

From: [Fogg, Mindy](#)
To: [Hingtgen, Robert J](#); [Gungle, Ashley](#)
Subject: RE: 3910 120005, Soitec
Date: Monday, October 28, 2013 6:30:41 PM
Attachments: [Ch 4 0 Alternatives 09.20.13 09232013-RHedits.docx](#)
[Ch 1.0 Project Description 09192013-RHedits.docx](#)

I can't tell what comments/changes are yours. Check your track changes options and change to "color by author". I have a couple of concerns on the Alt Chapter. I don't think the EIR should state whether or not the alternatives meet the project objectives. That is something we will do down the line. I don't think we need exhibits right now for any alternatives rejected. I don't think we need to consider and reject a wind alternative or nuclear energy alternative. I have a question about the alternative sites – are those being offered up as real options for the decision maker? I thought the alternative sites was more for land use comparison than CEQA comparison.

The PD chapter is fine.

Mindy

From: Hingtgen, Robert J
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 3:22 PM
To: Gungle, Ashley; Fogg, Mindy
Subject: 3910 120005, Soitec

Ashley and Mindy,

Please review attached chapters 1 and 4 with my comments/edits and let me know if you would like to discuss before these chapters are sent to applicant. I have some points I would like to make you aware of before these are sent to the applicant with which we have a meeting set up for Friday to discuss.

Thanks,
Rob