Construction Liability

The proposed amendment to the Colorado Constitution:

- with some exceptions, prohibits limits, including limiting damages for pain and suffering to \$250,000, on a property owner's ability to recover damages when improvements to property are not constructed in a "good and workmanlike manner"; and
- defines an improvement constructed in a "good and workmanlike manner" as an improvement that is suitable for its intended purposes.

Background

Currently, state law establishes a procedure to recover damages from a construction professional when construction is defective. Under this law, a property owner may sue the responsible construction professional after giving notice and providing an opportunity to fix the defect. Construction professionals include architects, contractors, developers, and others involved in the construction business. If an agreement to fix the defect is not reached within 75 days in the case of residential property, or 90 days in the case of commercial property, the property owner may sue the construction professional responsible for the defect.

A property owner who sues, and wins, may be reimbursed for the lesser of the following three dollar amounts: 1) the value of the property without the defect, 2) the cost to replace the property, or 3) the reasonable cost to repair the defect. Medical expenses resulting from an injury are fully reimbursable. Awards for "pain and suffering" for bodily and personal injury are capped at \$250,000. In addition, if the owner can show that the construction professional knowingly violated the law that protects consumers from fraud, he or she may be awarded up to an additional \$250,000. Damage awards may also include the costs associated with moving, interest, or legal fees. Under this law, a lawsuit must be filed within two years from the date of discovering the defect or six years from the date the construction occurred.

The proposal. This proposal creates a new section in the state constitution that repeals current law. It removes limitations on the amount of money a property owner can collect in damages, except for punitive damages and lawsuits against governments. It also sets in the state constitution the current time frames for filing a lawsuit. Finally, the proposal eliminates the current requirement that a property owner and construction professional try to resolve the problem before bringing a lawsuit. In addition to these changes to current law, the proposal restricts the types of laws the legislature can pass in the future concerning construction liability.

Arguments For

- 1) The proposal protects property owners by ensuring they can be fully compensated for faulty construction. For the past three years, property owners have been limited in their ability to recover damages. Damages will be determined on a case-by-case basis in a court of law, rather than through a formula that treats all property owners the same. Property owners will be eligible for compensation for the pain and suffering caused by a defect.
- 2) The proposal changes a system that favors construction professionals at the expense of property owners. Individual property owners do not have the necessary time or resources to effectively negotiate with construction professionals or corporations that may be responsible. It creates constitutional standards that safeguard property owners from laws that limit their ability to collect damages.

Arguments Against

- 1) The proposal will drive up the cost of housing. An increase in the number of lawsuits, and the awards that result from those lawsuits, could make insurance costs prohibitive. In addition to construction professionals, this proposal allows for lawsuits against anyone who makes improvements to property, not just construction professionals. The proposal creates a fundamental change in liability to include construction professionals and non-professionals alike.
- 2) A process already exists for property owners and construction professionals to resolve construction defect disputes without immediately turning to the courts. The current system also defines damages in a way that is fair to both property owners and construction professionals: it compensates property owners for the actual cost of fixing their property but limits excessive compensation.

Estimate of Fiscal Impact

This proposal may affect the time devoted to construction-related cases by Colorado courts. If the proposal increases the incentive for property owners to pursue claims, the caseload and the time spent per case may increase. On the other hand, if it increases the incentive for construction professionals to either increase construction quality or settle claims out of court, the time devoted to construction-related cases may decrease. Ultimately, the effect of the proposal on the courts will depend on the number of claims filed, the portion of those claims settled out of court, and the time devoted to each case that goes to trial.