
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2224
Author: Hadwick (R), et al.
Amended: 5/21/26 in Assembly
Vote: 21

SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: 6-0, 6/17/26
AYES: Durazo, Choi, Arreguín, Cervantes, Laird, Seyarto
NO VOTE RECORDED: Ashby

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: County recorders: fees

SOURCE: County Recorders Association of California

DIGEST: This bill makes various changes to recording fees and requires county recorders to implement an electronic recording system by January 1, 2028.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits the fee for recording and indexing an instrument, paper, or notice from exceeding \$10 for recording the first page and \$3 fee for each additional page, to reimburse the county for the costs of services rendered, as specified.
- 2) Requires \$1 of each \$3 fee for each additional page to be deposited in the county general fund.
- 3) Authorizes additional recording fees for specified purposes.
- 4) Establishes the Electronic Recording Delivery Act of 2004 (ERDA), which provides the following:

- a) Authorizes, upon approval by resolution of the board of supervisors and system certification by the Attorney General, a recorder to establish an electronic recording delivery system (ERDS).
 - b) Authorizes, upon system certification, a recorder to enter into a contract with specified entities for the delivery for recording, and return to the party requesting recording, a digitized electronic record.
- 5) Authorizes, until January 1, 2027, a county to enter into a contract with an entity other than those specified above, if certain requirements are met.

This bill:

- 1) Makes various changes to recording fees and requires county recorders to implement an electronic recording system by January 1, 2028. Specifically, the measure:
 - a) Increases the recording fee for the first page from \$10 to \$15;
 - b) Increases the fee for additional pages from \$3 to \$4;
 - c) Repeals the additional \$1 per-page fee for recording documents if the printing on printed forms is spaced more than nine lines per vertical inch or more than 22 characters and spaces per inch measured horizontally for not less than three inches in one sentence;
 - d) Repeals the additional \$3 per-page fee for pages that do not conform to 8.5x 11 inch paper size;
 - e) Repeals the requirement that \$1 of each \$3 fee for each additional page must be deposited in the county general fund; and
 - f) Repeals the additional \$1 per indexing fees for records that require additional indexing work.
- 2) Prohibits fee amounts from exceeding the reasonable costs of the county recorder's office for providing these services.
- 3) Requires that fees collected exclusively go towards the county recorder's office and requires the recorder to provide access to a true copy of the public record for each instrument, paper, or notice, recorded in the office of the recorder, to facilitate public inspection.

- 4) Removes the January 1, 2027, sunset on provisions of the ERDA that allow for the digitized electronic delivery of specified records and expands the ability of the county recorder to include in their ERDS a secure method of receiving electronic records to any record.

Background

County recorders are responsible for examining and recording all documents dealing with the ownership of land in counties. These documents include payments of taxes or fees, filings of fictitious business names, deeds, mortgage documents, easements, power of attorney documents, liens, and any documents that affect the ownership of any given property. Other documents include deeds of trust, court decrees, and documents affecting title to real property; commercial code filings; subdivision maps; vital statistics such as births, deaths, and marriages; and other items.

Comments

Purpose of the bill. According to the author, “California county recorder’s offices are funded via fees on recorded documents. However, their costs have risen while fees have not been increased since 2011—resulting in growing budget shortages. Assembly Bill 2224 creates a more straightforward fee system for consumers and helps recorders recuperate their rising costs while requiring them to offer digital recording services.”

Another bite at the apple. Recorders have articulated the need for fee reform for years. Most recently, they asked the Legislature to increase recording fees in AB 1430 (Bennett, 2025), which would have increased the recording and indexing fee to \$15 for recording the first page and \$4 for recording each additional page at the county recorder’s office. The Governor vetoed AB 1430. AB 2224 takes another stab at the issue, but balances the same fee increases as AB 1430 proposed with deleting unnecessary fees due to technological advancements, offsetting some of the cost burden for these increased fees. Additionally, it requires county recorders to implement e-recording, which is supposed to increase the efficiency of their operations.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: Yes

SUPPORT: (Verified 6/30/26)

County Recorders Association of California (source)
Agenthome
Coalition for Improving Court Access

Corinthian Title Company
County of Contra Costa
County of Los Angeles
County of Riverside
Fidelity National Title Company
Westcor Land Title Insurance Company
Wfg National Title Company

OPPOSITION: (Verified 6/30/26)

None received

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 72-0, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas
NO VOTE RECORDED: DeMaio, Jackson, Lee, Macedo, Patel, Celeste Rodriguez, Sanchez, Ta

Prepared by: Jonathan Peterson / L. GOV. / (916) 651-4119
7/1/26 16:55:10

**** END ****