

**Fiscal Year 2015/2016 Addendum to Memorandum of Understanding
Department of Justice
Electronic Recording Delivery System
Costs for Regulation and Oversight**

Parties

This Addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding (Addendum) is between the California Department of Justice, hereinafter referred to as "DOJ" and the County of El Dorado, hereinafter referred to as "County."

Incorporation by Reference of MOU

Both County and DOJ agree that the terms of the MOU, previously executed, continue to operate and are incorporated herein by reference.

Purpose

The purpose of this Addendum is to continue the agreement found in the MOU previously executed by the parties to comply with the Electronic Recording Delivery Act of 2004 (ERDA) (Gov. Code, §§ 27390-27399; "Act"). This Addendum shall operate to bind the parties to the final proportionate costs to the County for fiscal year 2015/16. These costs include the costs for regulation and oversight.

Agreement

DOJ and County hereby consent and agree that County will pay DOJ for the direct cost of regulation and oversight in support of the Act, as set forth in Article 6 (commencing with Section 27390) to Chapter 6 of Division 2 of Title 3. The final proportionate cost for fiscal year 2015/16 is attached and incorporated by reference. Upon receipt of payment, the County is authorized to participate in the Electronic Recording Delivery System (ERDS).

Term of Addendum

The term of this Addendum operates for fiscal year 2015/16.

ATTEST: James S. Whitman
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
By: Kim Dawson, Sr. Deputy Clerk

JUN 10

MOU Representatives

The Addendum representatives during the term of this Addendum are:

County of: El Dorado	Department of Justice
Name: WILLIAM E. SCHULTZ, RECORDER	Name: Michelle N. Mitchell
Phone: 530-621-5494	Phone: (916) 227-1127
Fax:	Fax: (916) 227-0595
E-mail: william.schultz@edcgov.us	E-Mail: michellen.mitchell@doj.ca.gov

(contract administrator)

Agreed and Accepted

Certification of Addendum Representatives

I certify that I have read and understand the aforementioned statements and agree to comply with the requirements contained herein:

County of: El Dorado	Department of Justice
Name:	Name: Michelle N. Mitchell

Signed: *B. K. V. P.*
 Dated: 9/29/15

Signed: *Michelle N. Mitchell*
 Dated: 10/8/15

Attachments: Final Proportionate Costs:	Attachment A
Expenditure Report:	Attachment B

ATTEST:

**ATTEST: James S. Mitrison
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors**

By *Kim Dawson*
Kim Dawson, Sr. Deputy Clerk

Fiscal Year 2015/16 Final Proportionate Cost for County Recorders to Fund DOJ Program Costs

<i>County Code</i>	<i>County Name</i>	<i>Recordings*</i>	<i>% of Recordings</i>	<i>Final County Cost **</i>
1	Alameda	319,904	4.67%	\$6,336.19
4	Butte	49,125	0.72%	\$973.00
7	Contra Costa	262,426	3.83%	\$5,197.75
9	El Dorado	54,026	0.79%	\$1,070.07
10	Fresno	159,786	2.33%	\$3,164.81
15	Kern	178,129	2.60%	\$3,528.12
19	Los Angeles	1,420,226	20.73%	\$28,129.77
21	Marin	61,868	0.90%	\$1,225.39
24	Merced	42,158	0.62%	\$835.00
27	Monterey	68,901	1.01%	\$1,364.69
28	Napa	32,603	0.48%	\$645.75
29	Nevada	31,142	0.45%	\$616.82
30	Orange	568,611	8.30%	\$11,262.22
31	Placer	94,767	1.38%	\$1,877.01
33	Riverside	563,514	8.22%	\$11,161.26
34	Sacramento	360,688	5.26%	\$7,143.98
35	San Benito	12,117	0.18%	\$240.00
36	San Bernardino	499,693	7.29%	\$9,897.19
37	San Diego	655,812	9.57%	\$12,989.37
38	San Francisco	203,797	2.97%	\$4,036.51
39	San Joaquin	135,409	1.98%	\$2,681.98
41	San Mateo	140,110	2.04%	\$2,775.09
42	Santa Barbara	71,202	1.04%	\$1,410.27
43	Santa Clara	333,143	4.86%	\$6,598.41

Recordings are based on what the counties submitted to the Insurance Commissioner in 2014 per the LOI.

The total documents recorded and filed by the participating counties, as reported to the Office of the Insurance Commissioner pursuant to Section 3 of the Government Code, for the previous calendar year; A percentage figure will be calculated, by dividing the total documents recorded per participating county, by the total documents recorded for all participating counties; The percentage figure is applied to the estimated annual costs of RDS Program to arrive at each participating county's System Administrative Fee.

<i>County Code</i>	<i>County Name</i>	<i>Recordings*</i>	<i>% of Recordings</i>	<i>Final County Cost **</i>
44	Santa Cruz	51,637	0.75%	\$1,022.75
45	Shasta	39,814	0.58%	\$788.58
48	Solano	98,802	1.44%	\$1,956.93
49	Sonoma	94,213	1.37%	\$1,866.03
52	Tehama	14,720	0.21%	\$291.55
54	Tulare	69,957	1.02%	\$1,385.61
56	Ventura	163,880	2.39%	\$3,245.90
	Total	6,852,180		\$135,718.00

* Recordings are based on what the counties submitted to the Insurance Commissioner in 2014 per the LOI.

** The total documents recorded and filed by the participating counties, as reported to the Office of the Insurance Commissioner pursuant to Section 27296 of the Government Code, for the previous calendar year; A percentage figure will be calculated, by dividing the total documents recorded per participating county, by the total documents recorded for all participating counties; The percentage figure is applied to the estimated annual costs of the ERDS Program to arrive at each participating county's System Administrative Fee.

PROJECTIONS
ERDS Expenditure/Collections Report

COLLECTIONS

YTD Collections (November 2004 through June 2015)	3,749,915
Interest on Collections	44,029
Total Collections	3,793,944

EXPENDITURES

Summary of ERDS Program Expenditures (November 2004 through June 2015)	3,618,723
2014-15 ERDS Actual Expenditures	214,882
1/ Expenditure Credit Applied to (2015-16) for Subsequent Years (2014-15)	(79,165)
2015-16 Projected MOUs	135,718

1/ Expenditure credits will be applied one year in arrears to allow for fiscal year liquidation.