

**From:** [Alec Uzemeck](#)  
**To:** [Rohlfes, Larry@DTSC](#)  
**Cc:** [Abe Weitzberg](#); [Ronald Ziman](#); [John Luker](#); [Tom Nachtrab](#); [Rubin, Marcia@DTSC](#); [Malinowski, Mark@DTSC](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: IRP Draft Report  
**Date:** Thursday, October 13, 2016 11:24:32 AM

---

Abe has expressed my concerns regarding the report recommendations for COI. As for the diversity issue, we believe that we have diversity in our membership, however the CAG will start recruiting for new members throughout the communities so that we pick up anyone who has an interest but has not applied to join the CAG.

Alec Uzemeck

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Abe Weitzberg" <[aweitzberg@att.net](mailto:aweitzberg@att.net)>  
**Subject:** RE: IRP Draft Report  
**Date:** October 13, 2016 at 10:26:21 AM PDT  
**To:** "Rohlfes, Larry@DTSC" <[Larry.Rohlfes@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Larry.Rohlfes@dtsc.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** "Ronald Ziman" <[rbziman@gmail.com](mailto:rbziman@gmail.com)>, "John Luker" <[jcluker2@yahoo.com](mailto:jcluker2@yahoo.com)>, "Alec Uzemeck" <[alecmu@aol.com](mailto:alecmu@aol.com)>

Larry,

Please forward this email to the IRP and post it on their website. Thanks

In reference to the following recommendation in the draft IRP progress report that is due on October 24, I have several comments.

*"1. Provide funding for sufficient technical assistance for CAGs and other community groups and establish a clear conflict of interest policy requirement for CAG members so that there is clear public trust in the organizations. Give DTSC the authority to cease technical support for CAGs that do not retain stakeholder diversity, keep meetings open to the public, or enforce the conflict of interest policy."*

The first part of the first sentence appears evenhanded, addressing both CAGs and other community groups. However, the remainder of the item singles out just CAGs for concern and possible punitive action. This dichotomy would appear to be based on information provided to you regarding conflicts between the SSFL Workgroup and the SSFL CAG. Based on the facts, your concerns should have

been directed to the Workgroup and not the CAG. As has been well documented, the Workgroup fought suggestions by DTSC to diversify its membership, and only consists of people who agree with Dan Hirsch. The CAG has far more diversity than the Workgroup, even though Workgroup members refused to participate in the CAG . Regarding conflict of interest (COI) it is appropriate to question the definition of COI. If it is financial, then there is no COI for the CAG because all members are unpaid volunteers. However for the Workgroup Dan Hirsch of CBG and Denise Duffield of PSR receive compensation for their activities. Similarly the Consumer Watchdog participant receives compensation. If COI is simply based on prior employment without any evidence of actual conflict, one might agree that would not be a valid basis for punitive measures.

What would be your measure of clear public trust? Dan Hirsch of the Workgroup always speaks as though he represents the voice of the public, and he can get 3000 emails at any time supporting his position. However, groups generally aligned with the CAG speak for many more people, but they are not as loud or influential and they do not send robo emails.

The resolution of the concerns I have expressed is simple. Just apply your requirements and your sanctions equally to CAGs and other community groups, and there will be no problem.

Thank you,

Abe

---

Abe Weitzberg phone: 818-347-5068  
5711 Como Circle mobile: 301-254-9601  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367