination at each property. The accrued liability is the aggregate of our estimate of the fair value of cost for each component of the liability. The accrued liability is net of estimated recoveries from state underground storage tank (“UST”) remediation funds considering estimated recovery rates developed from prior experience with the funds. Net environmental liabilities are currently measured based on their expected future cash flows which have been adjusted for inflation and discounted to present value. We accrue for environmental liabilities that we believe are allocable to other potentially responsible parties if it becomes probable that the other parties will not pay their environmental remediation obligations.

Income Taxes

We and our subsidiaries file a consolidated federal income tax return. Effective January 1, 2001, we elected to qualify, and believe that we are operating so as to qualify, as a REIT for federal income tax purposes. Accordingly, we generally will not be subject to federal income tax on qualifying REIT income, provided that distributions to our shareholders equal at least the amount of our taxable income as defined under the Internal Revenue Code. We accrue for uncertain tax matters when appropriate. The accrual for uncertain tax positions is adjusted as circumstances change and as the uncertainties become more clearly defined, such as when audits are settled or exposures expire. Tax returns for the years 2014, 2015 and 2016, and tax returns which will be filed for the year ended 2017, remain open to examination by federal and state tax jurisdictions under the respective statutes of limitations.

New Accounting Pronouncements

In May 2014, the FASB issued Accounting Standards Update (“ASU”) 2014-09, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606) (“ASU 2014-09”). ASU 2014-09 is a comprehensive new revenue recognition model requiring a company to recognize revenue to depict the transfer of goods or services to a customer at an amount reflecting the consideration it expects to receive in exchange for those goods or services. In adopting ASU 2014-09, companies may use either a full retrospective or a modified retrospective approach. In March 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-08, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Principal versus Agent Considerations (Reporting Revenue Gross versus Net). In April 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-10, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Identifying Performance Obligations and Licensing. In May 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-12, Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606): Narrow-Scope Improvements and Practical Expedients and ASU 2016-11, Revenue Recognition (Topic 605) and Derivatives and Hedging (Topic 815): Rescission of SEC Guidance Because of Accounting Standards Updates 2014-09 and 2014-16 Pursuant to Staff Announcements at the March 3, 2016 EITF Meeting. In December 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-20, Technical Corrections and Improvements to Topic 606, Revenue from Contracts with Customers. In September 2017, the FASB issued ASU 2017-13, Revenue Recognition (Topic 605), Revenue from Contracts with Customers (Topic 606), Leases (Topic 840), and Leases (Topic 842). These amendments provide additional clarification and implementation guidance on the previously issued ASU 2014-09. These ASUs do not change the core principles of the guidance stated in ASU 2014-09, instead these amendments are intended to clarify and improve operability of certain topics included within the revenue standard. ASU 2014-09 establishes a single comprehensive model for entities to use in accounting for revenue from contracts with customers and supersedes most of the existing revenue recognition guidance. We evaluated each of the Company’s revenue streams to determine the sources of revenue that are impacted by ASU 2014-09 and concluded that only sales of real estate falls under the scope of Topic 606. Specifically, we evaluated the impact of the guidance on timing of gain recognition for dispositions and concluded there was no impact to our consolidated financial statements. The effective date and transition requirements for these amendments were the same

as the effective date and transition requirements of ASU 2014-09, which was effective for fiscal years, and for interim periods within those years, beginning after December 15, 2017. Our revenue-producing contracts are primarily leases that are not within the scope of ASU 2014-09. Effective January 1, 2018, we adopted ASU 2014-09 and the related practical expedient related to leases, technical corrections, and improvements for certain aspects of ASU 2014-09, on a modified retrospective basis, which was applied to all contracts at the date of initial application. The adoption of the new revenue recognition guidance did not have an impact on our consolidated financial statements or notes to our consolidated financial statements.

In February 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-02, Leases (Topic 842) (“ASU 2016-02”). ASU 2016-02 amends the existing accounting standards for lease accounting, including requiring lessees to recognize most leases on their balance sheets. Under ASU 2016-2 lessor accounting will remain similar to lessor accounting under previous GAAP, while aligning with the FASB’s new revenue recognition guidance. ASU 2016-02 is effective for fiscal years, and for interim periods within those years, beginning January 1, 2019. Early adoption of ASU 2016-02 is permitted. The standard requires a modified retrospective transition approach for all leases existing at, or entered into after, the date of initial application, with an option to use certain transition relief. On March 28, 2018, the FASB tentatively approved a new practical expedient for lessors adopting the new leases standard. When issued, lessors will have the option to aggregate nonlease components with the related lease component upon adoption of the new standard if the following conditions are met: 1. The timing and pattern of transfer for the nonlease component and the related lease component are the same. 2. The stand-alone lease component would be classified as an operating lease if accounted for separately. We continue to evaluate the effect the

adoption of ASU 2016-02 will have on our consolidated financial statements. However, we currently believe that the adoption will not have a material impact for operating leases where we are a lessor and we will continue to record revenues from rental properties for our operating leases on a straight-line basis. However, for leases where we are a lessee we expect to record a lease liability and a right of use asset on our consolidated financial statements at fair value upon adoption. The lease liability and right-of-use asset are to be carried at the present value of remaining expected future lease payments.

On June 16, 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-13, Financial Instruments – Credit Losses (Topic 326): Measurements of Credit Losses on Financial Instruments (“ASU 2016-13”) to amend the accounting for credit losses for certain financial instruments. Under the new guidance, an entity recognizes its estimate of expected credit losses as an allowance, which the FASB believes will result in more timely recognition of such losses. ASU 2016-13 is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019, including interim periods within those fiscal years. Early adoption is permitted for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018, including interim periods within those fiscal years. We are currently evaluating the impact the adoption of ASU 2016-13 will have on our consolidated financial statements.

In August 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-15, Statement of Cash Flows (Topic 230): Classification of Certain Cash Receipts and Cash Payments (“ASU 2016-15”). ASU 2016-15 is intended to clarify the presentation of cash receipts and payments in specific situations. The amendments in this update were effective for financial statements issued for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2017, including interim periods within those annual periods. Effective January 1, 2018, we adopted ASU 2016-15. The adoption of this guidance did not have an impact on our consolidated financial statements or notes to our consolidated financial statements.

On February 22, 2017, the FASB issued ASU 2017-05, Other Income—Gains and Losses from the Derecognition of Nonfinancial Assets (Subtopic 610-20), Clarifying the Scope of Asset Derecognition Guidance and Accounting for Partial Sales of Nonfinancial Assets (“ASU 2017-05”) to provide guidance for recognizing gains and losses from the transfer of nonfinancial assets and in-substance non-financial assets in contracts with non-customers, unless other specific guidance applies. ASU 2017-05 requires a company to derecognize nonfinancial assets once it transfers control of a distinct nonfinancial asset or distinct in substance nonfinancial asset. As a result of the new guidance, the guidance specific to real estate sales in ASC 360-20 was eliminated. As such, sales and partial sales of real estate assets will now be subject to the same derecognition model as all other nonfinancial assets. ASU 2017-05 was effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2017, including interim periods within that reporting period. Effective January 1, 2018, we adopted ASU 2017-05 on a modified retrospective basis. Upon adoption, we apply the guidance to prospective disposals of nonfinancial assets within the scope of Subtopic 610-20. The adoption of this guidance did not have an impact on our consolidated financial statements or notes to our consolidated financial statements.

NOTE 3. — LEASES

As of June 30, 2018, we owned 854 properties and leased 78 properties from third-party landlords. These 932 properties are located in 30 states across the United States and Washington, D.C. Substantially all of our properties are leased on a triple-net basis primarily to petroleum distributors, convenience store retailers and, to a lesser extent, individual operators. Generally, our tenants supply fuel and either operate our properties directly or sublet our properties to operators who operate their convenience stores, gasoline stations, automotive repair service facilities or other businesses at our properties. Our triple-net tenants are responsible for the payment of all taxes, maintenance, repairs, insurance and other operating expenses relating to our properties, and are also responsible for environmental contamination occurring during the terms of their leases and in certain cases also for environmental contamination that existed before their leases commenced. See Note 6 for additional information regarding environmental obligations.

Substantially all of our tenants' financial results depend on the sale of refined petroleum products, convenience store sales or rental income from their subtenants. As a result, our tenants' financial results are highly dependent on the performance of the petroleum marketing industry, which is highly competitive and subject to volatility. During the terms of our leases, we monitor the credit quality of our triple-net tenants by reviewing their published credit rating, if available, reviewing publicly available financial statements, or reviewing financial or other operating statements which are delivered to us pursuant to applicable lease agreements, monitoring news reports regarding our tenants and their respective businesses, and monitoring the timeliness of lease payments and the performance of other financial covenants under their leases.

Revenues from rental properties were \$29,022,000 and \$57,307,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, respectively, and \$24,365,000 and \$48,261,000 for the and three and six months ended June 30, 2017, respectively. Rental income contractually due from our tenants included in revenues from rental properties was \$28,424,000 and \$55,927,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, respectively, and \$23,839,000 and \$47,316,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2017, respectively.

In accordance with GAAP, we recognize rental revenue in amounts which vary from the amount of rent contractually due during the periods presented. As a result, revenues from rental properties include non-cash adjustments recorded for deferred rental revenue due to the recognition of rental income on a straight-line basis over the current lease term, the net amortization of above-market and below-market leases, rental income recorded under direct financing leases using the effective interest method which produces a

constant periodic rate of return on the net investments in the leased properties and the amortization of deferred lease incentives (the “Revenue Recognition Adjustments”). Revenue Recognition Adjustments included in revenues from rental properties in continuing operations were \$598,000 and \$1,380,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, respectively, and \$526,000 and \$945,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2017, respectively. We reserve for a portion of the recorded deferred rent receivable if circumstances indicate that a tenant will not make all of its contractual lease payments during the current lease term. Our assessments and assumptions regarding the recoverability of the deferred rent receivable are reviewed on an ongoing basis and such assessments and assumptions are subject to change. There were no deferred rent receivable reserves as of June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively.

Tenant reimbursements, which consist of real estate taxes and other municipal charges paid by us which were reimbursable by our tenants pursuant to the terms of triple-net lease agreements, were \$4,461,000 and \$7,529,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, respectively, and \$3,924,000 and \$6,917,000 for the three and six months ended June 30, 2017, respectively.

We incurred \$228,000 and \$30,000 of lease origination costs for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively. This deferred expense is recognized on a straight-line basis as amortization expense in our consolidated statements of operations over the terms of the various leases.

The components of the \$88,138,000 investment in direct financing leases as of June 30, 2018, are minimum lease payments receivable of \$148,029,000 plus unguaranteed estimated residual value of \$13,979,000 less unearned income of \$73,870,000. The components of the \$89,587,000 investment in direct financing leases as of December 31, 2017, are minimum lease payments receivable of \$154,441,000 plus unguaranteed estimated residual value of \$13,979,000 less unearned income of \$78,833,000.

Major Tenants

As of June 30, 2018, we had three significant tenants by revenue:

• We leased 160 convenience store and gasoline station properties in three separate unitary leases and three stand-alone leases to subsidiaries of Global Partners LP (NYSE: GLP) (“Global Partners”). In the aggregate, our leases with subsidiaries of Global Partners represented 18% and 22% of our total revenues for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively. All of our unitary leases with subsidiaries of Global Partners are guaranteed by the parent company.

• We leased 77 convenience store and gasoline station properties pursuant to three separate unitary leases to Apro, LLC (d/b/a “United Oil”). In the aggregate, our leases with United Oil represented 13% and 16% of our total revenues for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively.

• We leased 76 convenience store and gasoline station properties pursuant to two separate unitary leases to subsidiaries of Chestnut Petroleum Dist., Inc. (“Chestnut Petroleum”). In the aggregate, our leases with subsidiaries of Chestnut Petroleum represented 11% and 15% of our total revenues for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively. The largest of these unitary leases, covering 57 of our properties, is guaranteed by the parent company, its principals and numerous Chestnut Petroleum affiliates.

Getty Petroleum Marketing Inc.

Getty Petroleum Marketing Inc. (“Marketing”) was our largest tenant from 1997 until 2012, leasing substantially all of our properties acquired or leased prior to 1997 under a master lease. Our master lease with Marketing was terminated in April 2012 as a consequence of Marketing’s bankruptcy, at which time we either sold or released these properties. As of June 30, 2018, 377 of the properties we own or lease were previously leased to Marketing, of which 335 properties are subject to long-term triple-net leases with petroleum distributors in 14 separate property portfolios and 28 properties are leased as single unit triple-net leases. The leases covering properties previously leased to Marketing

are unitary triple-net lease agreements, generally with an initial term of 15 years and options for successive renewal terms of up to 20 years. Rent is scheduled to increase at varying intervals during both the initial and renewal terms of the leases. Several of the leases provide for additional rent based on the aggregate volume of fuel sold. In addition, the majority of the leases require the tenants to make capital expenditures at our properties, substantially all of which are related to the replacement of USTs that are owned by our tenants. As of June 30, 2018, we have a remaining commitment to fund up to \$8,112,000 in the aggregate with our tenants for our portion of such capital expenditures. Our commitment provides us with the option to either reimburse our tenants or to offset rent when these capital expenditures are made. This deferred expense is recognized on a straight-line basis as a reduction of rental revenue in our consolidated statements of operations over the life of the various leases.

As part of the triple-net leases for properties previously leased to Marketing, we transferred title of the USTs to our tenants, and the obligation to pay for the retirement and decommissioning or removal of USTs at the end of their useful lives, or earlier if circumstances warranted, was fully or partially transferred to our new tenants. We remain contingently liable for this obligation in the event that our tenants do not satisfy their responsibilities. Accordingly, through June 30, 2018, we removed \$13,813,000 of asset retirement obligations and \$10,808,000 of net asset retirement costs related to USTs from our balance sheet. The cumulative change of

\$1,864,000 (net of accumulated amortization of \$1,141,000) is recorded as deferred rental revenue and will be recognized on a straight-line basis as additional revenues from rental properties over the terms of the various leases.

NOTE 4. — COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

Credit Risk

In order to minimize our exposure to credit risk associated with financial instruments, we place our temporary cash investments, if any, with high credit quality institutions. Temporary cash investments, if any, are currently held in an overnight bank time deposit with JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. and these balances, at times, may exceed federally insurable limits.

Legal Proceedings

We are subject to various legal proceedings and claims which arise in the ordinary course of our business. As of June 30, 2018 and December 31, 2017, we had accrued \$12,311,000 for certain of these matters which we believe were appropriate based on information then currently available. We recorded credits aggregating \$70,000 for litigation losses for the six months ended June 30, 2017 for certain of these matters. We are unable to estimate ranges in excess of the amount accrued with any certainty for these matters. It is possible that our assumptions regarding the ultimate allocation method and share of responsibility that we used to allocate environmental liabilities may change, which may result in our providing an accrual, or adjustments to the amounts recorded, for environmental litigation accruals. Matters related to our former Newark, New Jersey Terminal and the Lower Passaic River, our MTBE litigations in the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland, and our lawsuit with the State of New York pertaining to a property formerly owned by us in Uniondale, New York, in particular, could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends or stock price. During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we received \$147,000 for former legal litigation settlements.

Matters related to our former Newark, New Jersey Terminal and the Lower Passaic River

In September 2003, we received a directive (the “Directive”) issued by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (“NJDEP”) under the New Jersey Spill Compensation and Control Act. The Directive indicated that we are one of approximately 66 potentially responsible parties for alleged natural resource damages resulting from the discharges of hazardous substances along the Lower Passaic River (the “Lower Passaic River”). The Directive provides, among other things, that the named recipients must conduct an assessment of the natural resources that have been injured by discharges into the Lower Passaic River and must implement interim compensatory restoration for the injured natural resources. The NJDEP alleges that our liability arises from alleged discharges originating from our former Newark, New Jersey Terminal site (which was sold in October 2013). We responded to the Directive by asserting that we are not liable. There has been no material activity and/or communications by the NJDEP with respect to the Directive since early after its issuance.

In May 2007, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) entered into an Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent (“AOC”) with over 70 parties to perform a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (“RI/FS”) for a 17-mile stretch of the Lower Passaic River in New Jersey. The RI/FS is intended to address the investigation and evaluation of alternative remedial actions with respect to alleged damages to the Lower Passaic River. Most of the parties to the AOC, including us, are also members of a Cooperating Parties Group (“CPG”). The CPG agreed to an interim allocation formula for purposes of allocating the costs to complete the RI/FS among its members, with the understanding that this agreed-upon allocation formula is not binding on the parties in terms of any potential liability for the costs to remediate the Lower Passaic River. The CPG submitted to the EPA its draft RI/FS in 2015. The draft RI/FS set forth various alternatives for remediating the entire 17-mile stretch of the Lower Passaic

River, and provides that cost estimate for the preferred remedial action presented therein is in the range of approximately \$483,000,000 to \$725,000,000. The EPA is still evaluating the draft RI/FS report submitted by the CPG.

In addition to the RI/FS activities, other actions relating to the investigation and/or remediation of the Lower Passaic River have proceeded as follows. First, in June 2012, certain members of the CPG entered into an Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent (“10.9 AOC”) effective June 18, 2012, to perform certain remediation activities, including removal and capping of sediments at the river mile 10.9 area and certain testing. The EPA also issued a Unilateral Order to Occidental Chemical Corporation (“Occidental”) directing Occidental to participate and contribute to the cost of the river mile 10.9 work. Concurrent with the CPG’s work on the RI/FS, on April 11, 2014, the EPA issued a draft Focused Feasibility Study (“FFS”) with proposed remedial alternatives to remediate the lower 8-miles of the 17-mile stretch of the Lower Passaic River. The FFS was subject to public comments and objections, and on March 4, 2016, the EPA issued its Record of Decision (“ROD”) for the lower 8-miles selecting a remedy that involves bank-to-bank dredging and installing an engineered cap with an estimated cost of \$1,380,000,000. On March 31, 2016, we and more than 100 other potentially responsible parties received from the EPA a “Notice of Potential Liability and Commencement of Negotiations for Remedial Design” (“Notice”), which informed the recipients that the EPA intends to seek an Administrative Order on Consent and Settlement Agreement with Occidental for remedial design of the remedy selected in the ROD, after which the EPA plans to begin negotiations with “major” potentially responsible parties for implementation and/or payment of the selected remedy. The

Notice also stated that the EPA believes that some of the potentially responsible parties and other parties not yet identified as potentially responsible parties will be eligible for a cash out settlement with the EPA. On October 5, 2016, the EPA announced that it had entered into a settlement agreement with Occidental which requires that Occidental perform the remedial design (which is expected to take four years to complete) for the remedy selected for the lower 8-miles of the Lower Passaic River.

By letter dated March 30, 2017, the EPA advised the recipients of the Notice that it would be entering into cash out settlements with 20 potentially responsible parties to resolve their alleged liability for the lower 8-mile remedial action that is the subject of the ROD. The letter also stated that the EPA would begin a process for identifying other potentially responsible parties for negotiation of cash out settlements to resolve their alleged liability for the lower 8-mile remedial action that is the subject of the ROD. We were not included in the initial group of 20 parties identified by the EPA for cash out settlements. In January 2018, the EPA published a notice of its intent to enter into a final settlement agreement with 15 of the identified 20 parties to resolve their respective alleged liability for the ROD work, each for a payment to the EPA in the amount of \$280,600. The EPA has also been engaged in discussions with the remaining recipients of the Notice regarding a proposed framework for an allocation process that will lead to offers of cash-out settlements to certain additional parties and a consent decree in which parties that are not offered a cash-out settlement will agree to perform the lower 8-mile remedial action, in which we are participating. The EPA-commenced allocation process is scheduled to conclude by mid-2019.

On June 30, 2018, Occidental filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey seeking cost recovery and contribution under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA”) for its alleged expenses with respect to the investigation, design, and anticipated implementation of the remedy for the lower 8-miles of the Passaic River. The complaint lists over 120 defendants, including us, many of which were also named in NJDEP’s 2003 Directive and EPA’s 2016 Notice. We do not know whether this new complaint will impact EPA’s allocation process or the ultimate outcome of the matter. We intend to defend the claims consistent with our defenses in the related proceedings.

Many uncertainties remain regarding how the EPA intends to implement the ROD. We anticipate that performance of the EPA’s selected remedy will be subject to future negotiations, potential enforcement proceedings and/or possible litigation. The RI/FS, AOC, 10.9 AOC and Notice do not obligate us to fund or perform remedial action contemplated by either the ROD or RI/FS and do not resolve liability issues for remedial work or the restoration of or compensation for alleged natural resource damages to the Lower Passaic River, which are not known at this time. Our ultimate liability, if any, in the pending and possible future proceedings pertaining to the Lower Passaic River is uncertain and subject to numerous contingencies which cannot be predicted and the outcome of which are not yet known.

MTBE Litigation – State of New Jersey

We are defending against a lawsuit brought by various governmental agencies of the State of New Jersey, including the NJDEP alleging various theories of liability due to contamination of groundwater with methyl tertiary butyl ether (a fuel derived from methanol, commonly referred to as “MTBE”) involving multiple locations throughout the State of New Jersey (the “New Jersey MDL Proceedings”). The complaint names as defendants approximately 50 petroleum refiners, manufacturers, distributors and retailers of MTBE or gasoline containing MTBE. The State of New Jersey is seeking reimbursement of significant clean-up and remediation costs arising out of the alleged release of MTBE containing gasoline in the State of New Jersey and is asserting various natural resource damage claims as well as liability against the owners and operators of gasoline station properties from which the releases occurred. The majority of the named defendants have already settled their cases with the State of New Jersey. A portion of the case (“bellwether” trials) has been transferred to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey for pre-trial proceedings and trial, although a trial date has not yet been set. We continue to engage in settlement negotiations and a dialogue with the plaintiffs’ counsel to educate them on the unique role of the Company and our business as

compared to other defendants in the litigation. Although the ultimate outcome of the New Jersey MDL Proceedings cannot be ascertained at this time, we believe that it is probable that this litigation will be resolved in a manner that is unfavorable to us. We are unable to estimate the range of loss in excess of the amount accrued with certainty for the New Jersey MDL Proceedings as we do not believe that plaintiffs' settlement proposal is realistic and there remains uncertainty as to the allegations in this case as they relate to us, our defenses to the claims, our rights to indemnification or contribution from other parties and the aggregate possible amount of damages for which we may be held liable. It is possible that losses related to the New Jersey MDL Proceedings in excess of the amounts accrued as of June 30, 2018, could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends or stock price.

MTBE Litigation – State of Pennsylvania

On July 7, 2014, our subsidiary, Getty Properties Corp., was served with a complaint filed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (the "State") in the Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County relating to alleged statewide MTBE contamination in Pennsylvania (the "Complaint"). The Complaint names us and more than 50 other defendants, including Exxon Mobil, various BP entities, Chevron, Citgo, Gulf, Lukoil Americas, Getty Petroleum Marketing Inc., Marathon, Hess, Shell Oil, Texaco, Valero, as well as other smaller petroleum refiners, manufacturers, distributors and retailers of MTBE or gasoline containing MTBE. The Complaint seeks compensation for natural resource damages and for injuries sustained as a result of "defendants' unfair and deceptive trade

practices and acts in the marketing of MTBE and gasoline containing MTBE.” The plaintiffs also seek to recover costs paid or incurred by the State to detect, treat and remediate MTBE from public and private water wells and groundwater. The plaintiffs assert causes of action against all defendants based on multiple theories, including strict liability – defective design; strict liability – failure to warn; public nuisance; negligence; trespass; and violation of consumer protection law.

The case was filed in the Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, but was removed by defendants to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and then transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York so that it may be managed as part of the ongoing MTBE MDL proceedings. Plaintiffs have recently filed a Second Amended Complaint naming additional defendants and adding factual allegations intended to bolster their claims against the defendants. We have joined with other defendants in the filing of a motion to dismiss the claims against us. This motion is pending with the Court. We intend to defend vigorously the claims made against us. Our ultimate liability, if any, in this proceeding is uncertain and subject to numerous contingencies which cannot be predicted and the outcome of which are not yet known.

MTBE Litigation – State of Maryland

On December 17, 2017, the State of Maryland, by and through the Attorney General on behalf of the Maryland Department of Environment and the Maryland Department of Health (the “State of Maryland”), filed a Complaint in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City related to alleged statewide MTBE contamination in Maryland (the “Complaint”). The Complaint was served upon us on January 19, 2018. The Complaint names us and more than 60 other defendants, including petroleum refiners, manufacturers, distributors and retailers of MTBE or gasoline containing MTBE. The Complaint seeks compensation for natural resource damages and for injuries sustained as a result of the defendants’ unfair and deceptive trade practices in the marketing of MTBE and gasoline containing MTBE. The plaintiffs also seek to recover costs paid or incurred by the State of Maryland to detect, investigate, treat and remediate MTBE from public and private water wells and groundwater, punitive damages and the award of attorneys’ fees and litigation costs. The plaintiffs assert causes of action against all defendants based on multiple theories, including strict liability – defective design; strict liability – failure to warn; strict liability for abnormally dangerous activity; public nuisance; negligence; trespass; and violations of Titles 4, 7 and 9 of the Maryland Environmental Code.

On February 14, 2018, defendants removed the case to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. It is unclear whether the matter will ultimately be removed to the MTBE MDL proceedings or remain in federal court in Maryland. We intend to defend vigorously the claims made against us. Our ultimate liability, if any, in this proceeding is uncertain and subject to numerous contingencies which cannot be predicted and the outcome of which are not yet known.

Uniondale, New York Litigation

In September 2004, the State of New York commenced an action against us, United Gas Corp., Costa Gas Station, Inc., Vincent Costa, The Ingraham Bedell Corporation, Richard Berger and Exxon Mobil Corporation in New York Supreme Court in Albany County seeking recovery for reimbursement of investigation and remediation costs claimed to have been incurred by the New York Environmental Protection and Spill Compensation Fund relating to contamination it alleges emanated from various gasoline station properties located in the same vicinity in Uniondale, N.Y., including a site formerly owned by us and at which a petroleum release and cleanup occurred. The complaint also seeks future costs for remediation, as well as interest and penalties. We have served an answer to the complaint denying responsibility. In 2007, the State of New York commenced action against Shell Oil Company, Shell Oil Products Company, Motiva Enterprises, LLC, and related parties, in New York Supreme court, Albany County seeking basically the same relief sought in the action involving us. We have also filed a third-party complaint against Hess Corporation and certain individual defendants based on alleged contribution to the contamination that is the

subject of the State's claims arising from a petroleum discharge at a gasoline station up-gradient from the site formerly owned by us. In 2016, the various actions filed by the State of New York and our third-party actions were consolidated for discovery proceedings and trial. Discovery in this case is in later stages and, as it nears completion, a schedule for trial will be established. We are unable to estimate the range of loss in excess of the amount we have accrued for this lawsuit. It is possible that losses related to this case, in excess of the amounts accrued, as of June 30, 2018, could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends or stock price.

NOTE 5. — DEBT

The amounts outstanding under our Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement (as defined below) are as follows (in thousands):

	Maturity	Interest	June 30,	December
	Date	Rate	2018	31,
				2017
Unsecured Revolving Credit Facility	March 2022	3.53 %	\$40,000	\$105,000
Unsecured Term Loan	March 2023	3.54 %	50,000	50,000
Series A Notes	February 2021	6.00 %	100,000	100,000
Series B Notes	June 2023	5.35 %	75,000	75,000
Series C Notes	February 2025	4.75 %	50,000	50,000
Series D Notes	June 2028	5.47 %	50,000	—
Series E Notes	June 2028	5.47 %	50,000	—
Total debt			415,000	380,000
Unamortized debt issuance costs, net			(3,786)	(842)
Total debt, net			\$411,214	\$379,158

Credit Agreement

On June 2, 2015, we entered into a \$225,000,000 senior unsecured credit agreement (the “Credit Agreement”) with a group of banks led by Bank of America, N.A. (the “Bank Syndicate”). The Credit Agreement consisted of a \$175,000,000 unsecured revolving credit facility (the “Revolving Facility”) and a \$50,000,000 unsecured term loan (the “Term Loan”).

On March 23, 2018, we entered in to an amended and restated credit agreement (the “Restated Credit Agreement”) amending and restating our Credit Agreement. Pursuant to the Restated Credit Agreement, we (a) increased the borrowing capacity under the Revolving Facility from \$175,000,000 to \$250,000,000, (b) extended the maturity date of the Revolving Facility from June 2018 to March 2022, (c) extended the maturity date of the Term Loan from June 2020 to March 2023 and (d) amended certain financial covenants and provisions.

Subject to the terms of the Restated Credit Agreement and our continued compliance with its provisions, we have the option to (a) extend the term of the Revolving Facility for one additional year to March 2023 and (b) request that the lenders approve an increase of up to \$300,000,000 in the amount of the Revolving Facility and/or the Term Loan to \$600,000,000 in the aggregate.

The Restated Credit Agreement incurs interest and fees at various rates based on our total indebtedness to total asset value ratio at the end of each quarterly reporting period. The Revolving Facility permits borrowings at an interest rate equal to the sum of a base rate plus a margin of 0.50% to 1.30% or a LIBOR rate plus a margin of 1.50% to 2.30%. The annual commitment fee on the undrawn funds under the Revolving Facility is 0.15% to 0.25%. The Term Loan bears interest at a rate equal to the sum of a base rate plus a margin of 0.45% to 1.25% or a LIBOR rate plus a margin of 1.45% to 2.25%. The Term Loan does not provide for scheduled reductions in the principal balance prior to its maturity.

Senior Unsecured Notes

On June 21, 2018, we entered into a third amended and restated note purchase and guarantee agreement (the “Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement”) amending and restating our existing senior note purchase agreement with The Prudential Insurance Company of America (“Prudential”) and certain affiliates of Prudential. Pursuant to the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement, we agreed that our (a) 6.0% Series A Guaranteed Senior Notes due February 25, 2021, in the original aggregate principal amount of \$100,000,000 (the “Series A Notes”), (b) 5.35% Series B Guaranteed Senior Notes due June 2, 2023, in the original aggregate principal amount of \$75,000,000 (the “Series B Notes”) and (c) 4.75% Series C Guaranteed Senior Notes due February 25, 2025, in the aggregate principal amount of \$50,000,000 (the “Series C Notes”) that were outstanding under the existing senior note purchase agreement would continue to remain outstanding under the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and we authorized and issued our 5.47% Series D Guaranteed Senior Notes due June 21, 2028, in the aggregate principal amount of \$50,000,000 (the “Series D Notes” and, together with the Series A Notes, Series B Notes and Series C Notes, the “Notes”). The Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement does not provide for scheduled reductions in the principal balance of the Notes prior to their respective maturities.

On June 21, 2018, we entered into a note purchase and guarantee agreement (the “MetLife Note Purchase Agreement”) with Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (“MetLife”) and certain affiliates of MetLife. Pursuant to the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement, we authorized and issued our 5.47% Series E Guaranteed Senior Notes due June 21, 2028, in the aggregate principal amount of \$50,000,000 (the “Series E Notes”). The MetLife Note Purchase Agreement does not provide for scheduled reductions in the principal balance of the Series E Notes prior to its maturity.

Covenants

The Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement contain customary financial covenants such as leverage, coverage ratios and minimum tangible net worth, as well as limitations on restricted payments, which may limit our ability to incur additional debt or pay dividends. The Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement also contain customary events of default, including cross defaults to each other, change of control and failure to maintain REIT status (provided that the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement require a mandatory offer to prepay the notes upon a change in control in lieu of a change of control event of default). Any event of default, if not cured or waived in a timely manner, would increase by 200 basis points (2.00%) the interest rate we pay under the Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement and could result in the acceleration of our indebtedness under the Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement. We may be prohibited from drawing funds under the Revolving Facility if there is any event or condition that constitutes an event of default under the Restated Credit Agreement or that, with the giving of any notice, the passage of time, or both, would be an event of default under the Restated Credit Agreement.

As of June 30, 2018, we are in compliance with all of the material terms of the Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement, including the various financial covenants described herein.

Debt Maturities

As of June 30, 2018, scheduled debt maturities, including balloon payments, are as follows (in thousands):

	Revolving Facility	Term Loan	Senior Unsecured Notes	Total
2018	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —
2019	—	—	—	—
2020	—	—	—	—
2021	—	—	100,000	100,000
2022 ⁽¹⁾	40,000	—	—	40,000
Thereafter	—	50,000	225,000	275,000
Total	\$ 40,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 325,000	\$ 415,000

(1) The Revolving Facility matures in March 2022. Subject to the terms of the Restated Credit Agreement and our continued compliance with its provisions, we have the option to extend the term of the Revolving Facility for one additional year to March 2023.

NOTE 6. — ENVIRONMENTAL OBLIGATIONS

We are subject to numerous federal, state and local laws and regulations, including matters relating to the protection of the environment such as the remediation of known contamination and the retirement and decommissioning or removal of long-lived assets including buildings containing hazardous materials, USTs and other equipment. Environmental costs are principally attributable to remediation costs which are incurred for, among other things, removing USTs, excavation of contaminated soil and water, installing, operating, maintaining and decommissioning remediation systems, monitoring contamination and governmental agency compliance reporting required in

connection with contaminated properties. We seek reimbursement from state UST remediation funds related to these environmental costs where available. The estimated future costs for known environmental remediation requirements are accrued when it is probable that a liability has been incurred and a reasonable estimate of fair value can be made. The accrued liability is the aggregate of our estimate of the fair value of cost for each component of the liability, net of estimated recoveries from state UST remediation funds considering estimated recovery rates developed from prior experience with the funds.

In July 2012, we purchased a 10-year pollution legal liability insurance policy covering substantially all of our properties at that time for preexisting unknown environmental liabilities and new environmental events. The policy has a \$50,000,000 aggregate limit and is subject to various self-insured retentions and other conditions and limitations. Our intention in purchasing this policy was to obtain protection predominantly for significant events. No assurances can be given that we will obtain a net financial benefit from this investment. In addition to the environmental insurance policy purchased by the Company, we also took assignment of certain environmental insurance policies, and rights to reimbursement for claims made thereunder, from Marketing, by order of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court during Marketing's bankruptcy proceedings. Under these assigned policies, we have received and expect to continue to receive reimbursement of certain remediation expenses for covered claims.

We enter into leases and various other agreements which contractually allocate responsibility between the parties for known and unknown environmental liabilities at or relating to the subject properties. We are contingently liable for these environmental

obligations in the event that our tenant or other counterparty does not satisfy them. It is possible that our assumptions regarding the ultimate allocation method and share of responsibility that we used to allocate environmental liabilities may change, which may result in material adjustments to the amounts recorded for environmental litigation accruals and environmental remediation liabilities. We are required to accrue for environmental liabilities that we believe are allocable to others under our leases and other agreements if we determine that it is probable that our tenant or other counterparty will not meet its environmental obligations. We may ultimately be responsible to pay for environmental liabilities as the property owner if our tenant or other counterparty fails to pay them. We assess whether to accrue for environmental liabilities based upon relevant factors including our tenants' histories of paying for such obligations, our assessment of their financial capability, and their intent to pay for such obligations. However, there can be no assurance that our assessments are correct or that our tenants who have paid their obligations in the past will continue to do so. The ultimate resolution of these matters could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends or stock price.

For substantially all of our triple-net leases, our tenants are contractually responsible for compliance with environmental laws and regulations, removal of USTs at the end of their lease term (the cost of which in certain cases is partially borne by us) and remediation of any environmental contamination that arises during the term of their tenancy. Under the terms of our leases covering properties previously leased to Marketing (substantially all of which commenced in 2012), we have agreed to be responsible for environmental contamination at the premises that was known at the time the lease commenced, and for environmental contamination discovered (other than as a result of a voluntary site investigation) during the first 10 years of the lease term (or a shorter period for a minority of such leases). After expiration of such 10-year (or, in certain cases, shorter) period, responsibility for all newly discovered contamination, even if it relates to periods prior to commencement of the lease, is contractually allocated to our tenant. Our tenants at properties previously leased to Marketing are in all cases responsible for the cost of any remediation of contamination that results from their use and occupancy of our properties. Under substantially all of our other triple-net leases, responsibility for remediation of all environmental contamination discovered during the term of the lease (including known and unknown contamination that existed prior to commencement of the lease) is the responsibility of our tenant.

We anticipate that a majority of the USTs at properties previously leased to Marketing will be replaced over the next several years because these USTs are either at or near the end of their useful lives. For long-term, triple-net leases covering sites previously leased to Marketing, our tenants are responsible for the cost of removal and replacement of USTs and for remediation of contamination found during such UST removal and replacement, unless such contamination was found during the first 10 years of the lease term and also existed prior to commencement of the lease. In those cases, we are responsible for costs associated with the remediation of such contamination. We have also agreed to be responsible for environmental contamination that existed prior to the sale of certain properties assuming the contamination is discovered (other than as a result of a voluntary site investigation) during the first five years after the sale of the properties. For properties that are vacant, we are responsible for costs associated with UST removals and for the cost of remediation of contamination found during the removal of USTs.

In the course of certain UST removals and replacements at properties previously leased to Marketing where we retained continuing responsibility for preexisting environmental obligations, previously unknown environmental contamination was and continues to be discovered. As a result, we have developed a reasonable estimate of fair value for the prospective future environmental liability resulting from preexisting unknown environmental contamination and have accrued for these estimated costs. These estimates are based primarily upon quantifiable trends which we believe allow us to make reasonable estimates of fair value for the future costs of environmental remediation resulting from the removal and replacement of USTs. Our accrual of the additional liability represents our estimate of the fair value of cost for each component of the liability, net of estimated recoveries from state UST remediation funds considering estimated recovery rates developed from prior experience with the funds. In arriving at our accrual, we analyzed the ages of USTs at properties where we would be responsible for preexisting contamination found within 10

years after commencement of a lease (for properties subject to long-term triple-net leases) or five years from a sale (for divested properties), and projected a cost to closure for new environmental contamination.

We measure our environmental remediation liabilities at fair value based on expected future net cash flows, adjusted for inflation (using a range of 2.0% to 2.75%), and then discount them to present value (using a range of 4.0% to 7.0%). We adjust our environmental remediation liabilities quarterly to reflect changes in projected expenditures, changes in present value due to the passage of time and reductions in estimated liabilities as a result of actual expenditures incurred during each quarter. As of June 30, 2018, we had accrued a total of \$61,828,000 for our prospective environmental remediation obligations. This accrual consisted of (a) \$16,724,000, which was our estimate of reasonably estimable environmental remediation liability, including obligations to remove USTs for which we are responsible, net of estimated recoveries and (b) \$45,104,000 for future environmental liabilities related to preexisting unknown contamination. As of December 31, 2017, we had accrued a total of \$63,565,000 for our prospective environmental remediation obligations. This accrual consisted of (a) \$18,537,000, which was our estimate of reasonably estimable environmental remediation liability, including obligations to remove USTs for which we are responsible, net of estimated recoveries and (b) \$45,028,000 for future environmental liabilities related to preexisting unknown contamination.

Environmental liabilities are accreted for the change in present value due to the passage of time and, accordingly, \$1,308,000 and \$1,795,000 of net accretion expense was recorded for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively, which is

included in environmental expenses. In addition, during the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, we recorded credits to environmental expenses, included in continuing and discontinued operations, aggregating \$608,000 and \$5,719,000, respectively, where decreases in estimated remediation costs exceeded the depreciated carrying value of previously capitalized asset retirement costs. Environmental expenses also include project management fees, legal fees and environmental litigation accruals.

During the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, we increased the carrying values of certain of our properties by \$2,116,000 and \$1,654,000, respectively, due to changes in estimated environmental remediation costs. The recognition and subsequent changes in estimates in environmental liabilities and the increase or decrease in carrying values of the properties are non-cash transactions which do not appear on the face of the consolidated statements of cash flows.

Capitalized asset retirement costs are being depreciated over the estimated remaining life of the UST, a 10-year period if the increase in carrying value is related to environmental remediation obligations or such shorter period if circumstances warrant, such as the remaining lease term for properties we lease from others. Depreciation and amortization expense related to capitalized asset retirement costs in our consolidated statements of operations for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, was \$2,099,000 and \$2,185,000, respectively. Capitalized asset retirement costs were \$44,973,000 (consisting of \$18,981,000 of known environmental liabilities and \$25,992,000 of reserves for future environmental liabilities) as of June 30, 2018, and \$45,380,000 (consisting of \$18,692,000 of known environmental liabilities and \$26,688,000 of reserves for future environmental liabilities) as of December 31, 2017. We recorded impairment charges aggregating \$1,817,000 and \$3,034,000 for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively, in continuing and discontinued operations for capitalized asset retirement costs.

Environmental exposures are difficult to assess and estimate for numerous reasons, including the extent of contamination, alternative treatment methods that may be applied, location of the property which subjects it to differing local laws and regulations and their interpretations, as well as the time it takes to remediate contamination and receive regulatory approval. In developing our liability for estimated environmental remediation obligations on a property by property basis, we consider, among other things, enacted laws and regulations, assessments of contamination and surrounding geology, quality of information available, currently available technologies for treatment, alternative methods of remediation and prior experience. Environmental accruals are based on estimates which are subject to significant change, and are adjusted as the remediation treatment progresses, as circumstances change, and as environmental contingencies become more clearly defined and reasonably estimable.

Our estimates are based upon facts that are known to us at this time and an assessment of the possible ultimate remedial action outcomes. It is possible that our assumptions, which form the basis of our estimates, regarding our ultimate environmental liabilities may change, which may result in our providing an accrual, or adjustments to the amounts recorded, for environmental remediation liabilities. Among the many uncertainties that impact the estimates are our assumptions, the necessary regulatory approvals for, and potential modifications of remediation plans, the amount of data available upon initial assessment of contamination, changes in costs associated with environmental remediation services and equipment, the availability of state UST remediation funds and the possibility of existing legal claims giving rise to additional claims, and possible changes in the environmental rules and regulations, enforcement policies, and reimbursement programs of various states.

In light of the uncertainties associated with environmental expenditure contingencies, we are unable to estimate ranges in excess of the amount accrued with any certainty; however, we believe that it is possible that the fair value of future actual net expenditures could be substantially higher than amounts currently recorded by us. Adjustments to accrued liabilities for environmental remediation obligations will be reflected in our consolidated financial statements as they become probable and a reasonable estimate of fair value can be made. Additional environmental liabilities could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends

or stock price.

NOTE 7. — SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY

A summary of the changes in shareholders' equity for the six months ended June 30, 2018, is as follows (in thousands):

	Common Stock		Paid-in Capital	Additional Dividends	
	Shares	Amount		Paid In Excess Of Earnings	Total
BALANCE, DECEMBER 31, 2017	39,696	\$ 397	\$ 604,872	\$ (51,574)	\$553,695
Net earnings				23,572	23,572
Dividends declared — \$0.64 per share				(25,915)	(25,915)
Shares issued pursuant to ATM Program, net	537	6	13,708	—	13,714
Shares issued pursuant to dividend reinvestment	29	—	755	—	755
Stock-based compensation	—	—	848	—	848
BALANCE, JUNE 30, 2018	40,262	\$ 403	\$ 620,183	\$ (53,917)	\$566,669

On March 1, 2018, our Board of Directors granted 121,650 restricted stock units ("RSU" or "RSUs") under our Amended and Restated 2004 Omnibus Incentive Compensation Plan.

On October 24, 2017, our Board of Directors approved Articles Supplementary to our Articles of Incorporation, as amended, to reclassify 10,000,000 authorized shares of preferred stock, par value \$.01 per share, into the same number of authorized but unissued shares of common stock, par value \$.01 per share, subject to further classification or reclassification and issuance by our Board of Directors. The Articles Supplementary were filed with the Maryland State Department of Assessments and Taxation on October 25, 2017, and became effective on that date.

On May 8, 2018, our stockholders approved an amendment to our Articles of Incorporation to increase the aggregate number of shares of stock of all classes which we have the authority to issue from 70,000,000 shares to 120,000,000 shares, by increasing (i) the aggregate number of shares of common stock which we have the authority to issue from 60,000,000 to 100,000,000 shares, and (ii) the aggregate number of shares of preferred stock which we have the authority to issue from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 shares.

Equity Offering

On July 10, 2017, we entered into an underwriting agreement (the “Underwriting Agreement”) with Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated, J.P. Morgan Securities LLC and KeyBanc Capital Markets Inc., as representatives of the several underwriters (the “Underwriters”), pursuant to which we sold to the Underwriters 4,100,000 shares of common stock (the “Equity Offering”). Pursuant to the terms of the Underwriting Agreement, we granted the Underwriters a 30-day option to purchase up to an additional 615,000 shares of common stock. We received net proceeds from the Equity Offering, including the full exercise by the Underwriters of their option to purchase additional shares, of \$104,312,000 after deducting the underwriting discount and offering expenses. The net proceeds of the Equity Offering were used to repay of amounts outstanding under our Revolving Facility and subsequently were used to fund the Empire and Applegreen Transactions.

ATM Program

In June 2016, we established an at-the-market equity offering program (the “2016 ATM Program”), pursuant to which we were able to issue and sell shares of our common stock with an aggregate sales price of up to \$125,000,000 through a consortium of banks acting as agents. The 2016 ATM Program was terminated in January 2018.

In March 2018, we established a new at-the-market equity offering program (the “ATM Program”), pursuant to which we are able to issue and sell shares of our common stock with an aggregate sales price of up to \$125,000,000 through a consortium of banks acting as agents. Sales of the shares of common stock may be made, as needed, from time to time in at-the-market offerings as defined in Rule 415 of the Securities Act, including by means of ordinary brokers’ transactions on the New York Stock Exchange or otherwise at market prices prevailing at the time of sale, at prices related to prevailing market prices or as otherwise agreed to with the applicable agent.

During the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, we issued a total of 537,000 shares of common stock and received net proceeds of \$13,714,000 under the ATM Program. During the three and six months ended June 30, 2017, we issued 64,000 and 232,000 shares, respectively, of common stock and received net proceeds of \$1,580,000 and \$5,860,000, respectively, under the 2016 ATM Program. Future sales, if any, will depend on a variety of factors to be determined by us from time to time, including among others, market conditions, the trading price of our common stock, determinations by us of the appropriate sources of funding for us and potential uses of funding available to us.

Dividends

For the six months ended June 30, 2018, we paid regular quarterly dividends of \$25,736,000 or \$0.64 per share. For the six months ended June 30, 2017, we paid regular quarterly dividends of \$19,569,000 or \$0.56 per share.

Dividend Reinvestment Plan

Our dividend reinvestment plan provides our common stockholders with a convenient and economical method of acquiring additional shares of common stock by reinvesting all or a portion of their dividend distributions. During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we issued 28,884 shares of common stock under the dividend reinvestment plan and received proceeds of \$755,000. During the six months ended June 30, 2017, we issued 24,284 shares of common stock under the dividend reinvestment plan and received proceeds of \$628,000.

Stock-Based Compensation

Compensation cost for our stock-based compensation plans using the fair value method was \$848,000 and \$655,000 for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively, and is included in general and administrative expenses in our consolidated statements of operations.

NOTE 8. — EARNINGS PER COMMON SHARE

Basic and diluted earnings per common share gives effect, utilizing the two-class method, to the potential dilution from the issuance of shares of our common stock in settlement of RSUs which provide for non-forfeitable dividend equivalents equal to the dividends declared per common share. Basic and diluted earnings per common share is computed by dividing net earnings less dividend equivalents attributable to RSUs by the weighted average number of common shares outstanding during the period. Diluted earnings per common share, also gives effect to the potential dilution from the exercise of stock options utilizing the treasury stock method. There were no options outstanding at June 30, 2018 and June 30, 2017.

(in thousands)	Three Months Ended		Six Months Ended	
	June 30, 2018	2017	June 30, 2018	2017
Earnings from continuing operations	\$ 13,823	\$ 14,551	\$ 23,985	\$ 22,268
Less dividend equivalents attributable to RSUs outstanding	(191)	(194)	(365)	(319)
Earnings from continuing operations attributable to common shareholders	13,632	14,357	23,620	21,949
(Loss) earnings from discontinued operations	(283)	555	(413)	2,542
Less dividend equivalents attributable to RSUs outstanding	—	—	—	—
(Loss) earnings from discontinued operations attributable to common shareholders	(283)	555	(413)	2,542
Net earnings attributable to common shareholders used for basic and diluted earnings per share calculation	\$ 13,349	\$ 14,912	\$ 23,207	\$ 24,491
Weighted average common shares outstanding:				
Basic	39,901	34,634	39,806	34,594
Incremental shares from share based compensation	13	—	11	—
Diluted	39,914	34,634	39,817	34,594
Basic earnings per common share	\$0.33	\$0.43	\$0.58	\$0.71
Diluted earnings per common share	\$0.33	\$0.43	\$0.58	\$0.71

NOTE 9. — FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS

Debt Instruments

As of June 30, 2018 and December 31, 2017, the carrying value of the borrowings under the Restated Credit Agreement approximated fair value. As of June 30, 2018 and December 31, 2017, the fair value of the borrowings under senior unsecured notes was \$331,800,000 and \$233,500,000, respectively. The fair value of the borrowings outstanding as of June 30, 2018 and December 31, 2017, was determined using a discounted cash flow technique that incorporates a market interest yield curve with adjustments for duration, risk profile and borrowings outstanding, which are based on unobservable inputs within Level 3 of the Fair Value Hierarchy.

Supplemental Retirement Plan

We have mutual fund assets that are measured at fair value on a recurring basis using Level 1 inputs. We have a Supplemental Retirement Plan for executives. The amounts held in trust under the Supplemental Retirement Plan using Level 2 inputs may be used to satisfy claims of general creditors in the event of our or any of our subsidiaries' bankruptcy. We have liability to the executives participating in the Supplemental Retirement Plan for the participant account balances equal to the aggregate of the amount invested at the executives' direction and the income earned in such mutual funds.

The following summarizes as of June 30, 2018, our assets and liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis by level within the Fair Value Hierarchy (in thousands):

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Assets:				
Mutual funds	\$544	\$—	\$ —	\$544
Liabilities:				
Deferred compensation	\$—	\$544	\$ —	\$544

The following summarizes as of December 31, 2017, our assets and liabilities measured at fair value on a recurring basis by level within the Fair Value Hierarchy:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
Assets:				
Mutual funds	\$451	\$—	\$ —	\$451
Liabilities:				
Deferred compensation	\$—	\$451	\$ —	\$451

Real Estate Assets

We have certain real estate assets that are measured at fair value on a non-recurring basis using Level 3 inputs as of June 30, 2018 and December 31, 2017, of \$2,217,000 and \$2,785,000, respectively, where impairment charges have been recorded. Due to the subjectivity inherent in the internal valuation techniques used in estimating fair value, the amounts realized from the sale of such assets may vary significantly from these estimates.

NOTE 10. — DISCONTINUED OPERATIONS AND ASSETS HELD FOR SALE

We report as discontinued operations properties which met the criteria to be accounted for as held for sale in accordance with GAAP as of June 30, 2014, and certain properties disposed of during the periods presented that were previously classified as held for sale as of June 30, 2014. All results of these discontinued operations are included in a separate component of income on the consolidated statements of operations under the caption discontinued operations. As of June 30, 2018, there were no properties that met criteria to be classified as held for sale.

Activity from discontinued operations was as follows (in thousands):

	Three Months Ended		Six Months Ended	
	June 30, 2018	June 30, 2017	June 30, 2018	June 30, 2017
Revenues from rental properties	\$—	\$—	\$—	\$—
Impairments	(329)	—	(718)	(269)
Changes in environmental estimates	46	551	305	2,804
Other operating income	—	4	—	7
Earnings (loss) from discontinued operations	\$(283)	\$555	\$(413)	\$2,542

NOTE 11. — PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

On April 17, 2018, we acquired fee simple interests in 30 convenience store and gasoline station properties (the “GPM Properties”) for \$52,592,000 and entered into a unitary lease with GPM Investments, LLC (“GPM”) at the closing of the transaction. We funded the GPM transaction through funds available under our Revolving Facility. The unitary lease provides for an initial term of 15 years, with four five-year renewal options. The unitary lease requires GPM to pay a

fixed annual rent plus all amounts pertaining to the GPM Properties, including environmental expenses, real estate taxes, assessments, license and permit fees, charges for public utilities and all other governmental charges. Rent is scheduled to increase annually during the initial and renewal terms of the lease. The GPM Properties are located primarily within metropolitan markets in the states of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas. We accounted for the acquisition of the GPM Properties as an asset acquisition. We estimated the fair value of acquired tangible assets (consisting of land, buildings and improvements) “as if vacant.” Based on these estimates, we allocated \$31,633,000 of the purchase price to land, \$17,489,000 to buildings and improvements, \$4,047,000 to in-place leases and \$577,000 to below market leases, which is accounted for as a deferred liability.

During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we also acquired fee simple interests in two convenience store and gasoline station, and other automotive related properties for an aggregate purchase price of \$2,716,000. We accounted for the acquisitions of fee simple interests as asset acquisitions. We estimated the fair value of acquired tangible assets (consisting of land, buildings and improvements) “as if vacant.” Based on these estimates, we allocated \$1,207,000 of the purchase price to land, \$1,326,000 to buildings and improvements and \$183,000 to in-place leases.

During the six months ended June 30, 2017, we acquired fee simple interests in 10 convenience store and gasoline station, and other automotive related properties for an aggregate purchase price of \$17,800,000. We accounted for the acquisitions of fee simple interests as asset acquisitions. We estimated the fair value of acquired tangible assets (consisting of land, buildings and improvements) “as if vacant.” Based on these estimates, we allocated \$3,825,000 of the purchase price to land, \$12,000,000 to buildings and improvements and \$1,975,000 to in-place leases.

On September 6, 2017, we acquired fee simple interests in 49 convenience store and gasoline station properties (the “Empire Properties”) for \$123,126,000 and entered into a unitary lease with Empire Petroleum Partners, LLC (“Empire”) at the closing of the transaction (the “Empire Transaction”). We funded the Empire Transaction through a combination of funds from our Equity Offering and funds available under our Revolving Facility. The unitary lease provides for an initial term of 15 years, with four five-year renewal options. The unitary lease requires Empire to pay a fixed annual rent plus all amounts pertaining to the Empire Properties including environmental expenses, real estate taxes, assessments, license and permit fees, charges for public utilities and all other governmental charges. Rent is scheduled to increase annually during the initial and renewal terms of the lease. The Empire Properties are located primarily within metropolitan markets in the states of Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, New Mexico and Texas.

We accounted for the acquisition of the Empire Properties as an asset acquisition. We estimated the fair value of acquired tangible assets (consisting of land, buildings and improvements) “as if vacant.” Based on these estimates, we allocated \$75,674,000 of the purchase price to land, \$38,205,000 to buildings and improvements, \$189,000 to above market leases and \$9,058,000 to in-place leases.

On October 3, 2017, we acquired fee simple interests in 33 convenience store and gasoline station properties and five stand-alone Burger King quick service restaurants (the “Applegreen Properties”) for \$68,710,000 and entered into a unitary lease with U.S. subsidiary of Applegreen PLC (“Applegreen”) at the closing of the transaction (the “Applegreen Transaction”). We funded the Applegreen Transaction through a combination of funds from our Equity Offering and funds available under our Revolving Facility. The unitary lease provides for an initial term of 15 years, with four five-year renewal options. The unitary lease requires Applegreen to pay a fixed annual rent plus all amounts pertaining to the Applegreen Properties including environmental expenses, real estate taxes, assessments, license and permit fees, charges for public utilities and all other governmental charges. Rent is scheduled to increase on the fifth anniversary of the commencement of the lease and annually thereafter. The Applegreen Properties are located within the metropolitan market of Columbia, SC.

We accounted for the acquisition of the Applegreen Properties as an asset acquisition. We estimated the fair value of acquired tangible assets (consisting of land, buildings and improvements) “as if vacant.” Based on these estimates, we allocated \$36,874,000 of the purchase price to land, \$27,431,000 to buildings and improvements, \$961,000 to above market leases, \$1,104,000 to below market leases, which is accounted for as a deferred liability, and \$4,548,000 to in-place leases.

We evaluated each of the acquisitions and determined that substantially all the fair value related to each acquisition is concentrated in a similar identifiable operating property. Accordingly, these transactions did not meet the definition of a business and consequently were accounted for as asset acquisitions. In each of these transactions, we allocated the total consideration for each acquisition to the individual assets acquired on a relative fair value basis.

NOTE 12. — SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

In preparing our unaudited consolidated financial statements, we have evaluated events and transactions occurring after June 30, 2018, for recognition or disclosure purposes. Based on this evaluation, there were no significant subsequent events from June 30, 2018, through the date the financial statements were issued.

ITEM 2. MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The following discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operations should be read in conjunction with the sections entitled "Item 1A. Risk Factors" and "Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017; and "Part I, Item 1. Financial Statements" in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

Cautionary Note Regarding Forward-Looking Statements

Certain statements in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q may constitute "forward-looking statements" within the meaning of the federal securities laws, including Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the "Securities Act"), and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"). Statements preceded by, followed by, or that otherwise include the words "believes," "expects," "seeks," "plans," "projects," "estimates," "anticipates," "predicts" and similar expressions or future or conditional verbs such as "will," "should," "would," "may" and "could" are generally forward-looking in nature and are not historical facts.

Examples of forward-looking statements included in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q include, but are not limited to, our prospective future environmental liabilities, including those resulting from preexisting unknown environmental contamination; quantifiable trends, which we believe allow us to make reasonable estimates of fair value for the future costs of environmental remediation resulting from the removal and replacement of USTs; the impact of our redevelopment efforts related to certain of our properties; the amount of revenue we expect to realize from our properties; AFFO as a measure that best represents our core operating performance and its utility in comparing the sustainability of our core operating performance with the sustainability of the core operating performance of other REITs; the reasonableness of our estimates, judgments, projections and assumptions used regarding our accounting policies and methods; our Critical Accounting Policies (as defined below); our exposure and liability due to and our accruals, estimates and assumptions regarding our environmental liabilities and remediation costs; loan loss reserves or allowances; our belief that our accruals for environmental and litigation matters including matters related to our former Newark, New Jersey Terminal and the Lower Passaic River, our MTBE multi-district litigation cases in the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland, and our lawsuit with the State of New York pertaining to a property formerly owned by us in Uniondale NY, were appropriate based on the information then available; our claims for reimbursement of monies expended in in the defense and settlement of certain MTBE cases under pollution insurance policies; our beliefs about the settlement proposals we receive and the probable outcome of litigation or regulatory actions and their impact on us; our expected recoveries from UST funds; our indemnification obligations and the indemnification obligations of others; our investment strategy and its impact on our financial performance; the adequacy of our current and anticipated cash flows from operations, borrowings under our Restated Credit Agreement and available cash and cash equivalents; our continued compliance with the covenants in our Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement; our belief that certain environmental liabilities can be allocated to others under various agreements; our beliefs regarding our properties, including their alternative uses and our ability to sell or lease our vacant properties over time; and our ability to maintain our federal tax status as a REIT.

These forward-looking statements are based on our current beliefs and assumptions and information currently available to us, and are subject to known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors and were derived utilizing numerous important assumptions that may cause our actual results, performance or achievements to differ materially from any future results, performance or achievements expressed or implied by such forward-looking statements. Factors and assumptions involved in the derivation of forward-looking statements, and the failure of such other assumptions to be realized as well as other factors may also cause actual results to differ materially from those projected. Most of these factors are difficult to predict accurately and are generally beyond our control. These factors

and assumptions may have an impact on the continued accuracy of any forward-looking statements that we make.

Factors which may cause actual results to differ materially from our current expectations include, but are not limited to, the risks described in “Item 1A. Risk Factors” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017, as such risk factors may be updated from time to time in our public filings, and risks associated with: complying with environmental laws and regulations and the costs associated with complying with such laws and regulations; counterparty risks; the creditworthiness of our tenants; our tenants’ compliance with their lease obligations; renewal of existing leases and our ability to either re-lease or sell properties; our dependence on external sources of capital; the uncertainty of our estimates, judgments, projections and assumptions associated with our accounting policies and methods; our business operations generating sufficient cash for distributions or debt service; potential future acquisitions and redevelopment opportunities; our ability to successfully manage our investment strategy; owning and leasing real estate; adverse developments in general business, economic or political conditions; substantially all of our tenants depending on the same industry for their revenues; property taxes; potential exposure related to pending lawsuits and claims; owning real estate primarily concentrated in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions of the United States; competition in our industry; the adequacy of our insurance coverage and that of our tenants; failure to qualify as a REIT; changes in interest rates and our ability to manage or

mitigate this risk effectively; adverse effects of inflation; dilution as a result of future issuances of equity securities; our dividend policy, ability to pay dividends and changes to our dividend policy; changes in market conditions; provisions in our corporate charter and by-laws; Maryland law discouraging a third-party takeover; the loss of a member or members of our management team; changes in accounting standards; future impairment charges; terrorist attacks and other acts of violence and war; and our information systems.

As a result of these and other factors, we may experience material fluctuations in future operating results on a quarterly or annual basis, which could materially and adversely affect our business, financial condition, operating results, ability to pay dividends or stock price. An investment in our stock involves various risks, including those mentioned above and elsewhere in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and those that are described from time to time in our other filings with the SEC.

You should not place undue reliance on forward-looking statements, which reflect our view only as of the date hereof. Except for our ongoing obligations to disclose material information under the federal securities laws, we undertake no obligation to release publicly any revisions to any forward-looking statements, to report events or to report the occurrence of unanticipated events, unless required by law. For any forward-looking statements contained in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q or in any other document, we claim the protection of the safe harbor for forward-looking statements contained in the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995.

General

Real Estate Investment Trust

We are a real estate investment trust (“REIT”) specializing in the ownership, leasing and financing of convenience store and gasoline station properties. As of June 30, 2018, we owned 854 properties and leased 78 properties from third-party landlords. As a REIT, we are not subject to federal corporate income tax on the taxable income we distribute to our shareholders. In order to continue to qualify for taxation as a REIT, we are required, among other things, to distribute at least 90% of our ordinary taxable income to our shareholders each year.

Our Triple-Net Leases

Substantially all of our properties are leased on a triple-net basis primarily to petroleum distributors, convenience store retailers and, to a lesser extent, individual operators. Generally, our tenants supply fuel and either operate our properties directly or sublet our properties to operators who operate their convenience stores, gasoline stations, automotive repair service facilities or other businesses at our properties. Our triple-net tenants are generally responsible for the payment of all taxes, maintenance, repairs, insurance and other operating expenses relating to our properties, and are also responsible for environmental contamination occurring during the terms of their leases and in certain cases also for environmental contamination that existed before their leases commenced.

Substantially all of our tenants’ financial results depend on the sale of refined petroleum products, convenience store sales or rental income from their subtenants. As a result, our tenants’ financial results are highly dependent on the performance of the petroleum marketing industry, which is highly competitive and subject to volatility. During the terms of our leases, we monitor the credit quality of our triple-net tenants by reviewing their published credit rating, if available, reviewing publicly available financial statements, or reviewing financial or other operating statements which are delivered to us pursuant to applicable lease agreements, monitoring news reports regarding our tenants and their respective businesses, and monitoring the timeliness of lease payments and the performance of other financial covenants under their leases. For additional information regarding our real estate business, our properties and environmental matters, see “Item 1. Business — Company Operations”, “Item 2. Properties” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017, and “Environmental Matters” below.

Our Properties

Net Lease. As of June 30, 2018, we leased 918 of our properties to tenants under triple-net leases.

Our net lease properties include 817 properties leased under 25 separate unitary or master triple-net leases and 101 properties leased under single unit triple-net leases. These leases generally provide for an initial term of 15 to 20 years with options for successive renewal terms of up to 20 years and periodic rent escalations. Several of our leases provide for additional rent based on the aggregate volume of fuel sold. Certain leases require our tenants to invest capital in our properties.

Redevelopment. As of June 30, 2018, we were actively redeveloping nine of our former convenience store and gasoline station properties either as a new convenience and gasoline use or for alternative single-tenant net lease retail uses. For the six months ended June 30, 2018, rent commenced on two redevelopment projects.

Vacancies. As of June 30, 2018, five of our properties were vacant. We expect that we will either sell or enter into new leases on these properties over time.

Investment Strategy and Activity

As part of our overall growth strategy, we regularly review acquisition and financing opportunities to invest in additional convenience store and gasoline station properties, and we expect to continue to pursue investments that we believe will benefit our financial performance. In addition to sale/leaseback and other real estate acquisitions, our investment activities include purchase money financing with respect to properties we sell, and real property loans relating to our leasehold portfolios. Our investment strategy seeks to generate current income and benefit from long-term appreciation in the underlying value of our real estate. To achieve that goal, we seek to invest in high quality individual properties and real estate portfolios that are in strong primary markets that serve high density population centers. A key element of our investment strategy is to invest in properties that will promote our geographic and tenant diversity. We cannot provide any assurance that we will be successful making additional investments, that investments which meet our investment criteria will be available or that our current sources of liquidity will be sufficient to fund such investments.

During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we acquired fee simple interests in 32 convenience store and gasoline station, and other automotive related properties for an aggregate purchase price of \$55.3 million. During the six months ended June 30, 2017, we acquired fee simple interests in 10 convenience store and gasoline station, and other automotive related properties, in separate transactions, for an aggregate purchase price of \$17.8 million.

Redevelopment Strategy and Activity

We believe that a portion of our properties are located in geographic areas which, together with other factors, may make them well-suited for a new convenience and gasoline use or for alternative single-tenant net lease retail uses, such as quick service restaurants, automotive parts and service stores, specialty retail stores and bank branch locations. We believe that such alternative types of properties can be leased or sold at higher values than their current use.

For the six months ended June 30, 2018, we spent \$1.1 million of construction-in-progress costs related to our redevelopment activities. During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we transferred \$381,000 of construction-in-progress to buildings and improvements on our consolidated balance sheet. For the six months ended June 30, 2018, rent commenced on two redevelopment projects.

As of June 30, 2018, we were actively redeveloping nine of our former convenience store and gasoline station properties either as a new convenience and gasoline use or for alternative single-tenant net lease retail uses. In addition, to the nine properties currently classified as redevelopment, we are in various stages of feasibility and planning for the recapture of select properties from our net lease portfolio that are suitable for redevelopment to either a new convenience and gasoline use or for alternative single-tenant net lease retail uses. As of June 30, 2018, we have signed leases on five properties, that are currently part of our net lease portfolio, which will be recaptured and transferred to redevelopment when the appropriate entitlements, permits and approvals have been secured.

Asset Impairment

We perform an impairment analysis for the carrying amounts of our properties in accordance with GAAP when indicators of impairment exist. We reduced the carrying amounts to fair value, and recorded in continuing and discontinued operations, impairment charges aggregating \$1.2 million and \$4.0 million for the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, respectively, and \$0.9 million and \$4.7 million for the three and six months ended June 30, 2017, respectively, where the carrying amounts of the properties exceed the estimated undiscounted cash flows expected to be received during the assumed holding period which includes the estimated sales value expected to be received at disposition. The impairment charges were attributable to the effect of adding asset retirement costs due to changes in estimates associated with our environmental liabilities, which increased the carrying values of certain

properties in excess of their fair values, reductions in estimated undiscounted cash flows expected to be received during the assumed holding period for certain of our properties, and reductions in estimated sales prices from third-party offers based on signed contracts, letters of intent or indicative bids for certain of our properties. The evaluation of and estimates of anticipated cash flows used to conduct our impairment analysis are highly subjective and actual results could vary significantly from our estimates.

Supplemental Non-GAAP Measures

We manage our business to enhance the value of our real estate portfolio and, as a REIT, place particular emphasis on minimizing risk, to the extent feasible, and generating cash sufficient to make required distributions to shareholders of at least 90% of our ordinary taxable income each year. In addition to measurements defined by GAAP, we also focus on Funds From Operations (“FFO”) and Adjusted Funds From Operations (“AFFO”) to measure our performance. FFO and AFFO are generally considered by analysts and investors to be appropriate supplemental non-GAAP measures of the performance of REITs. FFO and AFFO are not in accordance with, or a substitute for, measures prepared in accordance with GAAP. In addition, FFO and AFFO are not based on any comprehensive set of accounting rules or principles. Neither FFO nor AFFO represent cash generated from operating activities calculated in accordance with GAAP and therefore these measures should not be considered an alternative for GAAP net earnings or

as a measure of liquidity. These measures should only be used to evaluate our performance in conjunction with corresponding GAAP measures.

FFO is defined by the National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts as GAAP net earnings before depreciation and amortization of real estate assets, gains or losses on dispositions of real estate, impairment charges and cumulative effect of accounting changes. Our definition of AFFO is defined as FFO less (i) Revenue Recognition Adjustments (net of allowances), (ii) changes in environmental estimates, (iii) accretion expense, (iv) environmental litigation accruals, (v) insurance reimbursements, (vi) legal settlements and judgments, (vii) acquisition costs expensed and (viii) other unusual items that are not reflective of our core operating performance. Other REITs may use definitions of FFO and/or AFFO that are different from ours and, accordingly, may not be comparable.

Beginning in the fourth quarter of 2017, we revised our definition of AFFO to exclude three additional items – environmental litigation accruals, insurance reimbursements, and legal settlements and judgments – because we believe that these items are not indicative of our core operating performance. While we do not label excluded items as non-recurring, management believes that excluding items from our definition of AFFO that are either non-cash or not reflective of our core operating performance provides analysts and investors the ability to compare our core operating performance between periods. AFFO for the six months ended June 30, 2017, has been restated to conform to our revised definition.

We believe that FFO and AFFO are helpful to analysts and investors in measuring our performance because both FFO and AFFO exclude various items included in GAAP net earnings that do not relate to, or are not indicative of, our core operating performance. FFO excludes various items such as depreciation and amortization of real estate assets, gains or losses on dispositions of real estate, and impairment charges. In our case, however, GAAP net earnings and FFO typically include the impact of revenue recognition adjustments comprised of deferred rental revenue (straight-line rental revenue), the net amortization of above-market and below-market leases, adjustments recorded for recognition of rental income recognized from direct financing leases on revenues from rental properties and the amortization of deferred lease incentives, as offset by the impact of related collection reserves. Deferred rental revenue results primarily from fixed rental increases scheduled under certain leases with our tenants. In accordance with GAAP, the aggregate minimum rent due over the current term of these leases is recognized on a straight-line basis rather than when payment is contractually due. The present value of the difference between the fair market rent and the contractual rent for in-place leases at the time properties are acquired is amortized into revenues from rental properties over the remaining lives of the in-place leases. Income from direct financing leases is recognized over the lease terms using the effective interest method, which produces a constant periodic rate of return on the net investments in the leased properties. The amortization of deferred lease incentives represents our funding commitment in certain leases, which deferred expense is recognized on a straight-line basis as a reduction of rental revenue. GAAP net earnings and FFO include non-cash changes in environmental estimates and environmental accretion expense, which do not impact our recurring cash flow. GAAP net earnings and FFO also include environmental litigation accruals, insurance reimbursements, and legal settlements and judgments, which items are not indicative of our core operating performance. GAAP net earnings and FFO from time to time may also include property acquisition costs expensed and other unusual items that are not reflective of our core operating performance. Acquisition costs are expensed, generally in the period when properties are acquired and are not reflective of our core operating performance.

We pay particular attention to AFFO, as we believe it best represents our core operating performance. In our view, AFFO provides a more accurate depiction than FFO of our core operating performance. By providing AFFO, we believe that we are presenting useful information that assists analysts and investors to better assess our core operating performance. Further, we believe that AFFO is useful in comparing the sustainability of our core operating performance with the sustainability of the core operating performance of other real estate companies.

A reconciliation of net earnings to FFO and AFFO is as follows (in thousands, except per share amounts):

	Three Months Ended		Six Months Ended	
	June 30, 2018	June 30, 2017	June 30, 2018	June 30, 2017
Net earnings	\$13,540	\$15,106	\$23,572	\$24,810
Depreciation and amortization of real estate assets	5,907	4,394	11,501	8,787
(Gain) loss on dispositions of real estate	(3,016)	(507)	(3,665)	(176)
Impairments	1,160	914	3,977	4,651
Funds from operations	17,591	19,907	35,385	38,072
Revenue recognition adjustments	(598)	(526)	(1,380)	(945)
Changes in environmental estimates	(96)	(1,402)	(608)	(5,719)
Accretion expense	616	762	1,308	1,795
Environmental litigation accruals	—	3	—	(70)
Insurance reimbursements	(94)	(3,873)	(309)	(4,092)
Legal settlements and judgments	—	—	(147)	—
Adjusted funds from operations	\$17,419	\$14,871	\$34,249	\$29,041
Basic per share amounts:				
Earnings per share	\$0.33	\$0.43	\$0.58	\$0.71
Funds from operations per share	0.43	0.57	0.88	1.09
Adjusted funds from operations per share	\$0.43	\$0.42	\$0.85	\$0.83
Basic weighted average common shares outstanding	39,901	34,634	39,806	\$34,594
Diluted per share amounts:				
Earnings per share	\$0.33	\$0.43	\$0.58	\$0.71
Funds from operations per share	0.43	0.57	0.88	1.09
Adjusted funds from operations per share	\$0.43	\$0.42	\$0.85	\$0.83
Diluted weighted average common shares outstanding	39,914	34,634	39,817	34,594

Results of Operations

Three months ended June 30, 2018, compared to the three months ended June 30, 2017

Revenues from rental properties increased by \$4.6 million to \$29.0 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$24.4 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in revenues from rental properties was primarily due to \$4.8 million of revenue from properties acquired in 2018 and the second half of 2017. Rental income contractually due from our tenants included in revenues from rental properties in continuing operations was \$28.4 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$23.8 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. Tenant reimbursements, which consist of real estate taxes and other municipal charges paid by us which are reimbursable by our tenants pursuant to the terms of triple-net lease agreements were \$4.5 million and \$3.9 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively. Interest income on notes and mortgages receivable was \$0.8 million and \$0.7 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, and 2017, respectively.

In accordance with GAAP, we recognize revenues from rental properties in amounts which vary from the amount of rent contractually due during the periods presented. As a result, revenues from rental properties include Revenue Recognition Adjustments comprised of non-cash adjustments recorded for deferred rental revenue due to the recognition of rental income on a straight-line basis over the current lease term, the net amortization of above-market

and below-market leases, recognition of rental income under direct financing leases using the effective interest rate method which produces a constant periodic rate of return on the net investments in the leased properties and the amortization of deferred lease incentives. Revenues from rental properties included in continuing operations includes Revenue Recognition Adjustments which increased rental revenue by \$0.6 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, and \$0.5 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017.

Property costs, which are primarily comprised of rent expense, real estate and other state and local taxes, municipal charges, maintenance expense and reimbursable tenant expenses, were \$6.4 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$5.3 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in property costs for the three months ended June 30, 2018, was principally due to an increase in reimbursable real estate taxes.

Impairment charges included in continuing operations were \$0.8 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$0.9 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. Impairment charges are recorded when the carrying value of a property is reduced to fair value. Impairment charges in continuing operations for the three months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, were attributable to the effect of adding asset retirement costs due to changes in estimates associated with our environmental liabilities, which increased the carrying values of certain properties in excess of their fair values, reductions in estimated undiscounted cash flows

expected to be received during the assumed holding period for certain of our properties, and reductions in estimated sales prices from third-party offers based on signed contracts, letters of intent or indicative bids for certain of our properties.

Environmental expenses included in continuing operations for the three months ended June 30, 2018, increased by \$1.0 million to \$1.4 million, as compared to \$0.4 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in environmental expenses for the three months ended June 30, 2018, was principally due to increases in environmental legal and professional fees, and net environmental remediation costs. Environmental expenses vary from period to period and, accordingly, undue reliance should not be placed on the magnitude or the direction of changes in reported environmental expenses for one period, as compared to prior periods.

General and administrative expense was \$3.9 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$3.7 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in general and administrative expense for the three months ended June 30, 2018, was principally due to an increase in public company and employee related expenses.

Depreciation and amortization expense was \$5.9 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$4.4 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in depreciation and amortization expense was primarily due to depreciation and amortization charges related to properties acquired, partially offset by the effect of certain assets becoming fully depreciated and dispositions of real estate.

Other income, net was \$0.2 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$3.9 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. For the three months ended June 30, 2018, other income was primarily attributable to \$0.1 million net proceeds received from the sale of air emission rights and \$0.1 million received from insurance carriers for reimbursement of environmental costs. Other income for the three months ended June 30, 2017, was primarily attributable to \$3.9 million received from insurance carriers for reimbursement of environmental costs.

Interest expense was \$5.3 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$4.3 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. The increase was primarily due to higher average borrowings outstanding and an increase in variable interest rates for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to the three months ended June 30, 2017.

Loss from discontinued operations was \$0.3 million for the three months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to earnings from discontinued operations of \$0.6 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. The decrease in earnings from discontinued operations for the three months ended June 30, 2018, was primarily due to lower environmental credits. For the three months ended June 30, 2018, impairment charges recorded in discontinued operations of \$0.3 million were attributable to the accumulation of asset retirement costs as a result of increases in estimated environmental liabilities which increased the carrying values of discontinued properties above their fair values. There were no impairment charges recorded in discontinued operations for the three months ended June 30, 2017. Gains on dispositions of real estate and impairment charges vary from period to period and, accordingly, undue reliance should not be placed on the magnitude or the direction of changes in reported gains and impairment charges for one period, as compared to prior periods.

For the three months ended June 30, 2018, FFO was \$17.6 million as compared to \$19.9 million for the three months ended June 30, 2017. For the three months ended June 30, 2018, AFFO increased by \$2.5 million to \$17.4 million, as compared to \$14.9 million for the prior period. FFO for the three months ended June 30, 2018, was impacted by the changes in net earnings but excludes a \$0.3 million increase in impairment charges, a \$2.5 million increase in gains on dispositions of real estate and a \$1.5 million increase in depreciation and amortization expense. The increase in AFFO for the three months ended June 30, 2018, also excludes a \$3.8 million decrease in insurance reimbursements, a \$1.1 million decrease in environmental estimates and accretion expense and a \$0.1 million increase in Revenue

Recognition Adjustments.

Six months ended June 30, 2018, compared to the six months ended June 30, 2017

Revenues from rental properties increased by \$9.0 million to \$57.3 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$48.3 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in revenues from rental properties was primarily due to \$8.7 million revenue from properties acquired in 2018 and the second half of 2017. Rental income contractually due from our tenants included in revenues from rental properties in continuing operations was \$55.9 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$47.3 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. Tenant reimbursements, which consist of real estate taxes and other municipal charges paid by us which are reimbursable by our tenants pursuant to the terms of triple-net lease agreements were \$7.5 million and \$6.9 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively. Interest income on notes and mortgages receivable was \$1.5 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, and the six months ended June 30, 2017.

In accordance with GAAP, we recognize revenues from rental properties in amounts which vary from the amount of rent contractually due during the periods presented. As a result, revenues from rental properties include Revenue Recognition Adjustments comprised of non-cash adjustments recorded for deferred rental revenue due to the recognition of rental income on a straight-line basis over the current lease term, the net amortization of above-market and below-market leases, recognition of rental income under direct financing leases using the effective interest rate method which produces a constant periodic rate of return on the net investments in the leased properties and the amortization of deferred lease incentives. Revenues from rental properties included in continuing operations

includes Revenue Recognition Adjustments which increased rental revenue by \$1.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, and \$0.9 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017.

Property costs, which are primarily comprised of rent expense, real estate and other state and local taxes, municipal charges, maintenance expense and reimbursable tenant expenses, were \$11.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$10.1 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in property costs for the six months ended June 30, 2018, was principally due to an increase in reimbursable real estate taxes offset by a decrease in maintenance expense.

Impairment charges included in continuing operations were \$3.3 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$4.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. Impairment charges are recorded when the carrying value of a property is reduced to fair value. Impairment charges in continuing operations for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, were attributable to the effect of adding asset retirement costs due to changes in estimates associated with our environmental liabilities, which increased the carrying values of certain properties in excess of their fair values, reductions in estimated undiscounted cash flows expected to be received during the assumed holding period for certain of our properties, and reductions in estimated sales prices from third-party offers based on signed contracts, letters of intent or indicative bids for certain of our properties.

Environmental expenses included in continuing operations for the six months ended June 30, 2018, increased by \$2.8 million to \$2.7 million, as compared to a credit of \$0.1 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in environmental expenses for the six months ended June 30, 2018, was principally due to increases in environmental legal and professional fees and net environmental remediation costs. Environmental expenses vary from period to period and, accordingly, undue reliance should not be placed on the magnitude or the direction of changes in reported environmental expenses for one period, as compared to prior periods.

General and administrative expense was \$7.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$7.2 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in general and administrative expense for the six months ended June 30, 2018, was principally due to an increase in public company and employee related expenses.

Depreciation and amortization expense was \$11.5 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$8.8 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in depreciation and amortization expense was primarily due to depreciation and amortization charges related to properties acquired, partially offset by the effect of certain assets becoming fully depreciated and dispositions of real estate.

Other income, net was \$0.6 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$4.1 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. For the six months ended June 30, 2018, other income was primarily attributable to \$0.3 million received from insurance carriers for reimbursement of environmental costs, \$0.1 million net proceeds received from the sale of air emission rights and \$0.1 million received from a legal settlement. Other income for the six months ended June 30, 2017, was primarily attributable to \$4.1 million received from insurance carriers for reimbursement of environmental costs.

Interest expense was \$10.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to \$8.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase was primarily due to higher average borrowings outstanding and an increase in variable interest rates for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to the six months ended June 30, 2017.

Loss from discontinued operations was \$0.4 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, as compared to earnings of \$2.5 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The decrease in earnings for the six months ended June 30, 2018, was primarily due to lower environmental credits. For the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017,

impairment charges recorded in discontinued operations of \$0.7 million and \$0.3 million, respectively, were attributable to the accumulation of asset retirement costs as a result of increases in estimated environmental liabilities which increased the carrying values of discontinued properties above their fair values. Gains on dispositions of real estate and impairment charges vary from period to period and, accordingly, undue reliance should not be placed on the magnitude or the direction of changes in reported gains and impairment charges for one period, as compared to prior periods.

For the six months ended June 30, 2018, FFO was \$35.4 million as compared to \$38.1 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. For the six months ended June 30, 2018, AFFO increased by \$5.3 million to \$34.3 million, as compared to \$29.0 million for the prior period. FFO for the six months ended June 30, 2018, was impacted by the changes in net earnings but excludes a \$0.7 million decrease in impairment charges, a \$3.5 million increase in gains on dispositions of real estate and a \$2.7 million increase in depreciation and amortization expense. The increase in AFFO for the six months ended June 30, 2018, also excludes a \$3.8 million decrease in insurance reimbursements, a \$0.1 million increase in legal settlements and judgments, a \$0.1 million decrease in environmental litigation accruals, a \$4.6 million increase in environmental estimates and accretion expense and a \$0.5 million decrease in Revenue Recognition Adjustments.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

Our principal sources of liquidity are the cash flows from our operations, funds available under our Revolving Facility which is scheduled to mature in March 2022 and available cash and cash equivalents. Our business operations and liquidity are dependent on our ability to generate cash flow from our properties. We believe that our operating cash needs for the next twelve months can be met

by cash flows from operations, borrowings under our Restated Credit Agreement, proceeds from the sale of shares of our common stock under our ATM Program and available cash and cash equivalents.

Our cash flow activities for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, are summarized as follows (in thousands):

	Six Months Ended	
	June 30,	2017
	2018	
Net cash flow provided by operating activities	\$30,750	\$21,784
Net cash flow (used in) investing activities	(52,287)	(15,235)
Net cash flow provided by (used in) financing activities	\$20,111	\$(4,471)

Operating Activities

Net cash flow from operating activities increased by \$9.0 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, to \$30.8 million, as compared to \$21.8 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. Net cash provided by operating activities represents cash received primarily from rental and interest income less cash used for property costs, environmental expenses, general and administrative expenses and interest expense. The change in net cash flow provided by operating activities for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, is primarily the result of changes in revenues and expenses as discussed in “Results of Operations” above.

Investing Activities

Our investing activities are primarily real estate-related transactions. Since we generally lease our properties on a triple-net basis, we have not historically incurred significant capital expenditures other than those related to investments in real estate and our redevelopment activities. Net cash flow used in investing activities increased by \$37.1 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, to \$52.3 million, as compared to \$15.2 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in net cash flow used in investing activities for the six months ended June 30, 2018, was primarily due to an increase of \$37.5 million in property acquisitions.

Financing Activities

Net cash flows provided by financing activities increased by \$24.6 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018, to \$20.1 million, as compared to a use of \$4.5 million for the six months ended June 30, 2017. The increase in net cash flow provided by financing activities was primarily due to an increase in net borrowings of \$25.0 million and an increase in net proceeds from issuances of common stock of \$7.8 million, partially offset by an increase in dividends paid of \$6.1 million and an increase of \$3.2 million in credit agreement and unsecured note origination costs.

Credit Agreement

On June 2, 2015, we entered into a \$225.0 million senior unsecured credit agreement (the “Credit Agreement”) with a group of banks led by Bank of America, N.A. (the “Bank Syndicate”). The Credit Agreement consisted of a \$175.0 million unsecured revolving credit facility (the “Revolving Facility”) and a \$50.0 million unsecured term loan (the “Term Loan”).

On March 23, 2018, we entered in to an amended and restated credit agreement (the “Restated Credit Agreement”) amending and restating our Credit Agreement. Pursuant to the Restated Credit Agreement, we (a) increased the

borrowing capacity under the Revolving Facility from \$175.0 million to \$250.0 million, (b) extended the maturity date of the Revolving Facility from June 2018 to March 2022, (c) extended the maturity date of the Term Loan from June 2020 to March 2023 and (d) amended certain financial covenants and provisions.

Subject to the terms of the Restated Credit Agreement and our continued compliance with its provisions, we have the option to (a) extend the term of the Revolving Facility for one additional year to March 2023 and (b) request that the lenders approve an increase of up to \$300.0 million in the amount of the Revolving Facility and/or Term Loan to \$600.0 million in the aggregate.

The Restated Credit Agreement incurs interest and fees at various rates based on our total indebtedness to total asset value ratio at the end of each quarterly reporting period. The Revolving Facility permits borrowings at an interest rate equal to the sum of a base rate plus a margin of 0.50% to 1.30% or a LIBOR rate plus a margin of 1.50% to 2.30%. The annual commitment fee on the undrawn funds under the Revolving Facility is 0.15% to 0.25%. The Term Loan bears interest at a rate equal to the sum of a base rate plus a margin of 0.45% to 1.25% or a LIBOR rate plus a margin of 1.45% to 2.25%. The Term Loan does not provide for scheduled reductions in the principal balance prior to its maturity.

Senior Unsecured Notes

On June 21, 2018, we entered into a third amended and restated note purchase and guarantee agreement (the “Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement”) amending and restating our existing senior note purchase agreement with The Prudential

Insurance Company of America (“Prudential”) and certain affiliates of Prudential. Pursuant to the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement, we agreed that our (a) 6.0% Series A Guaranteed Senior Notes due February 25, 2021, in the original aggregate principal amount of \$100.0 million (the “Series A Notes”), (b) 5.35% Series B Guaranteed Senior Notes due June 2, 2023, in the original aggregate principal amount of \$75.0 million (the “Series B Notes”) and (c) 4.75% Series C Guaranteed Senior Notes due February 25, 2025, in the aggregate principal amount of \$50.0 million (the “Series C Notes”) that were outstanding under the existing senior note purchase agreement would continue to remain outstanding under the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and we authorized and issued our 5.47% Series D Guaranteed Senior Notes due June 21, 2028, in the aggregate principal amount of \$50.0 million (the “Series D Notes” and, together with the Series A Notes, Series B Notes and Series C Notes the “Notes”). The Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement does not provide for scheduled reductions in the principal balance of the Notes prior to their respective maturities.

On June 21, 2018, we entered into a note purchase and guarantee agreement (the “MetLife Note Purchase Agreement”) with Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (“MetLife”) and certain affiliates of MetLife. Pursuant to the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement, we authorized and issued our 5.47% Series E Guaranteed Senior Notes due June 21, 2028, in the aggregate principal amount of \$50.0 million (the “Series E Notes”). The MetLife Note Purchase Agreement does not provide for scheduled reductions in the principal balance of the Series E Notes prior to its maturity.

Equity Offering

On July 10, 2017, we entered into an underwriting agreement (the “Underwriting Agreement”) with Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated, J.P. Morgan Securities LLC and KeyBanc Capital Markets Inc., as representatives of the several underwriters (the “Underwriters”), pursuant to which we sold to the Underwriters 4.1 million shares of common stock (the “Equity Offering”). Pursuant to the terms of the Underwriting Agreement, we granted the Underwriters a 30-day option to purchase up to an additional 0.6 million shares of common stock. We received net proceeds from the Equity Offering, including the full exercise by the Underwriters of their option to purchase additional shares, of \$104.3 million after deducting the underwriting discount and offering expenses. The net proceeds of the Equity Offering were used to repay amounts outstanding under our Revolving Facility and subsequently were used to fund the Empire and Applegreen Transactions.

ATM Program

In June 2016, we established an at-the-market equity offering program (the “2016 ATM Program”), pursuant to which we were able to issue and sell shares of our common stock with an aggregate sales price of up to \$125.0 million through a consortium of banks acting as agents. The 2016 ATM Program was terminated in January 2018.

In March 2018, we established a new at-the-market equity offering program (the “ATM Program”), pursuant to which we are able to issue and sell shares of our common stock with an aggregate sales price of up to \$125.0 million through a consortium of banks acting as agents. Sales of the shares of common stock may be made, as needed, from time to time in at-the-market offerings as defined in Rule 415 of the Securities Act, including by means of ordinary brokers’ transactions on the New York Stock Exchange or otherwise at market prices prevailing at the time of sale, at prices related to prevailing market prices or as otherwise agreed to with the applicable agent.

During the three and six months ended June 30, 2018, we issued a total of 537,000 shares of common stock and received net proceeds of \$13.7 million. During the three and six months ended June 30, 2017, we issued 64,000 and 232,000 shares of common stock, respectively, and received net proceeds of \$1.6 million and \$5.9 million, respectively. Future sales, if any, will depend on a variety of factors to be determined by us from time to time, including among others, market conditions, the trading price of our common stock, determinations by us of the appropriate sources of funding for us and potential uses of funding available to us.

Property Acquisitions and Capital Expenditures

As part of our overall business strategy, we regularly review opportunities to acquire additional properties and we expect to continue to pursue acquisitions that we believe will benefit our financial performance.

During the six months ended June 30, 2018, we acquired fee simple interests in 32 convenience store and gasoline station, and other automotive related properties for an aggregate purchase price of \$55.3 million. During the six months ended June 30, 2017, we acquired fee simple interests in 10 convenience store and gasoline station, and other automotive related properties for an aggregate purchase price of \$17.8 million. We accounted for the acquisitions of fee simple interests as asset acquisitions. See Note 11 for additional information.

We are reviewing select opportunities for capital expenditures, redevelopment and alternative uses for certain of our properties. We are also seeking to recapture select properties from our net lease portfolio to redevelop such properties either for a new convenience and gasoline use or for an alternative single-tenant net lease retail use. For the six months ended June 30, 2018, we spent \$1.1 million of construction-in-progress costs related to our redevelopment activities.

Since we generally lease our properties on a triple-net basis, we have not historically incurred significant capital expenditures other than those related to acquisitions. However, our tenants frequently make improvements to the properties leased from us at their expense. As of June 30, 2018, we have a remaining commitment to fund up to \$8.1 million in the aggregate in capital improvements in certain properties previously leased to Marketing and now subject to unitary triple-net leases with other tenants.

Dividends

We elected to be treated as a REIT under the federal income tax laws with the year beginning January 1, 2001. To qualify for taxation as a REIT, we must, among other requirements such as those related to the composition of our assets and gross income, distribute annually to our stockholders at least 90% of our taxable income, including taxable income that is accrued by us without a corresponding receipt of cash. We cannot provide any assurance that our cash flows will permit us to continue paying cash dividends.

It is also possible that instead of distributing 100% of our taxable income on an annual basis, we may decide to retain a portion of our taxable income and to pay taxes on such amounts as permitted by the Internal Revenue Service. Payment of dividends is subject to market conditions, our financial condition, including but not limited to, our continued compliance with the provisions of the Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement, the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement and other factors, and therefore is not assured. In particular, our Restated Credit Agreement, the Third Restated Prudential Note Purchase Agreement and the MetLife Note Purchase Agreement prohibit the payment of dividends during certain events of default.

Regular quarterly dividends paid to our shareholders for the six months ended June 30, 2018, were \$25.7 million, or \$0.64 per share. There can be no assurance that we will continue to pay dividends at historical rates.

Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates

The consolidated financial statements included in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q have been prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The preparation of consolidated financial statements in accordance with GAAP requires us to make estimates, judgments and assumptions that affect the amounts reported in our consolidated financial statements. Although we have made estimates, judgments and assumptions regarding future uncertainties relating to the information included in our consolidated financial statements, giving due consideration to the accounting policies selected and materiality, actual results could differ from these estimates, judgments and assumptions and such differences could be material.

Estimates, judgments and assumptions underlying the accompanying consolidated financial statements include, but are not limited to, real estate, receivables, deferred rent receivable, direct financing leases, depreciation and amortization, impairment of long-lived assets, environmental remediation obligations, litigation, accrued liabilities, income taxes and the allocation of the purchase price of properties acquired to the assets acquired and liabilities assumed. The information included in our consolidated financial statements that is based on estimates, judgments and assumptions is subject to significant change and is adjusted as circumstances change and as the uncertainties become more clearly defined.

Our accounting policies are described in Note 1 in “Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017. The SEC’s Financial Reporting Release (“FRR”) No. 60, Cautionary Advice Regarding Disclosure About Critical Accounting Policies (“FRR 60”), suggests that companies provide additional disclosure on those accounting policies considered most critical. FRR 60 considers an accounting policy to be critical if it is important to our financial condition and results of operations and requires significant judgment and estimates on the part of management in its application. We believe that our most critical

accounting policies relate to revenue recognition and deferred rent receivable, direct financing leases, impairment of long-lived assets, environmental remediation obligations, litigation, income taxes, and the allocation of the purchase price of properties acquired to the assets acquired and liabilities assumed (collectively, our “Critical Accounting Policies”), each of which is discussed in “Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017.

Environmental Matters

General

We are subject to numerous federal, state and local laws and regulations, including matters relating to the protection of the environment such as the remediation of known contamination and the retirement and decommissioning or removal of long-lived assets including buildings containing hazardous materials, USTs and other equipment. Environmental costs are principally attributable to remediation costs which are incurred for, among other things, removing USTs, excavation of contaminated soil and water, installing, operating, maintaining and decommissioning remediation systems, monitoring contamination and governmental agency compliance reporting required in connection with contaminated properties. We seek reimbursement from state UST remediation funds related to these environmental costs where available. The estimated future costs for known environmental remediation requirements are accrued when it is probable that a liability has been incurred and a reasonable estimate of fair value can be made. The accrued liability is the

aggregate of our estimate of the fair value of cost for each component of the liability, net of estimated recoveries from state UST remediation funds considering estimated recovery rates developed from prior experience with the funds.

In July 2012, we purchased a 10-year pollution legal liability insurance policy covering substantially all of our properties at that time for preexisting unknown environmental liabilities and new environmental events. The policy has a \$50.0 million aggregate limit and is subject to various self-insured retentions and other conditions and limitations. Our intention in purchasing this policy was to obtain protection predominantly for significant events. No assurances can be given that we will obtain a net financial benefit from this investment. In addition to the environmental insurance policy purchased by the Company, we also took assignment of certain environmental insurance policies, and rights to reimbursement for claims made thereunder, from Marketing, by order of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court during Marketing's bankruptcy proceedings. Under these assigned policies, we have received and expect to continue to receive reimbursement of certain remediation expenses for covered claims.

We enter into leases and various other agreements which contractually allocate responsibility between the parties for known and unknown environmental liabilities at or relating to the subject properties. We are contingently liable for these environmental obligations in the event that our tenant or other counterparty does not satisfy them. It is possible that our assumptions regarding the ultimate allocation method and share of responsibility that we used to allocate environmental liabilities may change, which may result in material adjustments to the amounts recorded for environmental litigation accruals and environmental remediation liabilities. We are required to accrue for environmental liabilities that we believe are allocable to others under our leases and other agreements if we determine that it is probable that our tenant or other counterparty will not meet its environmental obligations. We may ultimately be responsible to pay for environmental liabilities as the property owner if our tenant or other counterparty fails to pay them. We assess whether to accrue for environmental liabilities based upon relevant factors including our tenants' histories of paying for such obligations, our assessment of their financial capability, and their intent to pay for such obligations. However, there can be no assurance that our assessments are correct or that our tenants who have paid their obligations in the past will continue to do so. The ultimate resolution of these matters could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends or stock price.

For substantially all of our triple-net leases, our tenants are contractually responsible for compliance with environmental laws and regulations, removal of USTs at the end of their lease term (the cost of which in certain cases is partially borne by us) and remediation of any environmental contamination that arises during the term of their tenancy. Under the terms of our leases covering properties previously leased to Marketing (substantially all of which commenced in 2012), we have agreed to be responsible for environmental contamination at the premises that was known at the time the lease commenced, and for environmental contamination discovered (other than as a result of a voluntary site investigation) during the first 10 years of the lease term (or a shorter period for a minority of such leases). After expiration of such 10-year (or, in certain cases, shorter) period, responsibility for all newly discovered contamination, even if it relates to periods prior to commencement of the lease, is contractually allocated to our tenant. Our tenants at properties previously leased to Marketing are in all cases responsible for the cost of any remediation of contamination that results from their use and occupancy of our properties. Under substantially all of our other triple-net leases, responsibility for remediation of all environmental contamination discovered during the term of the lease (including known and unknown contamination that existed prior to commencement of the lease) is the responsibility of our tenant.

We anticipate that a majority of the USTs at properties previously leased to Marketing will be replaced over the next several years because these USTs are either at or near the end of their useful lives. For long-term, triple-net leases covering sites previously leased to Marketing, our tenants are responsible for the cost of removal and replacement of USTs and for remediation of contamination found during such UST removal and replacement, unless such contamination was found during the first 10 years of the lease term and also existed prior to commencement of the

lease. In those cases, we are responsible for costs associated with the remediation of such contamination. We have also agreed to be responsible for environmental contamination that existed prior to the sale of certain properties assuming the contamination is discovered (other than as a result of a voluntary site investigation) during the first five years after the sale of the properties. For properties that are vacant, we are responsible for costs associated with UST removals and for the cost of remediation of contamination found during the removal of USTs.

In the course of certain UST removals and replacements at properties previously leased to Marketing where we retained continuing responsibility for preexisting environmental obligations, previously unknown environmental contamination was and continues to be discovered. As a result, we have developed a reasonable estimate of fair value for the prospective future environmental liability resulting from preexisting unknown environmental contamination and have accrued for these estimated costs. These estimates are based primarily upon quantifiable trends which we believe allow us to make reasonable estimates of fair value for the future costs of environmental remediation resulting from the removal and replacement of USTs. Our accrual of the additional liability represents our estimate of the fair value of cost for each component of the liability, net of estimated recoveries from state UST remediation funds considering estimated recovery rates developed from prior experience with the funds. In arriving at our accrual, we analyzed the ages of USTs at properties where we would be responsible for preexisting contamination found within 10 years after commencement of a lease (for properties subject to long-term triple-net leases) or five years from a sale (for divested properties), and projected a cost to closure for new environmental contamination.

We measure our environmental remediation liabilities at fair value based on expected future net cash flows, adjusted for inflation (using a range of 2.0% to 2.75%), and then discount them to present value (using a range of 4.0% to 7.0%). We adjust our environmental remediation liabilities quarterly to reflect changes in projected expenditures, changes in present value due to the passage of time and reductions in estimated liabilities as a result of actual expenditures incurred during each quarter. As of June 30, 2018, we had accrued a total of \$61.8 million for our prospective environmental remediation obligations. This accrual consisted of (a) \$16.7 million, which was our estimate of reasonably estimable environmental remediation liability, including obligations to remove USTs for which we are responsible, net of estimated recoveries and (b) \$45.1 million for future environmental liabilities related to preexisting unknown contamination. As of December 31, 2017, we had accrued a total of \$63.6 million for our prospective environmental remediation obligations. This accrual consisted of (a) \$18.6 million, which was our estimate of reasonably estimable environmental remediation liability, including obligations to remove USTs for which we are responsible, net of estimated recoveries and (b) \$45.0 million for future environmental liabilities related to preexisting unknown contamination.

Environmental liabilities are accreted for the change in present value due to the passage of time and, accordingly, \$1.3 million and \$1.8 million of net accretion expense was recorded for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively, which is included in environmental expenses. In addition, during the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, we recorded credits to environmental expenses, included in continuing and discontinued operations, aggregating \$0.6 million and \$5.7 million, respectively, where decreases in estimated remediation costs exceeded the depreciated carrying value of previously capitalized asset retirement costs. Environmental expenses also include project management fees, legal fees and environmental litigation accruals.

During the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, we increased the carrying values of certain of our properties by \$2.1 million and \$1.7 million, respectively, due to changes in estimated environmental remediation costs. The recognition and subsequent changes in estimates in environmental liabilities and the increase or decrease in carrying values of the properties are non-cash transactions which do not appear on the face of the consolidated statements of cash flows.

Capitalized asset retirement costs are being depreciated over the estimated remaining life of the UST, a 10-year period if the increase in carrying value is related to environmental remediation obligations or such shorter period if circumstances warrant, such as the remaining lease term for properties we lease from others. Depreciation and amortization expense related to capitalized asset retirement costs in our consolidated statements of operations for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, was \$2.1 million and \$2.2 million, respectively. Capitalized asset retirement costs were \$45.0 million (consisting of \$19.0 million of known environmental liabilities and \$26.0 million of reserves for future environmental liabilities) as of June 30, 2018, and \$45.4 million (consisting of \$18.7 million of known environmental liabilities and \$26.7 million of reserves for future environmental liabilities) as of December 31, 2017. We recorded impairment charges aggregating \$1.8 million and \$3.0 million for the six months ended June 30, 2018 and 2017, respectively, in continuing and discontinued operations for capitalized asset retirement costs.

Environmental exposures are difficult to assess and estimate for numerous reasons, including the extent of contamination, alternative treatment methods that may be applied, location of the property which subjects it to differing local laws and regulations and their interpretations, as well as the time it takes to remediate contamination and receive regulatory approval. In developing our liability for estimated environmental remediation obligations on a property by property basis, we consider, among other things, enacted laws and regulations, assessments of contamination and surrounding geology, quality of information available, currently available technologies for treatment, alternative methods of remediation and prior experience. Environmental accruals are based on estimates which are subject to significant change, and are adjusted as the remediation treatment progresses, as circumstances change, and as environmental contingencies become more clearly defined and reasonably estimable.

Our estimates are based upon facts that are known to us at this time and an assessment of the possible ultimate remedial action outcomes. It is possible that our assumptions, which form the basis of our estimates, regarding our ultimate environmental liabilities may change, which may result in our providing an accrual, or adjustments to the amounts recorded, for environmental remediation liabilities. Among the many uncertainties that impact the estimates are our assumptions, the necessary regulatory approvals for, and potential modifications of remediation plans, the amount of data available upon initial assessment of contamination, changes in costs associated with environmental remediation services and equipment, the availability of state UST remediation funds and the possibility of existing legal claims giving rise to additional claims, and possible changes in the environmental rules and regulations, enforcement policies, and reimbursement programs of various states.

In light of the uncertainties associated with environmental expenditure contingencies, we are unable to estimate ranges in excess of the amount accrued with any certainty; however, we believe that it is possible that the fair value of future actual net expenditures could be substantially higher than amounts currently recorded by us. Adjustments to accrued liabilities for environmental remediation obligations will be reflected in our consolidated financial statements as they become probable and a reasonable estimate of fair value can be made. Additional environmental liabilities could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends or stock price.

Environmental Litigation

We are subject to various legal proceedings and claims which arise in the ordinary course of our business. As of June 30, 2018 and December 31, 2017, we had accrued \$12.3 million for certain of these matters which we believe were appropriate based on information then currently available. It is possible that our assumptions regarding the ultimate allocation method and share of responsibility that we used to allocate environmental liabilities may change, which may result in our providing an accrual, or adjustments to the amounts recorded, for environmental litigation accruals. Matters related to our former Newark, New Jersey Terminal and Lower Passaic River, our MTBE litigations in the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland, and our lawsuit with the State of New York pertaining to a property formerly owned by us in Uniondale, New York, in particular, could cause a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations, liquidity, ability to pay dividends or stock price. For additional information with respect to these and other pending environmental lawsuits and claims, see “Item 3. Legal Proceedings” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017, and Note 4 in “Part I, Item 1. Financial Statements” in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q.

ITEM 3. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

We are exposed to interest rate risk, primarily as a result of our \$300.0 million senior unsecured credit agreement (the “Restated Credit Agreement”) entered into on March 23, 2018, with a group of commercial banks led by Bank of America, N.A. (the “Bank Syndicate”). The Restated Credit Agreement consists of a \$250.0 million unsecured revolving facility (the “Revolving Facility”), which is scheduled to mature in March 2022 and a \$50.0 million unsecured term loan (the “Term Loan”), which is scheduled to mature in March 2023. Subject to the terms of the Restated Credit Agreement and our continued compliance with its provisions, we have the option to (a) extend the term of the Revolving Facility for one additional year to March 2023 and (b) request that the lenders approve an increase of up to \$300.0 million in the amount of the Revolving Facility and/or Term Loan to \$600.0 million in the aggregate. The Restated Credit Agreement incurs interest and fees at various rates based on our total indebtedness to total asset value ratio at the end of each quarterly reporting period. The Revolving Facility permits borrowings at an interest rate equal to the sum of a base rate plus a margin of 0.50% to 1.30% or a LIBOR rate plus a margin of 1.50% to 2.30%. The annual commitment fee on the undrawn funds under the Revolving Facility is 0.15% to 0.25%. The Term Loan bears interest at a rate equal to the sum of a base rate plus a margin of 0.45% to 1.25% or a LIBOR rate plus a margin of 1.45% to 2.25%. The Term Loan does not provide for scheduled reductions in the principal balance prior to its maturity. We use borrowings under the Restated Credit Agreement to finance acquisitions and for general corporate purposes. Borrowings outstanding at variable interest rates under the Restated Credit Agreement as of June 30, 2018, were \$90.0 million.

Based on our outstanding borrowings under the Restated Credit Agreement of \$90.0 million as of June 30, 2018, an increase in market interest rates of 1.0% for 2018 would decrease our 2018 net income and cash flows by \$0.5 million. This amount was determined by calculating the effect of a hypothetical interest rate change on our borrowings floating at market rates, and assumes that the \$90.0 million outstanding borrowings under the Restated Credit Agreement is indicative of our future average floating interest rate borrowings for 2018 before considering additional borrowings required for future acquisitions or repayment of outstanding borrowings from proceeds of future equity offerings. The calculation also assumes that there are no other changes in our financial structure or the terms of our borrowings. Our exposure to fluctuations in interest rates will increase or decrease in the future with increases or decreases in the outstanding amount under our Restated Credit Agreement and with increases or decreases in amounts outstanding under borrowing agreements entered into with interest rates floating at market rates.

In order to minimize our exposure to credit risk associated with financial instruments, we place our temporary cash investments, if any, with high credit quality institutions. Temporary cash investments, if any, are currently held in an overnight bank time deposit with JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. and these balances, at times, may exceed federally

insurable limits.

ITEM 4. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We maintain disclosure controls and procedures that are designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in our reports filed or furnished pursuant to the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the Commission's rules and forms, and that such information is accumulated and communicated to our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosure. In designing and evaluating the disclosure controls and procedures, management recognized that any controls and procedures, no matter how well designed and operated, can provide only reasonable assurance of achieving the desired control objectives, and management necessarily was required to apply its judgment in evaluating the cost-benefit relationship of possible controls and procedures.

As required by Rules 13a-15(b) and 13d-15(b) of the Exchange Act, we have carried out an evaluation, under the supervision and with the participation of our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and our Chief Financial Officer, of the effectiveness of the design and operation of our disclosure controls and procedures as of the end of the period covered by this

Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q. Based on the foregoing, our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15(e) under the Exchange Act) were effective as of June 30, 2018, at the reasonable assurance level.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

During the second quarter of 2018, there were no changes in our internal control over financial reporting (as defined in Rules 13a-15(f) and 15d-15(f) under the Exchange Act) that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, our internal control over financial reporting.

PART II—OTHER INFORMATION

ITEM 1. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

Please refer to “Item 3. Legal Proceedings” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017, and to Note 4 in “Part I, Item 1. Financial Statements” in this Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, for information regarding material pending legal proceedings. Except as set forth therein, there have been no new material legal proceedings and no material developments in any of our previously disclosed legal proceedings reported in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017, other than the following:

Matters related to our former Newark, New Jersey Terminal and the Lower Passaic River

In September 2003, we received a directive (the “Directive”) issued by the NJDEP under the New Jersey Spill Compensation and Control Act. The Directive indicated that we are one of approximately 66 potentially responsible parties for alleged natural resource damages resulting from the discharges of hazardous substances along the lower Passaic River (the “Lower Passaic River”). Other named recipients of the Directive are 360 North Pastoria Environmental Corporation, Amerada Hess Corporation, American Modern Metals Corporation, Apollo Development and Land Corporation, Ashland Inc., AT&T Corporation, Atlantic Richfield Assessment Company, Bayer Corporation, Benjamin Moore & Company, Bristol Myers-Squibb, Chemical Land Holdings, Inc., Chevron Texaco Corporation, Diamond Alkali Company, Diamond Shamrock Chemicals Company, Diamond Shamrock Corporation, Dilorenzo Properties Company, Dilorenzo Properties, L.P., Drum Service of Newark, Inc., E.I. Dupont De Nemours and Company, Eastman Kodak Company, Elf Sanofi, S.A., Fine Organics Corporation, Franklin-Burlington Plastics, Inc., Franklin Plastics Corporation, Freedom Chemical Company, H.D. Acquisition Corporation, Hexcel Corporation, Hilton Davis Chemical Company, Kearny Industrial Associates, L.P., Lucent Technologies, Inc., Marshall Clark Manufacturing Corporation, Maxus Energy Corporation, Monsanto Company, Motor Carrier Services Corporation, Nappwood Land Corporation, Noveon Hilton Davis Inc., Occidental Chemical Corporation, Occidental Electro-Chemicals Corporation, Occidental Petroleum Corporation, Oxy-Diamond Alkali Corporation, Pitt-Consol Chemical Company, Plastics Manufacturing Corporation, PMC Global Inc., Propane Power Corporation, Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Public Service Enterprise Group, Inc., Purdue Pharma Technologies, Inc., RTC Properties, Inc., S&A Realty Corporation, Safety-Kleen Envirosystems Company, Sanofi S.A., SDI Divestiture Corporation, Sherwin Williams Company, SmithKline Beecham Corporation, Spartech Corporation, Stanley Works Corporation, Sterling Winthrop, Inc., STWB Inc., Texaco Inc., Texaco Refining and Marketing Inc., Thomasset Colors, Inc., Tierra Solution, Incorporated, Tierra Solutions, Inc., and Wilson Five Corporation.

The Directive provides, among other things, that the named recipients must conduct an assessment of the natural resources that have been injured by discharges into the Lower Passaic River and must implement interim compensatory restoration for the injured natural resources. The NJDEP alleges that our liability arises from alleged discharges originating from our former Newark, New Jersey Terminal site (which was sold in October 2013). We responded to the Directive by asserting that we are not liable. There has been no material activity and/or communications by the NJDEP with respect to the Directive since early after its issuance.

In May 2007, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) entered into an Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent (“AOC”) with over 70 parties to perform a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (“RI/FS”) for a 17-mile stretch of the Lower Passaic River in New Jersey. The RI/FS is intended to address the investigation and evaluation of alternative remedial actions with respect to alleged damages to the Lower Passaic River. Most of the parties to the AOC, including us, are also members of a Cooperating Parties Group (“CPG”). The CPG agreed to an interim allocation formula for purposes of allocating the costs to complete the RI/FS among its members, with the understanding that this agreed-upon allocation formula is not binding on the parties in terms of any potential liability for the costs to remediate the Lower Passaic River. The CPG submitted to the EPA its draft RI/FS in

2015. The draft RI/FS set forth various alternatives for remediating the entire 17-mile stretch of the Lower Passaic River, and provides that cost estimate for the preferred remedial action presented therein is in the range of approximately \$483 million to \$725 million. The EPA has provided comments to the draft RI/FS to the CPG, some of which require proposed additional work to finalize the RI/FS. The CPG is evaluating the EPA's comments and engaging the EPA in discussions to address the EPA's comments and to determine a schedule for the completion of the RI/FS.

In addition to the RI/FS activities, other actions relating to the investigation and/or remediation of the Lower Passaic River have proceeded as follows. First, in June 2012, certain members of the CPG entered into an Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent ("10.9 AOC") effective June 18, 2012, to perform certain remediation activities, including removal and capping of sediments at the river mile 10.9 area and certain testing. The EPA also issued a Unilateral Order to Occidental Chemical Corporation ("Occidental") directing Occidental to participate and contribute to the cost of the river mile 10.9 work. Concurrent with the CPG's work on the RI/FS, on April 11, 2014, the EPA issued a draft Focused Feasibility Study ("FFS") with proposed remedial alternatives to remediate the lower 8-miles of the 17-mile stretch of the Lower Passaic River. The FFS was subject to public comments and objections and, on March 4, 2016, the EPA issued its Record of Decision ("ROD") for the lower 8-miles selecting a remedy that involves bank-to-bank dredging and installing an engineered cap with an estimated cost of \$1.38 billion. On March 31, 2016, we and more than 100 other potentially responsible parties received from the EPA a "Notice of Potential Liability and Commencement of

Negotiations for Remedial Design” (“Notice”), which informed the recipients that the EPA intends to seek an Administrative Order on Consent and Settlement Agreement with Occidental for remedial design of the remedy selected in the ROD, after which the EPA plans to begin negotiations with “major” potentially responsible parties for implementation and/or payment of the selected remedy. The Notice also stated that the EPA believes that some of the potentially responsible parties and other parties not yet identified as potentially responsible parties will be eligible for a cash out settlement with the EPA. On October 5, 2016, the EPA announced that it had entered into a settlement agreement with Occidental which requires that Occidental perform the remedial design (which is expected to take four years to complete) for the remedy selected for the lower 8-miles of the Lower Passaic River.

On June 16, 2016, Maxus Energy Corporation and Tierra Solutions, Inc., who have contractual liability to Occidental for Occidental’s potential liability related to the Lower Passaic River, filed for reorganization under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. In the Chapter 11 proceedings, YPF SA, Maxus and Tierra’s corporate parent, sought bankruptcy approval of a settlement under which YPF would pay \$130 million to the bankruptcy estate in exchange for a release in favor of Maxus, Tierra, YPF and YPF’s affiliates of Maxus and Tierra’s contractual environmental liability to Occidental. We and the CPG filed proofs of claims for costs incurred by the CPG relating to the lower Passaic River.

On April 19, 2017, Maxus, Tierra and certain of its affiliates (collectively, the “Debtors”), together with the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors, of which the CPG is a member, filed an Amended Chapter 11 Plan of Liquidation (the “Chapter 11 Plan”) in the Chapter 11 proceedings, which has been confirmed by order of the bankruptcy court, having an effective date of July 14, 2017 (the “Effective Date”). The Chapter 11 Plan provides for, among other things, the creation of a Liquidating Trust to liquidate and distribute from available assets certain allowed claims pursuant to the procedures set forth therein. Under the terms of the Chapter 11 Plan, the CPG’s proof of claim, which includes past costs incurred in the performance of the RI/FS and River Mile 10.9 work, is classified as an Allowed Class 4 Claim in the approximate amount of \$14.3 million. To the extent that the CPG receives any distributions from the Liquidating Trust with respect to its Allowed Class 4 Claim, we would be entitled to seek reimbursement of our pro-rata share of said distribution for past costs we incurred with respect to performance of the RI/FS and River Mile 10.9 work. The Chapter 11 Plan also provides for a Mutual Contribution Release Agreement under which claims for contribution relating to liabilities associated with the Lower Passaic River and incurred prior to the Effective Date are mutually released by and among the parties identified therein. We are one of 59 parties (the “Released Parties”) that entered into the Mutual Contribution Release Agreement, pursuant to which (i) the Debtors release the Released Parties from any contribution claim they may have, (ii) Occidental releases the Released Parties for the amounts itemized in Occidental’s Class 4 Claim, and (iii) the Released Parties release the Debtors and Occidental for the amounts itemized in the CPG’s Class 4 Claim. The Mutual Contribution Release Agreement does not reduce or affect the CPG’s right to receive distributions from the Liquidating Trust on account of the CPG’s Class 4 Claim or our pro-rata share of any such distributions, nor does it affect our right to assert any future claims against Occidental for costs that we may incur related to the remediation of the Lower Passaic River after the Effective Date.

By letter dated March 30, 2017, the EPA advised the recipients of the Notice that it would be entering into cash out settlements with 20 potentially responsible parties to resolve their alleged liability for the lower 8-mile remedial action that is the subject of the ROD. The letter also stated that the EPA would begin a process for identifying other potentially responsible parties for negotiation of cash out settlements to resolve their alleged liability for the lower 8-mile remedial action that is the subject of the ROD. We were not included in the initial group of 20 parties identified by the EPA for cash out settlements. In January 2018, the EPA published a notice of its intent to enter into a final settlement agreement with 15 of the identified 20 parties to resolve their respective alleged liability for the ROD work, each for a payment to the EPA in the amount of \$280,600. The EPA has also been engaged in discussions with the remaining recipients of the Notice regarding a proposed framework for an allocation process that will lead to offers of cash-out settlements to certain additional parties and a consent decree in which parties that are not offered a cash-out settlement will agree to perform the lower 8-mile remedial action, in which we are participating. The

EPA-commenced allocation process is scheduled to conclude by mid-2019.

On June 30, 2018, Occidental filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey seeking cost recovery and contribution under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (“CERCLA”) for its alleged expenses with respect to the investigation, design, and anticipated implementation of the remedy for the lower 8-miles of the Passaic River. The complaint lists over 120 defendants, including us, many of which were also named in NJDEP’s 2003 Directive and EPA’s 2016 Notice. We do not know whether this new complaint will impact EPA’s allocation process or the ultimate outcome of the matter. We intend to defend the claims consistent with our defenses in the related proceedings.

Many uncertainties remain regarding how the EPA intends to implement the ROD. We anticipate that performance of the EPA’s selected remedy will be subject to future negotiation, potential enforcement proceedings and/or possible litigation. The RI/FS, AOC and 10.9 AOC and Notice do not obligate us to fund or perform remedial action contemplated by either the ROD or RI/FS and do not resolve liability issues for remedial work or the restoration of or compensation for alleged natural resource damages to the Lower Passaic River, which are not known at this time. Our ultimate liability, if any, in the pending and possible future proceedings pertaining to the Lower Passaic River is uncertain and subject to numerous contingencies which cannot be predicted and the outcome of which are not yet known.

We have made a demand upon Chevron/Texaco for indemnity under certain agreements between us and Chevron/Texaco that allocate environmental liabilities for the Newark Terminal site between the parties. In response, Chevron/Texaco has asserted that the proceedings and claims are still not yet developed enough to determine the extent to which indemnities apply. We have engaged in discussions with Chevron/Texaco regarding our demands for indemnification. To facilitate these discussions, in October 2009, the parties entered into a Tolling/Standstill Agreement which tolls all claims by and among Chevron/Texaco and us that relate to the various Lower Passaic River matters, until either party terminates such Tolling/Standstill Agreement.

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

There have not been any material changes to the information previously disclosed in “Item 1A. Risk Factors” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017.

ITEM 5. OTHER INFORMATION

None.

ITEM 6. EXHIBITS

Exhibit

Number	Description of Document	Location of Document
10.1**	<u>Third Amended and Restated Note Purchase and Guarantee Agreement, dated as of June 21, 2018, among Getty Realty Corp., certain of its subsidiaries party thereto, the Prudential Insurance Company of America (“Prudential”) and certain affiliates of Prudential.</u>	Filed herewith.
10.2**	<u>Note Purchase and Guarantee Agreement, dated as of June 21, 2018, among Getty Realty Corp., certain of its subsidiaries party thereto, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (“MetLife”) and certain affiliates of MetLife.</u>	Filed herewith.
31.1	<u>Certification of Christopher J. Constant, President and Chief Executive Officer, pursuant to Rule 13a-14(a) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.</u>	Filed herewith.
31.2	<u>Certification of Danion Fielding, Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, pursuant to Rule 13a-14(a) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.</u>	Filed herewith.
32.1	<u>Certification of Christopher J. Constant, President and Chief Executive Officer, pursuant to Rule 13a-14(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and 18 U.S.C. § 1350.</u>	Filed herewith.
32.2	<u>Certification of Danion Fielding, Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, pursuant to Rule 13a-14(b) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and 18 U.S.C. § 1350.</u>	Filed herewith.
101.INS	XBRL Instance Document.	Filed herewith.
101.SCH	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema.	Filed herewith.
101.CAL	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Calculation Linkbase.	Filed herewith.
101.DEF	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Definition Linkbase.	Filed herewith.
101.LAB	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Label Linkbase.	Filed herewith.
101.PRE	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Presentation Linkbase.	Filed herewith.

** Confidential treatment has been requested for certain portions of this Exhibit pursuant to Rule 24b-2 under the Exchange Act, which portions are omitted and filed separately with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this Report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

Date: July 26, 2018

Getty Realty Corp.

By: /s/ CHRISTOPHER J. CONSTANT

Christopher J. Constant

President and Chief Executive Officer

(Principal Executive Officer)

By: /s/ DANION FIELDING

Danion Fielding

Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer

(Principal Financial Officer)

By: /s/ EUGENE SHNAYDERMAN

Eugene Shnayderman

Chief Accounting Officer and Controller

(Principal Accounting Officer)