



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

Correspondence Received

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
48.		Oppose	Heinrich V Keifer	I have sold off several of my residential investment properties due to increasing over regulation. I have one left and it could be sold anytime. My 30 year tenant will not be very happy.
			Scott deBeaubien	We, in regards this proposal, are strongly opposed to making "Temperature" requirements part of law in parts of Los Angeles County. Especially in beach areas where the average temperature year round is well below you set "Maximum" temperature of 82f. Thank you.
		Item Total	2	
Grand Total			2	

From the desk of Heinrich Keifer

August 7, 2025

Honorable Board of Supervisors,

Please vote no on the proposed maximum indoor temperature ordinance in order to save the county's current stock of affordable less expensive housing!

Top Seven Reasons to Vote NO:

1. Increasing fixed and operational expenses on the lowest-priced stock of affordable housing will cause the price of that housing to increase.
2. Being as the lowest-cost housing, it is also the most aged, requiring electrical system upgrades that could cost \$100,000's of dollars per building.
3. Electrical system upgrades would also cause resident displacement, increasing the cost to upgrade even higher
4. If the numbers don't work, buildings will become uninvestable and therefore removed from the market.
5. Where system upgrades are not made, the risk of electrical overload and fire will increase exponentially. You really want more fires?
6. The overall burden on the electrical grid will increase, potentially resulting in even more rolling blackouts or brownouts as EVs and AI demands on the grid also increase.
7. What if the renter would rather have a lower-priced unit that doesn't have extra amenities? There are already many units that have AC. If someone really wants AC, let them find a unit that has it. This mandate assumes that there are zero existing rentals with AC.

Thank you for using common sense and allowing people to have the freedom to choose the type of rental that they want to live in. Over the past five years, the cost of rentals has NOT kept up with the cost of home ownership or the 60% increase that we've seen in the state budget. Keep housing more affordable by voting no on this maximum temperature requirement.

Respectfully,

Heinrich V Keifer