



Senate Box 203078  
Harrisburg, PA 17120-3078  
(717) 787-7680  
Fax (717) 772-4524  
www.lgc.state.pa.us

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
COMMISSION**  
*Created in 1935*

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**  
Philip H. Klotz

**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR**  
David A. Greene

---

---

**MEMBERS**

Senator John H. Eichelberger, Jr.  
Senator Thomas J. McGarrigle  
Senator Scott E. Hutchinson

Senator John N. Wozniak  
Senator John P. Blake

Representative Chris Ross  
Representative Mauree Gingrich  
Representative Kate Harper

Representative Robert L. Freeman  
Representative Mary Jo Daley

---

**ACT 77 OF 2015 (House Bill 909, Printer's Number 1126)**

**Amending the Real Estate Tax Sale Law –  
Providing for the collection of additional costs  
related to rehabilitation and maintenance**

**PURPOSAL/SUMMARY:** The bill would add a new section 612.3 (Additional Costs for Rehabilitation and Maintenance) to the Real Estate Tax Sale Law, Act 542 of 1947 (RETSL). The amendment would authorize county tax claim bureaus to incur reasonably necessary costs for the rehabilitation and maintenance of property exposed to, but not sold at, an upset sale. The costs incurred would be recoverable by the county from the proceeds of any subsequent sale of the property.

The amendment would apply to all counties, except Philadelphia and Allegheny, choosing to utilize the provisions of RETSL. The intent of the bill is to provide counties an explicit mechanism to incur and recover, through the proceeds of sale, costs associated with maintaining property in a salable condition or in a condition otherwise required by municipal property maintenance codes. The amendment specifically provides that the new section is not to be interpreted as creating a duty on the part of the county or the tax claim bureau to maintain or rehabilitate property.

This proposal was requested by the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania in accordance with a 2009 resolution adopted by the membership of the Association. In the Commonwealth Court case of *Commonwealth v. Sprock*,<sup>1</sup> and related subsequent appellate cases, it was held that a tax claim bureau gains title to property after an unsuccessful upset sale of that property. Consequently, a tax claim bureau may be held responsible as an owner for compliance with municipal property maintenance ordinances. The Real Estate Tax Sale Law currently provides no express authorization for a tax claim bureau to incur and collect, as costs of sale, any expenses necessary to comply with property maintenance ordinances, or to otherwise incur and collect costs associated with maintaining the condition of the property. The law, at Section 206, provides the following:

Section 206. Costs, Fees and Expenses.--The county shall be liable, or initially liable for all costs, fees and expenses which shall be required to be paid to administer the affairs of the

---

<sup>1</sup> 795 A.2d 1100 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2002).

bureau and of this act, including but not limited to, costs of mailing and advertising notices, fees for the entry of claims, and proceedings thereon, and all other proceedings required by this act, except where otherwise provided by this act, the costs of repairs and alteration to, and insurance on property in sequestration or management, commissions to rental agents, advertising for rent, title searches and salaries and compensation, and the costs of bonds of officers, employes and agents of the bureau, and rental of offices, furniture, equipment, material and supplies for the use of the bureau.

All such costs, fees and expenses shall be paid as other expenses of the county are paid from appropriations made by the county, and not otherwise, and when any of such costs, fees and expenses are recovered they shall be deposited in the treasury of the county for the use of the county.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Absent statutory language specifically authorizing otherwise, the 5% commission charged by the county tax claim bureau under Section 207 of RETSL is considered to be the sole alternative source for recovery of the costs of the “operations” of the bureau. *See Borough of Canonsburg v. Nichols*, 528 A.2d 1087 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1987); *Hargreaves v. Mid-Valley School Dist.*, 396 A.2d 894 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1979).