

This CUP request presents a staggering increase from the current 24 special events allowed under County ordinances to 150 events—a drastic escalation. This could place an overwhelming burden on the community, shatter the rural character and undermine the agricultural focus that the General Plan is designed to protect. Hosting 150 events with up to 150 partygoers in a quiet pastoral setting simply does not align with the local environment. The thought of 22,000 strangers unfamiliar with the area, coupled with the fire risks we face during drought conditions, is deeply unsettling for us as nearby parcel owners. These events would strain the local environment, generate excessive noise, increase traffic, and shift the primary use of agricultural land toward commercial activities—an outcome fundamentally at odds with the intent of the Ranch Marketing and Winery ordinances.

The applicant's amendment, while seemingly an attempt to address noise complaints through barn activities and silent disco headphones, will ultimately fall short of creating the quiet environment it promises. Partygoers, regardless of the setup, will inevitably generate noise—that is simply a fact. Furthermore, the amendment introduces a significant enforcement challenge that cannot be overlooked.

The proposal to limit outdoor amplified sound to 15 events and require the remaining 135 events to use barns or silent disco headphones does little to mitigate the broader negative impacts of hosting such a high volume of events on agricultural land. While this amendment may appear to address noise concerns, it does nothing to reduce the cumulative strain these events impose on the agricultural integrity of the property and surrounding areas. Additionally, the topography of this particular area plays a significant role in how noise travels, meaning neighbors may be affected differently based on their proximity, elevation, or natural sound barriers. This variability further complicates enforcement and exacerbates the disruption for certain residents.

Enforcement of this amendment would be a logistical nightmare. The County's history of relying on self-monitoring has repeatedly proven ineffective, and this proposal heavily depends on that same flawed model. With such a high volume of events, ensuring compliance would be nearly impossible without consistent oversight, which would place an immense burden on code enforcement officers. These officers would face the daunting task of tracking whether events are held in the barn, verifying the use of silent disco headphones, and determining if outdoor amplified sound is truly contained. Real-time monitoring for every event would require significant resources and is simply not feasible.

Moreover, accurately measuring sound levels presents its own challenges. Factors such as time of day, weather conditions, and event-specific circumstances can all affect

decibel readings, making it difficult to ensure compliance with noise ordinances consistently.

In summary, while the applicant's amendment may be well-intentioned, it creates an enforcement quagmire that the County is ill-equipped to manage. Without a clear and enforceable framework, this amendment risks undermining the very ordinances designed to protect our community from excessive disruption and preserve the integrity of agricultural lands.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.
Sharon Arsenith