HENRY SCHWARZ

September 21, 2004

Long Beach Mayor and Members of the City Council City of Long Beach 333 West Ocean Boulevard Long Beach, CA 90802-4664

Members of the Council:

Subject: Dognobyl on the beach, the Results are in.

On the morning of June 15 of this year I walked down to my local public beach with a plastic container and plastic shovel and walked around the so-called Dog Zone area of the beach and scooped up untreated and infectious dog sewage that had been dumped by dogs and their owners from 22 or 23 sites. I brought them to you that night and asked the Council how they could allow infectious feces to be dumped on a public beach and still expect the public to make any other use of it, since the labeling on the container, which originally contained commercial cat litter, specifically warned that people should wash their hands after any contact with used litter. I also gave to the council the reports from my studies of beach conditions from November 2003 through January, 2004, indicating that fresh dog feces were being added to the beach and left permanently in the sand at the rate of about 3 to 4 new sewage deposits per day. I also gave the Council information on the human health risks from this kind of toxic pollution from untreated sewage, as well as other human risks especially to children - related to continued so-called "trial operation" of the beach as a unrestricted dog sewage zone. Despite this information the Council voted unanimously to allow the Zone to continue in operation so that, I understand it, "a full study of the animal impacts on the beach could be studied through a full summer season of heavy beach use.

Well on August 17 the Marine Advisory Commission, which sends recommendations about beach use to this Council, received the official report from the City's lifeguard personnel that basically everything we had told the City Council several months earlier. Dogs and their owners were observed by lifeguards leaving, over a 60 day test period, an average of 4.6 new dense sewage sites on the beach each day. Imagine what they might have seen if their primary responibility had been to keep watch behind them on the sand instead of people offshore in the water.

The verdict is in by the City's own test methods. The only possible votes for continuation of this environmental disaster would have to come from circumstances in which this entire City Council of rational persons diligently working to represent the interests of their district were somehow replaced with a row of Mr. Justin Rudd's famous "orphan poop."

But just in the off chance anyone on this Council is even remotely considering any continuation of a dog sewage on the beach program, please understand you are going to have to answer to your constituents on the following questions.

- 1. Why did vice mayor and city councilman Frank Colonna, with his Masters Degree in Environmental Health from California State University, Northridge, encourage a program to place untreated sewage on a clean public beach in the first place?
- 2. Why did Frank Colonna, aguably a knowledgeable expert on real estate values since he maintains a real estate sales office in Belmont Shore, take the lead in taking a \$55 million piece of public beachfront property and give it over as a 2.9 beachfront toilet for a couple of hundred pet owners?

I thought the first rule of real estate was to look for the highest and best use of a valuable property, instead of the worst and lowest use.

- 3. Why did the City's beach maintenance employees feel threatened last winter if they spoke openly about their own observations about the new beach pollution?
- 4. Why did the City's Parks Dept., even after such a damning report from the lifeguards, feel it necessary to develop and present such an obviously transparent and flawed "technical study" as its newest analysis of Dog Zone beach conditions by Tony's Terrific Tetra Testing? Here's someone using a high-dispersion test methodology usually reserved for high-dispersion environments like air and water on sand? Even Tony appeared embarrassed to present such a lame report to the MAC meeting on Sept. 7. So who was pushing so hard for such a phony good news result, and why?
- 5. Why did Vice Mayor Frank Colonna, like anybody was asking, make such a big point of announcing his intention not to run for the post of Mayor in the next elections? Why did he feel the need to take such a dramatic step to separate Frank Colonna, the individual, from Frank Colonna, the devoted public servant? What was the urgent reason for the early timing?

6. And finally, now that the developers our new Miami Beach highrises downtown have run out of beachfront properties to "redevelop," where are they looking next, Oceanside? Or perhaps someplace closer?

You know, it's real hard to make an argument that a clean public beach along side of healthy prosperous middle class community like Belmont Shore needs "redevelopment." But just turn it into a dump for untreated pet sewage for a year or two, rake the mess up and down the beach front until the whole place is seriously contaminated, and you could come back with a swell argument that the beach is unfit for anything else but "redevelopment," which is to say," a nice new row of high-rise condos to perk the place up again.

So you tell me what we're going to do here:

Is the City Council tonight going to vote for what I call the Frank Plan:

Dirty beaches, a dirty-tricks government, and a dirty future for our City?

Or are you going to vote for the Hank Plan:

Clean Beaches.

A clean, ethical government.

And a clean, bright future in which our City's natural environment and great public patrimony continues to belong to everyone in our City.

It's your decision. I hope you make it on behalf of all of the people of Long Beach.

Sincerely,

Henry Schwarz 163 Park Avenue

Long Beach, CA 90803

Chy