

Trippi, Sean

Subject: FW: Hall Winery Distillery Project - overriding benefit

From: Mike Reynolds [<mailto:mreynolds@hallwines.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:12 PM
To: Anderson, Laura; 'Whit Manley'
Cc: Trippi, Sean; McDowell, John
Subject: RE: Hall Winery Distillery Project - overriding benefit

August 22nd, 2014

Laura Anderson
Deputy County Counsel
Napa County
1195 3rd Street
Napa, CA 94459

Re: Hall Winery Distillery Demolition – Project Benefits

Dear Ms. Anderson,

I have been asked to describe the project benefits of the proposed demolition of the distillery building at the Hall Winery for Napa County.

The DEIR describes that Bruce Judd found that the Distillery would still meet National Register Criterion A (association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of history or culture), as the Distillery building played a role in wine production in Napa Valley post-Prohibition. According to the DEIR, the removal of this building would create a significant and unavoidable impact under Criterion A. We believe that the mitigations suggested, including documentation of the building and the development of a publically accessible Memorial and bench in the location of the building, will actually enhance the awareness and appreciation of the history of winemaking at the Hall Winery location. The area is proposed to be landscaped which should improve the aesthetics of the former distillery location and well as the Memorial area for visitors to the winery.

As described in the Draft EIR, the Bruce Judd report reports the distillery as it exists today is “greatly deteriorated”, ...“in poor condition” and “little remains to convey the historic character or integrity of the building.” Further, structural engineer Derrick Roorda found that due to the unreinforced masonry block construction of the building, even if the building is retrofitted the “structure may still sustain some damage in a large earthquake”. Mr. Roorda notes in his July 29th, 2014 letter that “(t)he current California Building Code prohibits the construction of new UMB structures.” As a result, the current condition of the building (unreinforced and deteriorated) is a safety hazard which cannot be fully addressed even with a substantial rehabilitation effort.

We believe that leaving the building ‘as is’ or rehabilitating the building will continue to pose a safety hazard for occupants and visitors to the property. The overriding benefit of this project is, therefore, the removal of a tangible safety risk on the property which cannot be mitigated even with rehabilitation.

Let me know if you have any further questions.

Mike