To: 
Professor V. E. Petrucci, Sc. D.

Re: 

My feasibility report dated 11/18/99 indicated that wine grapes can be successfully grown in this unique and historical area of [redacted] of California.

Due to the fact grapes have not been grown commercially in [redacted] to this date (exception being a small trial vineyard), less than 5 acres which was early abandoned with little data of value recorded. [redacted] can offer another venue to their enterprise - wine grape vineyards. The growing of wine grapes in this area (close proximity to [redacted]) has been recognized by an enterprising young entrepreneur by the name of [redacted]. Mr. [redacted] has established on his [redacted] 10 acres of two Syrah clones on two different rootstocks SO4 and Schwartzmann and five port wine varieties (grown the most prominently in Portugal) Touriga Francesca, Tinta Cao, Alvarelloa, Temperanillo and Touriga Nancional all on 5BB rootstock totaling 8 acres. (Please see attachment for details)

In the attachment, including therein, is his general layout scheme, pertinent data, soil analysis, etc. All of which verifies findings in the
comprehensive feasibility study I presented to you on 11/18/99. This information is very positive to your intended vineyard program.

In our meeting at the [Company] headquarters with Mr. [Name], Company co-President, his son [Name] and [Name], my conclusion was this: (1) [Company] are not interested at this point in time to grant long term wine grape contracts. (2) However, they did show an interest in cooperating with [Name] on a test plot venture of some 12 acres - Six varieties at 2 acres each. (This in fact was their idea, with no commitment.) (3) I proposed that these "experimental" plantings would only be successful if they would purchase these grapes which would be sold to them exclusively for evaluation. My recollection of their comment was to meet at the proposed vineyard site and talk further.

In my follow up conversation with [Name], I emphasized the exclusiveness of this project and it would only be successful if they agreed to take all of the 12 acre production at the base price minimum or market price of the California Grape pricing District number ten, which comprises the counties of [County], [County], [County], [County], [County], [County] and [County]. Please see attached California Wine Grape Pricing District map and comparative pricing of varieties of each district. His candid remark was "lets talk about this when we meet on the 9th of May at the project site".

**Tentative Vineyard Layout**

The general consensus was to use the vineyard plantings for aesthetic purposes as an entry to [Location]. The entry road would be bordered on both sides by several rows of grapevines. I would suggest six varieties, (Three varieties on each side of the entry road) at a spacing
Invoice Billing for Consultation

March 10, 2001 (Saturday)
Principals present: [Redacted]
Agenda
(a) discuss feasibility report "Growing Grapes in the area of" (full discussion)
(b) visit first hand the potential vineyard sites
(c) added feature: view the newly established vineyard and meet owner-manager
(d) Added feature: visit the and view his abandoned 5 acre (?) vineyard plot.
Wine quality was reportedly excellent (positive claim for the area)
Discussion of all the above and make appointment to visit the principals (which was successful)
Charge $1500 - $500 discount * $1000.00

April 4, 2001 (Wednesday)
Principals present: [Redacted]
Agenda
(a) have lunch and discuss strategy for the visit with Co-President and son
(b) Visit with the people at Company office reviewed with them the feasibility report and the brochure. Both documents left with then
(c) outcome - interested enough to visit the site May 9th.
Charge $1500 - $500 discount * $1000.00
May 9th, 2001 (Wednesday)

(Principals invited (confirmed):

Agenda: (a) 1:30 p.m. meet privately with
(b) 2:30 p.m. meet with
(c) 3:00 p.m. meet with
(d) all principals to view vineyard site
(e) conclude with visit to vineyard

Charge $1500 - $500 discount* $1000.00

Total billing $3000.00

Payable to: Petrucci Viticulture Consulting

* discount due to referral
NOTE
The proposed parcels 1 through 14 as shown on this map are per the Tulare County approved Tentative Subdivision No. DST-11, and are subject to revisions which will be shown on the final Subdivision map.

TOPOGRAPHIC MAP
of Parcels A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4 as shown in volume B of Document No. 1, lying within a portion of section 12, 27, 28 & 33 in township 2 south, Range 14 East, Mount Diablo
meridian. Datum for elevations is 422 feet above mean sea level as measured on National Geodetic Survey Control Point F7 P5
405. Spill Contours take precedence over contour lines. This
map is for Topographic Purposes only and DOES NOT represent an accurate survey of property lines.
A & L WESTERN AGRICULTURAL LABORATORIES
1311 WOODLAND AVE #1 • MODESTO, CALIFORNIA 95351 • (209) 529-4080 • FAX (209) 529-4736

REPORT NUMBER: 54726
GROWER: LB WESTERN AGRICULTURAL LABORATORIES
1311 WOODLAND AVE #1 • MODESTO, CA 95351 • (209) 529-4080 • FAX (209) 529-4736

DATE OF REPORT: 08/06/99
LAB NO: 54726
SAMPLE ID: 2
PERCENT CATION SATURATION (computed)

100 100
50 50
0 0

VARY HIGH
HIGH
MEDIUM
LOW
VERY LOW

ORGANIC MATTER % NIITROGEN
NON-NO3 ppm
PHOSPHORUS WEAK BRAY ppm
PHOSPHORUS NAPC3-P ppm
POTASSIUM K ppm
MAGNESIUM Mg ppm
CALCIUM Ca ppm
SODIUM Na ppm
SULFUR SO4-S ppm
ZINC Zn ppm
MANGANESE Mn ppm
IRON Fe ppm
COPPER Cu ppm
BORON B ppm

SOIL FERTILITY GUIDELINES

DOLOMITE LIME GYPSUM ELEMENTAL SULFUR NITROGEN N PHOSPHATE PpOs POTASH K2O MAGNESIUM Mg SULFUR SO4-S ZINC Zn MANGANESE Mn IRON Fe COPPER Cu BORON B

COMMENTS

NITROGEN: Use local conditions and experience with variety to determine rates and timing. Allow for nitrate levels in your water source also (ppm N03 X 0.61 = lb N/acre-ft water). Monitor tissue-N.
SULFATE-SULFUR: Low soil levels may cause yellowing and lack of vigor. Maintain above 15 to 70 ppm to guard against deficiencies. Although, sulfates may have reached below sampling depth.
BORON: Aim for soil levels above 0.5 ppm to avoid a deficiency. A tissue analysis at the appropriate time will determine more accurately, plant availability. ADD BORON WITH CAUTION.
LIME REQUIREMENT: Liming may be necessary if buffer index is less than 6.9. Guidelines are based upon common agricultural lime (70-pounder per six-inch depth to raise soil pH to about 6.5). WITH BUTTERESS, CPAG.
The proposed parcels 1 through 14 as shown on this map are per the Tulalip County approved Tentative Boundary Map 217-11, and recommended to encroach which will be shown on the Final Real Estate Map.

TOPOGRAPHIC MAP
of Parcels A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4 as shown in volume 8 of Facsimile Maps at Page 1, lying within a portion of section 22, T-27 S, R-28 E, Mount Baker Census District. Datum for elevations is 432.0 feet above mean sea level.

NOTE
This map is for Topographical Purposes only and DOES NOT represent an accurate survey of property lines.

HANCO Del Lago
Potential Vineyard Sites
Tulalip County, WA

Location Map
NOTE

The proposed parcel boundaries shown on this map are per the Tulare County approved Tentative Subdivision No. TST-11, and are subject to changes which will be shown on the Final Subdivision Map.

TOPOGRAHIC MAP

of Parcel A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4 as shown on Volume 2 of the Tulare County Approved Tentative Subdivision No. TST-11, lying within a portion of section 23, 27, 28 & 29, T21 N., R4 E., Tulare County, California. Datum for elevations is 625 feet above mean sea level. Contouring is to 5-foot intervals. This map is for Topographic Purpose only and DOES NOT represent an accurate survey of property lines.
NOTE
The proposed parcels 1 through 14 as shown on this map are per the Tulare County approved Tentative Final Subdivision No. 1111-11, and are subject to revisions which will be shown on the final Final Subdivision Map.

TOPOGRAPHIC MAP
of Parcels A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4 as shown in volume II of Parcels Maps at Page 1, lying within a portion of section 22, T. 29 S., R. 17 E., Tulare County, California. Datum for elevations is 406 feet above mean sea level as measured on National Geodetic Survey Control Point 17-406.

Spot Elevations take precedence over contour lines. This map is for topographic purposes only and DOES NOT represent an accurate survey of property lines.