

WILLIAM F. DOERING
[REDACTED]
FALLS CHURCH, VIRGINIA 22044

November 23, 1983

Chief, FAA Wine and Beer Branch
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms
P O Box 385
Washington, DC 20044

Re: Notice No. 489

Dear Sir:

This is in response to Notice No. 489, published on October 12, 1983, regarding a proposal to establish a viticultural area known as "Mendocino."

I write as an experienced consumer who is familiar with Mendocino County wines and with the topography of the County.

The Bureau should deny the proposal, as misleading and confusing with the existing designation "Mendocino County." The term "Mendocino" is already well established and is understood by consumers; to add a new term which would mean something different from the County would be confusing and misleading. The two terms, "Mendocino" and "Mendocino County" could not exist side by side without being understood by the general public as synonymous.

Therefore, if the petitioners wish to mark off a part of Mendocino County as a particular limited viticultural area, the petition should (1) conform to the requirements of TD ATF 53 and (2) provide for a distinctive name. Examples of the latter could be "Mendocino Valley," "Mendocino Hills," or "Lower Mendocino."

As a general principle, ATF should adopt the rule that viticultural areas may not be named for the county, simply with deletion of the word "County." Names as well as boundaries should be distinct.

Sincerely,

William F. Doering