# Fiscal Year 2016/2017 Addendum to Memorandum of Understanding <br> Department of Justice <br> Electronic Recording Delivery System <br> 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, $\S \S 27390-27399$; "Act"). This Addendum shall operate to bind the parties to the final proportionate costs to the County for fiscal year 2016/17. 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 2016/17 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 2016/17.

## MOU Representatives

The Addendum representatives during the term of this Addendum are:

| County of: El Dorado | Department of Justice |
| :--- | :--- |
| Name: | Name: Michelle N. Mitchell |
| Phone: | Phone: (916) 227-1127 |
| Fax: | Fax: (916) 227-0595 |
| E-mail: | E-Mail: michellen.mitchell@doj.ca.gov |

## 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
Name:

Signed: $\qquad$
Dated: $\qquad$

Attachments: Final Proportionate Costs: Expenditure Report:

Department of Justice
Name: Michelle N. Mitchell

Signed: $\qquad$
Dated: $\qquad$

Attachment A Attachment B

# Fiscal Year 2016/17 Final Proportionate Cost for County Recorders to Fund DOJ Program Costs 

| County Code | County Name | Recordings* | $\%$ of <br> Recordings | Final <br> County Cost ** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alameda | 341,451 | 4.66\% | \$8,073.50 |
| 4 | Butte | 53,928 | 0.74\% | \$1,275.11 |
| 7 | Contra Costa | 310,805 | 4.24\% | \$7,348.88 |
| 9 | El Dorado | 61,054 | 0.83\% | \$1,443.60 |
| 10 | Fresno | 164,962 | 2.25\% | \$3,900.47 |
| 15 | Kern | 199,224 | 2.72\% | \$4,710.59 |
| 19 | Los Angeles | 1,598,848 | 21.82\% | \$37,804.23 |
| 21 | Marin | 69,800 | 0.95\% | \$1,650.40 |
| 24 | Merced | 46,732 | 0.64\% | \$1,104.96 |
| 26 | Mono | 5,868 | 0.08\% | \$138.75 |
| 27 | Monterey | .68,696 | 0.94\% | \$1,624.29 |
| 28 | Napa | 38,908 | 0.53\% | \$919.97 |
| 29 | Nevada | 36,614 | 0.50\% | \$865.73 |
| 30 | Orange | 660,746 | 9.02\% | \$15,623.12 |
| 31 | Placer | 71,213 | 0.97\% | \$1,683.81 |
| 33 | Riverside | 645,463 | 8.81\% | \$15,261.76 |
| 34 | Sacramento | 420,362 | 5.74\% | \$9,939.32 |
| 35 | San Benito | 14,266 | 0.19\% | \$337.31 |
| 36 | San Bernardino | 270,329 | 3.69\% | \$6,391.84 |
| 37 | San Diego | 781,385 | 10.66\% | \$18,475.59 |
| 38 | San Francisco | 207,354 | 2.83\% | \$4,902.82 |
| 39 | San Joaquin | 157,604 | 2.15\% | \$3,726.49 |
| 41 | San Mateo | 162,987 | 2.22\% | \$3,853.77 |
| 42 | Santa Barbara | 81,703 | 1.11\% | \$1,931.84 |

* Recordings are based on what the counties submitted to the Insurance Commision in 2015 pe
** 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.

| Cointy <br> Code | County Name | Recordings* | $\%$ of <br> Recordings | Final <br> County Cost $\% *$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 43 | Santa Clara | 221,544 | $3.02 \%$ | $\$ 5,238.33$ |
| 44 | Santa Cruz | 59,899 | $0.82 \%$ | $\$ 1,416.29$ |
| 45 | Shasta | 44,154 | $0.60 \%$ | $\$ 1,044.01$ |
| 48 | Solano | 127,531 | $1.74 \%$ | $\$ 3,015.43$ |
| 49 | Sonoma | 111,454 | $1.52 \%$ | $\$ 2,635.29$ |
| 52 | Tehama | 15,832 | $0.22 \%$ | $\$ 374.34$ |
| 54 | Tulare | 85,858 | $1.17 \%$ | $\$ 2,030.08$ |
| 56 | Ventura | 191,463 | $2.61 \%$ | $\$ 4,527.08$ |
|  |  |  | Total | $7.328,037$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 173,269.00$ |  |

[^0]** 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 2016)
Interest on Collections ..... 44,342
Total Collections ..... 3,929,336
EXPENDITURES
Summary of ERDS Program Expenditures (November 2004 through June 2016) ..... 3,833,606
2016-17 ERDS Projected Expenditures ..... 223,269
1/ Expenditure Credit Applied to (2016-17) for Subsequent Years (2015-16) ..... $(50,000)$
2016-17 Projected MOUs ..... 173,269


[^0]:    * Recordings are based on what the counties submitted to the Insurance Commissioner in 2015 per the LOI.

