

# **Bond Case Briefs**

*Municipal Finance Law Since 1971*

---

## **TAX - COLORADO**

### **City of Aurora v. Scott**

**Colorado Court of Appeals, Div. I - February 23, 2017 - P.3d - 2017 WL 710507 - 2017 COA 24**

City and city's urban renewal authority brought action against county assessor, seeking an order for assessor to delay allocation of tax increment financing (TIF) following city's adoption of urban renewal plan under the Urban Renewal Law (URL).

The District Court entered judgment in favor of assessor. City and authority appealed.

The Court of Appeals held that:

- Arbitration was not the exclusive remedy for assessor's challenge to city's plan;
- Assessor was neither party to, nor in privity with a party to, public hearings in which city's urban renewal plan was approved, and therefore claim preclusion did not bar assessor's subsequent challenge to plan's timeline for allocation of TIF; and
- Provision of URL stating that TIF cannot "exceed [25] years after the effective date of adoption of [a TIF] provision" does not allow city, in adopting an urban renewal plan, to choose any date as the effective date of adoption regardless of when the provision was actually approved.

County assessor's challenge to city's urban renewal plan's timeline for tax increment financing (TIF) under the Urban Renewal Law (URL) was not related to compliance with statutory TIF timeline, and therefore arbitration was not exclusive remedy for assessor's challenge, where challenge was unrelated to any requirement specifically enumerated in subsection of URL as subject to challenge through arbitration but rather was based on interpretation of different TIF subsection of URL.

County assessor was neither party to, nor in privity with a party to, public hearings in which city's urban renewal plan was approved, and therefore claim preclusion did not bar assessor's subsequent challenge to plan's timeline for allocation of tax increment financing (TIF), even if assessor had notice of public hearings, whether neither assessor nor county had any role in decision to adopt or reject plan.

Provision of Urban Renewal Law (URL) stating that tax increment financing (TIF) cannot "exceed [25] years after the effective date of adoption of [a TIF] provision" does not allow city, in adopting an urban renewal plan, to choose any date as the effective date of adoption regardless of when the provision was actually approved.

Even if home rule city's adoption of urban renewal plan was a legislative act, adoption of plan was not within scope of city's powers; urban renewal was matter of mixed state and local concern, and plan conflicted with state statute's timeline for tax increment financing (TIF).