Turley Vineyards 2962 A¹/₂ Road Grand Junction, Colorado 81503 April 18, 1991

Chief, Wine and Beer Branch Bureau Of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms P. O. Box 385 Washington, D. C. 20044-0385

Gentlemen:

I am writing to you regarding your proposal to establish a new federally approved viticultural area in Colorado, to be known as "The Grand Valley".

My family owns vineyard acreage within the proposed boundaries, acreage which produces four varieties of vinifera grapes. As such, we are quite pleased to know that wines made from our grapes will have the additional prestige of showing the appelation of our Grand Valley.

We, of the Grand Valley, are very proud of our fruits. Our peaches, pears, apricots, and cherries have built an enviable reputation, nationwide, and we are certain that wines produced in the Grand Valley from grapes and fruits grown in the Grand Valley, will attain an equal status, nationwide.

We have always sold our grapes to the Colorado Cellars winery. They have built an enviable reputation as Colorado's oldest, largest, and foremost award winning winery. They use grapes grown, exclusively, in the Grand Valley, and I am certain that their usage equals, or exceeds, the tonnage used by all other Colorado wineries, combined.

At least one other winery uses grapes grown 50 or 60 miles south of here, and we (of the Grand Valley) are pleased to know that the BATF regulators have recognized the fact that our area **is** different from other - more distant - areas in the state of Colorado which may (or may not, at the whim of Mother Nature) be able to support the production of vinifera grapes on a consistent basis.

We know that both Jim and Ann Seewald have spent countless hours working on the Grand Valley petition. I am also aware that employees of your offices have devoted countless hours to the evaluation of their petition. I would like to think that I am speaking for all of the Grand Valley growers, and all of the Grand Valley wineries when I extend my thanks to all individuals involved.

Yours v	ery truly	Ζ,
	Thus or	
Richard	Turtey	

GRANDE RIVER VINEYARDS

P.O. BOX 129 PALISADE, CO 81526

OFFICE (303) 464-5867 FAX (303) 464-5427

May 3, 1991

Chief Wine & Beer Branch Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, & Firearms P.O. Box 385 Washington, D.C. 20044-0385

RE: 27CFR Part 9 (Notice No. 714 (89F197P) RIN=1512-AA07 The Grand Valley Viticultural Area

Dear Sir,

We recently became Colorado's fifth Bonded Winery. We filed for the trade name Grande River Vineyards in January of 1991 with Secretary of State, the State Department of Revenue and in the county records. We have enclosed copies of our fling documents for your information.

We are concerned about a potential conflict with 27CFR CH. 1, 4.39 i & j. in obtaining label approval for our bottling trade name, Grande River Vineyards, should this viticultural area be approved with the name Grand Valley. While the Grande River name is of historical significance in that it was the original name of Colorado River, the name was changed by an act of Congress and the State Legislature in the early part of this century.

We do not think there should be a conflict with these names as Grande River Vineyards is a name of historical significance rather than geographical significance. We are supportive of the viticultural area but would be opposed to it if we would have trouble getting label approval, since we were using the name prior to the notice of proposed rule making. We would appreciate written assurance from ATF that there will not be a problem with the approval of our labels with the Grande River name should this viticultural area be approved. In the absence of such assurance, we would oppose the approval. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sharon Smith President



303/866-1324

May 3, 1991

Chief, Wine and Beer Branch Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms P.Q. Box 385 Washington, DC 20044-0385

RE: GRAND VALLEY VITICULTURAL AREA

I am writing on behalf of the Colorado Wine Industry Development Dear Sir or Madam: Board. Colorado law empowers the Board to promote the wine industry in our state and to communicate with other governmental agencies regarding matters affecting the wine industry here. The Board has reviewed the BATF proposal for the new viticultural area in Colorado and we believe that such as the second s in Colorado, and we believe that such a new area presents a great opportunity to help us promote our indigenous wines. The Board has two concerns which deserve our written comments: We propose that the viticultural area be enlarged to include a contiguous orchard development known as Rapid Creek. Rapid Creek is one of the oldest orchard areas in the state and is immediately adjacent to the northeastern border of the proposed

viticultural area. Also, it is at the mouth of the canyon where the Colorado River enters the Grand Valley and has been historically referred to as a portion of the Grand Valley. Most importantly, at least one orchard owner/manger is planning a vineyard in order to diversify his crop. The description of the area we propose be added to Grand Valley

appellation will be provided within the next ten days. constitutes approximately two square miles of orchard area. There is a recently licensed Colorado limited winery,

Grande River Vineyards, which has a somewhat similar name to the proposed viticultural area. The Wine Industry Development Board does not believe that the approval of the viticultural area should uses not believe that the approval of the viticultural area should in any way conflict with the use of the name Grande River Vineyards, a limited winery. First, the spelling of <u>Grand</u> and <u>Grande</u> is different and the names bear no other resemblance. Second, Grande River Vineyards is located within the Grand Valley proposed with cultural area. proposed viticultural area; and will use the Grand Valley appellation for most of its wines.



Chief, Wine and Beer Branch RE: Grand Valley Viticultural Area Page Two

> 700 KIPLING LAKEWOOD, COLORADO 80215 303/866-1324

I am providing a copy of this letter to Jim and Ann Seewald who proposed the structuring of the new viticultural area. I am certain that they will immediately correspond with you concerning their objection, if any, to the issues raised herein.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS R. PHILLIPS

Chair, Wine Industry Development Board

DRP:sk

cc: Jim and Ann Seewald 3553 E Road Palisade, CO 81526



June 3, 1991

Chief, Wine and Beer Branch Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms P.O. Box 385 Washington, DC 20044-0385 700 KIPLING LAKEWOOD, COLORADO 80215 303/866-1324

RE: GRAND VALLEY VITICULTURAL AREA

Dear Sir or Madam:

This letter is a follow-up to my correspondence dated May 3, 1991. Enclosed are the following maps:

- 1. Palisade, Colorado.
- 2. Cameo, Colorado,

I have outlined with a yellow marker the additional area which the Colorado Wine Industry Board proposed be added to Grand Valley Viticultural Area. This additional area is described as follows:

(1) From the beginning point N.E. of Palisade where Interstate 70 crosses the Colorado River and intersects with U.S. highways 6 and 24, proceed north along U.S. Highways 6 and 24 to the intersection of Rapid Creek and said highways; thence in an easterly direction follow Rapid Creek until it intersects with the five thousand foot contour line; thence south along the five thousand foot contour line until it intersects with the unnamed creek in the N.E. corner of Section 1, T.1, S., R.2 E.;

The remainder of the proposed Viticultural Area proceeds as stated under sub-paragraph four of Federal Register, Vol. 5-6, No. 54, P. 11715. Chief, Wine and Beer Branch RE: Grand Valley Viticultural Area Page 2

I am providing a copy of this letter to Ann and Jim Seewald for their comments if any.

Sincerely,



DOUGÍAS R. PHILLIPS Chair, Wine Industry Development Board

DRP:lao

enclosure

cc: Ann and Jim Seewald 3553 E. Road Palisade, CO 81526 Mr. Robert White Chief, Wine & Beer Branch Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., Room 6241 Washington, D. C. 20226

April 25, 1991

Subject: The "Grand Valley" viticultural area

Dear Mr. White:

At a meeting of the Colorado Wine Industry Development Board, yesterday, I was pleased to present copies from the Federal Register regarding the viticultural area we've been working toward the past few years.

To my dismay, two board members presented potential comments which may, or may not, eventually reach your desk. As such, I have hastened to research both of the matters, knowing full well that you will look to us to provide evidence which will refute these adverse comments.

The first comment was to the effect that we should have included an area which borders the Grand Valley. This area is known as "Rapid Creek". Some board members felt that, even though the area does not now support any vineyards, it does support a few orchards and could conceivably support vineyards at some future date.

My first inclination was to check into the soils of the Rapid Creek area. The Soil Survey of Grand Junction Area, Colorado (The packet including three maps and a grey booklet which you so kindly returned a couple of months ago) does not extend to the Rapid Creek area. The booklet does not mention Rapid Creek, nor does the eastern-most map show the soil detail of the Rapid Creek area.

Next, I called the local offices of the United States Government Department of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation. We have worked with many people in that office over the past ten years. Mr. Carl Landini has offered to send, (and I will delay mailing this letter until I can include, herewith) a map, of sorts, which will outline his office's concept of "the Grand Valley". In his estimation, the Rapid Creek area **can not** be included in the viticultural area known as "Grand Valley" because it lies outside of the Grand Valley Salinity District, a District with water rights to divert water from the Colorado and Gunnison rivers for the purpose of irrigating crops. Although the Rapid Creek area adjoins the eastern edge of the Grand Valley, no Salinity funds are expended in Rapid Creek as they are in the Grand Valley.

In addition to the differential in water rights and salinity control, the area known as Rapid Creek is radically different from the Grand Valley in that it is a very steep, hilly and rocky area. This could easily be verified through your consulting the U.S.G.S. map titled "Palisade Quadrangle" which was a part of our original petition attachments. The area of "Rapid Creek is a little south and east of Interstate 70 at that point where the highway crosses the Colorado River at the northeastern edge of Palisade. Mr. Robert White April 25, 1991 Page two

The area known as "Rapid Creekk" also has differences in both temperature and wind drainage due to the fact that the windflow swoops down from the top of the Grand Mesa along the route of the cañons carved by Rapid Creek.

I hope that the above will be sufficient for you to refute any comment which attempts to alter our proposed "Grand Valley" boundaries to include the area known locally as "Rapid Creek".

Secondly, earlier this year, a fifth Colorado winery received BATF sanction to operate under the name of "Grande River Vineyards". The owner, Stephen Smith, is concerned that the similarity between the name of the proposed viticultural area and the name of his winery **might** become a point of conflict in his future dealings with BATF. His most immediate concern is in gaining label approvals.

I find it difficult to believe that the vague similarity between the usage of "Grand" in conjunction with "Valley" and "Grande" (note the Spanish spelling) in conjunction with "River" would cause any problems with the winery's future dealings with BATF.

Should there be a conflict which would result in Mr Smith's having to change the name of his winery, it will be most costly, and he will obviously do all in his power to contest the acceptance of the name "Grand Valley" for the proposed viticulture area. His argument will be founded upon the fact that he received BATF sanction prior to the March 20, 1991, publication of the Federal Register announcement. Would not the date of our original petition be the more valid date? If so, we would have to look to you for the exact date due to the fact that, although I have a copy of the original petition, I do not have an **exact** copy - that was on a computer disc which was lost during a change in ownership.

I had anticipated that our period of comment would be without adverse comment. Possibly both individuals will reconsider their actions and such comments will not surface, after all. But, if they do, we hope that the above will help you refute the adverse comments.

Please do not hesitate to contact either Jim or myself **second second** if you have any comments, or questions.

Yours very truly,



Ann R. Seewald

AGRICULTURE

April 15, 1991

TO: COLORADO CELLARS

FROM: Carl Landini. CED. ASCS

SUBJECT: GRAND VALLEY AREA

As per phone conservation 4-25-91 as to what is considered the "Grand Valley", please see attached map.

Since 1979. Mesa County has been involved in a salinity control area. We in the U.S.D.A. ASCS Office use the valley floor as the area known as the "Grand Valley Unit". To define that area it only includes any and all lands that are irrigated legally with water diverted from the Colorado River or the Gunnison River (outlined by colored area). As for the question of the Rapid Creek Area being the "Grand Valley", as you will note on the map, that area is not within the "Grand Valley Unit" of the salinity control area.

Hope this helps.

Sincerely yours,

Carl Landini County Executive Director



