



Politics and SSFL Cleanup Standards: PASSFL Survey of the 2026 Candidates for Political Office

It is Spring 2026 and the mid-term election primaries are in full swing. Melissa Bumstead knows the power of politics and has served Kool-Aid to local, State and federal candidates for political office.

Parents Against Santa Susana Field Laboratory (PASSFL) conducted a [survey of candidates for local, State and federal office](#), to gauge their feelings about SSFL. In reality, Melissa has cleverly engineered the responses that she desired, through the use of [carefully worded questions, and limited options to multi-choice questions](#).

Eighty-one (81) candidates were polled. Thirty-six (36) or 44% replied. Not a bad response! But 56% declined to reply, either because they were too busy, or did not want to support Melissa's platform, or preferred not to opine about something they knew little about.

Interestingly, the PASSFL survey did not target any California state election candidates with the exception of the State Insurance Commissioner race.

The key question in the candidate survey was,

- *Which statement best describes your position for the Santa Susana Field Laboratory cleanup? (Select one)*
 - *A complete "Background" cleanup to remove all man-made contamination or equivalent*
 - *A reduced cleanup that "balances" remediation with Responsible Parties costs and concerns*
 - *No cleanup / leave contamination in place*
 - *Not sure / need more information*
 - *Prefer not to respond*

With the exception of two candidates, all other candidates (34) who responded to the survey, chose "Background" as their answer.

The first option sounds very reasonable to the layperson except that "background" is not a requirement in any federal or State regulation related to environmental remediation or nuclear decommissioning. Background is a cleanup goal that is not imposed at any other remedial site in California or the U.S. Perhaps Melissa and the candidates should ask themselves ... why not, and why is a goal of background being imposed solely at SSFL?

The second option is intentionally vague worded to focus on the negative words, "reduced cleanup", "costs" and "concerns." Why should the community or candidates care about RPs' "concerns?" Understandably, the community does not care about how much cleanup would



cost Boeing, but they forget that DOE and NASA are federal entities and as such are spending taxpayer dollars.

The second option should have been more honestly worded ***“A standard cleanup that is fully protective of human health and the environment, using established dose-based and/or risk-based goals and strategies in use at all other California and U.S. remedial sites, implemented by DOE, DOD, NASA, at all nuclear facilities, and all Superfund sites, and regulated by the NRC, EPA and/or State regulatory agencies.”***

How many candidates would have chosen the second option if it had been more honestly worded as above?

To their credit, many of the more thoughtful candidates did express the desire for “science-based cleanup”, “sound science”, “process must be guided by sound science”, “rigorous science-backed standards”, “push for a thorough, science-based cleanup”, “driven by science.” Those are all good statements! What they apparently do not realize is that **“cleanup-to-background” is not science-based**. On the contrary, the RPs have consistently favored **“science-based cleanup standards.”**

Some candidates were clearly scrambling to appear informed, and to be a savior to the community, repeating past misinformation, and pledging support to PASSFL.

Some candidates called for federal oversight, not realizing that the [State declined the federal EPA’s 2007 recommendation that SSFL be a Superfund site](#). The State understood that EPA would impose a risk-based CERCLA cleanup using realistically anticipated future land use of recreational open space. This conventional protective cleanup would have been counter to the agricultural land use mandate of SB-990 and the subsequent background mandate of the 2010 AOC. **Neither the State (CalEPA and DTSC) nor activist organizations want federal oversight.** All successful office holders should demand federal oversight.

One candidate incorrectly claimed that DOE sites at Savannah River, Oakridge, Los Alamos and Idaho have been cleaned up. They have not. Estimated completion dates for these sites are decades in the future. None are being cleaned to background. See GAO report on [Nuclear Waste Cleanup](#).

One candidate called for “compensation, restitution, and punitive damages for victims to be paid for by Boeing.” Apparently they want to give DOE and NASA a free pass, not wishing to commit even more taxpayer dollars. They did not identify the “victims.” One candidate called for Boeing to pay for all SSFL cleanup costs, apparently forgetting that DOE and NASA are also RPs.

Some candidates called for legal action against the RPs and DTSC.



Any candidate for political office should have taken the pulse of their constituents over controversial issues (such as SSFL) and assessed which opinion will give them the most votes in the next election. That may be cynical, but we all know that is true. Melissa's little exercise provided the expected response.

DTSC and DOE have been asked to terminate the background mandate of the 2010 AOC and replace it with cleanup remedies consistent with those used in the rest of California and the U.S. See [letter to DTSC Director Butler and Energy Secretary Wright](#).

Candidates for political office, if they wish, may begin to educate themselves by reading,

- [Offsite Impact of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory](#)
- [Nuclear Decommissioning at the Santa Susana Field Laboratory: 20+ Years of Politics vs Science](#)
- [Radiation Dose, Risk and Cleanup Standards](#)

The views and opinions expressed here are solely my own and should not be interpreted as those of my former employer, The Boeing Company.



Candidates Responding to the PASSFL Survey

Jurisdiction	Office	Name	Response	Email Address
California	Insurance Commissioner	Allen, Ben	Yes	info@benallenca.com
California	Insurance Commissioner	Bradford, Steven	Yes	info@bradfordforcalifornia.com
California	Insurance Commissioner	Vargas, Eduardo	Yes	contact@lalovargas4ca.com
LA City	City Attorney	Ashouri, Aida	Yes	contact@aida4la.com
LA City	City Attorney	Soto, Hydee Feldstein	Yes	cityatty.help@lacity.org
LA City	Mayor	Acosta, Bryant	Yes	hello@acostaforla.com
LA City	Mayor	Alnajjar, Asaad	Yes	asaad@LAMayor2026.org
LA City	Mayor	Diaz, Griselda	Yes	contact@grizzly4la.com
LA City	Mayor	Huang, Rae	Yes	contact@raeforla.com
LA City	Mayor	Hyman, Tish	Yes	hyman4mayor@gmail.com
LA City	Mayor	Kim, Andrew	Yes	andrewkimlawyer@gmail.com
LA City	Mayor	Selivra, Andrej	Yes	contact@andrej4la.com
LA City Council	District 13	Carlisle, Colter	Yes	info@colterforla.com
LA City Council	District 13	Sarian, Rich	Yes	hello@theeastsiderla.com
LA City Council	District 9	Mazariegos, Estuardo	Yes	contact@estuardo4la.com
LA County	Board of Supervisors, District 1	Alaniz, Elaine	Yes	elaine4supervisor@gmail.com
LA County	Board of Supervisors, District 1	Almario, Noel	Yes	NoelforDistrict1@gmail.com
LA County	Board of Supervisors, District 3	Arey, Tonia	Yes	toniaarey4supervisor@gmail.com
LA County	Board of Supervisors, District 3	Minasyan, Carmenlina	Yes	mydistrict6@yahoo.com
LA County	Sheriff	Bornman, Mike	Yes	mikebornman@pm.me
LA County	Sheriff	Martinez, Oscar	Yes	contact@oscar4sheriff.com
LA County	Sheriff	Strong, Eric	Yes	press@strong4sheriff.com
LA County	Sheriff	Villanueva, Alex	Yes	info@alexvillanueva2026.com
US House	District CA-26	Espinosa, Chris	Yes	chrisespino83@gmail.com
US House	District CA-26	Kacker, Sonia	Yes	info@drsoniaforcongress.com
US House	District CA-30	Feitosa, Dennis	Yes	dennis@gowithdennis.com
US House	District CA-32	Ahuja, Chris	Yes	press@chrisahuja.com
US House	District CA-32	Levine, Jake	Yes	together@jakelevineforcongress.com
US House	District CA-32	Lin, Marena	Yes	contact@marenalinforcongress.com
US House	District CA-32	Sherman, Brad	Yes	brad@bradsherman.com



Candidates Responding to the PASSFL Survey

Jurisdiction	Office	Name	Response	Email Address
US House	District CA-32	Thompson, Larry	Yes	Larry@LarryThompsonForCongress.com
US House	District CA-32	Wilding, Anna	Yes	info@wildingforcalifornia.com
Ventura County	Board of Supervisors, District 2	Orozco, Ashley	Yes	VoteOrozco@gmail.com
Ventura County	Board of Supervisors, District 2	Perryman, Mark	Yes	mark@perrymanforsupervisor.com
Ventura County	Board of Supervisors, District 4	Luevanos, Ruth	Yes	contact@ruth4supervisor.com
Ventura County	Board of Supervisors, District 4	Parvin, Janice	Yes	Supervisor.Parvin@ventura.org