

# Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits

News, Analysis and Commentary On Affordable Housing, Community Development and Renewable Energy Tax Credits

February 2010, Volume I, Issue II

Published by Novogradac & Company LLP

## HISTORY AND THE HILL



### Virginia Tax Fund Case a Victory for the Historic Tax Credit Industry

By John Leith-Tetrault, National Trust Community Investment Corporation

It is often said that holiday gifts sometimes come in strange packages. A long awaited U.S. Tax Court ruling, issued December 21, 2009 in *Virginia Tax Credit Fund 2001 vs. Commissioner*, was indeed an unexpected gift and a significant victory for the historic tax credit (HTC) industry that sent many tax lawyers, syndicators and investors home for the holidays with a sigh of relief.

After all, it's not every day that one of the IRS' so-called "Dirty Dozen" tax scams is overturned in such a resounding fashion. Because of the high profile of the case, many in the industry had speculated that the court would decide against the Virginia Tax Credit Fund. However, by the time the case was tried, the IRS had dropped its initial argument that the transaction was abusive.

Here are the facts: Two Virginia state historic tax credit funds formed in the 2001 offered investors the opportunity to purchase a small (1 percent in the aggregate) interest in the funds and exit with significant capital losses in less than 12 months. Investor returns were comprised of a discounted price (74 cents) for the Virginia state HTC and the exit benefits of selling partnership interests for a *de minimis* amount on the original purchase price. The IRS argued that the partners owed \$7 million in underpayments because the investors were not true partners and that the purported allocation of credits was a "disguised sale" under Section 707 of the IRC.

The Virginia HTC is an allocated credit that cannot be transferred or sold. The Virginia program does not specify how long an investor in a partnership that receives credits must

remain a partner, unlike the federal credit which has a holding period of five years. The state law also differs from the Section 47 federal credit in that recapture is limited to a change in the historic character of the building, and cannot be triggered by a transfer of ownership such as a foreclosure.

In making its argument that the fund investors were not partners, the IRS stated that the investors had no business purpose except the sale of the state HTCs, and did not have a common interest in the profits and losses of the partnership. Judge Diane Kroupa held, however, that the investors signed standard partnership agreements that were properly written and enforceable under Virginia law, and that their conduct was consistent with those documents. The investors contributed significant capital for the purpose of rehabilitating historic buildings, received both tax credits and net economic benefits for their participation, and accepted checks for the sale of their partnership interests when the purposes of the partnership had been achieved. The judge acknowledged that the primary economic benefits were state income tax benefits, but cited earlier IRS rulings related to the low-income housing tax credit that concluded that certain credit programs may be held to a different profit motive standard than what is required by Section 183.

The IRS argued further that the fund investors were not partners because they did not share in partnership risks, especially in light of the fact that their participation lasted less than 12 months. However, the judge cited sufficient risks including the risk that the Virginia State Department of His-

*continued on page 2*

continued from page 1

toric Resources would not approve the Part 3 and the possibility that construction would not be completed or would be completed late. She also cited the risk of mismanagement or fraud at the operating partnership level, and the risk that additional expenses would need to be borne by the funds for nonperformance by local managing members.

The second key ruling was Judge Kroupa's finding that the transaction was not a disguised sale. A disguised sale under the Internal Revenue Code refers to contributions and distributions in the form of cash or other property to or from a partnership which, when taken together, suggest that the transaction can be characterized as a sale. The judge held that the substance of the transactions was a series of valid contributions and allocations under properly written and executed partnership agreements and not a sale. With regard to two established legal tests of a disguised sale, she found that the transfers (capital contributions and the receipt of the credits) were not simultaneous, and that they were subject to the entrepreneurial risks of the partnership.

So what does all of this mean for state historic tax credits specifically, and the historic tax credit industry generally? According to tax credit law experts we spoke to, quite a lot. Bill Machen of Holland and Knight said that *Virginia Tax Credit Fund 2001 v. Commissioner* is the first Tax Court case to address historic tax credits and the legislative intent behind both federal and state credit statutes. The judge found the intent of historic tax credits very defensible, citing their use to attract private investments to the rehabilitation of historically significant structures that, absent the credits, would not be made. He also said that many of the legal principles cited in the case would apply to federal HTC transactions.

"This ruling appears to bless the structure of any allocated state historic credit, regardless of the size of the investor's ownership interest or the length of time they remain in the partnership," Machen said. "David Aughtry [attorney for the defense] did a tremendous job. His argument was that it didn't matter how long an investor stays in the deal. All that matters is that the real purpose of the partnership was to generate the state credits; once that was done, the purpose had been accomplished."

Jerry Breed of Bryan Cave said that the outcome of the Virginia case should provide real comfort to states that have put allocated historic tax credit programs in place. He said that a different ruling may have caused many states to rethink and redesign existing credit statutes that encourage private capital investment in historic properties. Breed added that investors that have provided capital to state HTC transactions can be comforted that the tax treatment they anticipated for their investments has been upheld. He went on to say that the outcome of this case has significance in the context of proving a profit motive, because "the judge has held that

continued on page 3

## Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits Editorial Board

### PUBLISHER

Michael J. Novogradac, CPA

### EDITOR

Jane Bowar Zastrow

### MANAGING EDITOR

Alex Ruiz

### STAFF WRITERS

Jennifer Dockery

Jennifer Hill

### TECHNICAL EDITORS

Robert S. Thesman, CPA

James R. Kroger, CPA

Owen P. Gray, CPA

Thomas Boccia, CPA

Daniel J. Smith, CPA

### CONTRIBUTING WRITERS

Brandi Day

Deborah DeMasi

Brad Elphick, CPA

Jenny Ho

John Leith-Tetrault

Rochelle Lento

Diana Letsinger, CPA

Charles A. Rhuda III, CPA

Matthew M. Ryan

Craig Staswick

Robert Stroh

John M. Tess

Laurel Tinsley

Stephen B. Tracy, CPA

### PRODUCTION

Jesse Barredo

James Matuszak

## Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits Information

Address all correspondence and  
editorial submissions to:  
Jane Bowar Zastrow / 415.356.8034

Address inquiries regarding  
advertising opportunities to:  
Emil Bagalso / 415.356.8037

Editorial material in this publication is for informational purposes only and should not be construed otherwise. Advice and interpretation regarding the low-income housing tax credit or any other material covered in this publication can only be obtained from your tax advisor.



**NOVOGRADAC  
& COMPANY** LLP

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

© Novogradac & Company LLP

2010 All rights reserved.

ISSN 2152-646X

Reproduction of this publication in whole or in part in any form without written permission from the publisher is prohibited by law.

## Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits Advisory Board

### LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS

Bud Clarke	BOSTON FINANCIAL INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT
Jana Cohen Barbe	SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
Tom Dixon	BOSTON CAPITAL
Valerie White	STANDARD & POOR'S CORPORATION
Rick Edson	HOUSING CAPITAL ADVISORS INC.
Richard Gerwitz	CITI COMMUNITY CAPITAL
Rochelle Lento	DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
John Lisella	U.S. BANCORP COMMUNITY DEV. CORP.
Phillip Melton	GRANDBRIDGE REAL ESTATE CAPITAL
Thomas Morton	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
Stephen Ryan	COX, CASTLE & NICHOLSON LLP
Arnold Schuster	SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
Rob Wasserman	U.S. BANCORP COMMUNITY DEV. CORP.

### PROPERTY COMPLIANCE

Rose Guerrero	CALIFORNIA TAX CREDIT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE
Sharon Jackman	SIG SERVICES LLC
Michael Kotin	KAY KAY REALTY
Patricia Murphy	TEXAS DEPT. OF HOUSING & COMM. AFFAIRS
Mardi Roberts	WASHINGTON STATE HOUSING FINANCE COMMISSION
Michael Snowdon	MCA HOUSING PARTNERS
Gianna Solari	SOLARI ENTERPRISES
Ruth Theobald Probst	THEOPRO COMPLIANCE & CONSULT. INC.
Kimberly Taylor	HOMESTEAD CAPITAL

### HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Sheldon Schreiber	PEPPER HAMILTON LLP
Monica Sussman	NIXON PEABODY LLP

### NEW MARKETS TAX CREDITS

Frank Altman	COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT FUND
Bruce Bonjour	PERKINS COIE LLC
Neil Kimmelfield	LANE POWELL
Scott Lindquist	SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
Ruth Sparrow	FUTURES UNLIMITED LAW PC
Herb Stevens	NIXON PEABODY LLP
Mary Tingerthal	HOUSING PARTNERSHIP NETWORK
Tom Tracy	HUNTER CHASE & COMPANY
Joseph Wesolowski	ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT INC.

### HISTORIC TAX CREDITS

Don Holm	FARRIS BOBANGO BRANAN PLC
John Leith-Tetrault	NATIONAL TRUST COMM. INVESTMENT CORP.
Bill MacRostie	MACROSTIE HISTORIC ADVISORS LLC
Donna Rodney	BRYAN CAVE LLP
John Tess	HERITAGE CONSULTING GROUP

### RENEWABLE ENERGY TAX CREDITS

Ed Feo	MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP
Michael Hall	BORREGO SOLAR SYSTEMS
Jim Howard	DUDLEY VENTURES

*continued from page 2*

state credit investments will count along with other elements of profit when assessing whether the investor has a pre-tax motive."

Both attorneys stressed that there is always the chance that the Tax Court ruling in the Virginia case may be appealed. Neither was comfortable advising future clients to replicate the structure of the Virginia Tax Credit Fund in every respect. Despite the ruling, conventional wisdom in historic tax credit legal circles seems to be leaning toward a more conservative approach of at least a 1 percent ownership interest and remaining in the deal for one to three tax years.

Keep an eye on *History on the Hill* for continued reporting of Tax Court cases affecting the historic tax credit industry. ♦



*John Leith-Tetrault has 32 years of experience in community development financing, banking, community organizing, historic preservation, training and organizational development. He has held senior management positions with Neighborworks, Enterprise Community Partners, Bank of America and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Mr. Leith-Tetrault is the founding president of the National Trust Community Investment Corporation and*

*serves as the Chairman of the Historic Tax Credit Coalition. He can be reached at (202) 588-6064 or [jleith@ntcicfunds.com](mailto:jleith@ntcicfunds.com).*

*This article first appeared in the February 2010 issue of the Novogradac Journal of Tax Credits.*

© Novogradac & Company LLP 2010 - All Rights Reserved

*Notice pursuant to IRS regulations: Any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this article is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code; nor is any such advice intended to be used to support the promotion or marketing of a transaction. Any advice expressed in this article is limited to the federal tax issues addressed in it. Additional issues may exist outside the limited scope of any advice provided – any such advice does not consider or provide a conclusion with respect to any additional issues. Taxpayers contemplating undertaking a transaction should seek advice based on their particular circumstances.*

*This editorial material is for informational purposes only and should not be construed otherwise. Advice and interpretation regarding property compliance or any other material covered in this article can only be obtained from your tax advisor. For further information visit [www.novoco.com](http://www.novoco.com).*