

BEFORE THE HEARING EXAMINER  
FOR THE CITY OF SEATTLE

In the Matter of the Appeals of END ) Hearing Examiner File No.: **MUP-17-001**  
PRISON INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX, et al. )  
)  
) DPD Project No. 3020845  
From a decision by the Director, )  
Department of Planning and Development, ) DECLARATION OF RICHARD STOLZ,  
on a Master Use Permit ) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF  
\_\_\_\_\_ ) ONEAMERICA

I, Rich Stolz, state the following under penalty of perjury of the State of Washington,

I am the Executive Director of OneAmerica, a social welfare organization committed to advancing the fundamental principles of democracy and justice at the local, state and national levels by building power within immigrant communities in collaboration with key allies.

OneAmerica has over 1,000 members, which we call leaders (regularly active participants in OneAmerica events and activities), of which approximately 200 live in the City of Seattle.

The decision of the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (“SDCI”) to issue this controversial permit on December 22, when so many people were on vacation or celebrating the holiday, obstructed the ability of many interested persons to file timely appeals in this process. After a 14 month review period for this permit, it is hard to imagine a reason for issuing the decision over the holidays other than an effort to exclude the public from the process.

In order for OneAmerica to appeal the MUP, I had to obtain approval from my Board of Directors, which was difficult over the holiday period. Many of my board members were just returning from vacation when the appeal period was ending on January 5<sup>th</sup>. Yet, through great

1 effort, I was able to obtain a holiday vote of our board's committee authorizing OneAmerica to  
2 appeal the MUP decision.

3 OneAmerica considered filing a separate appeal, but knew that all of the appeals would be  
4 consolidated anyway. So we decided to join together with EPIC and other appellants in filing a  
5 coordinated appeal, which our lawyers recommended to us as a means to expedite the appeal and  
6 reduce the administrative burden on the Office of the Hearing Examiner and the parties.  
7

8 Smith & Lowney represents us in this appeal proceeding. I have agreed to be the point of  
9 contact between Smith & Lowney and OneAmerica.

10 OneAmerica and the other Appellants authorized Smith & Lowney to file the appeal on  
11 our behalf.  
12

13 If the Office of the Hearing Examiner wishes further information about OneAmerica or  
14 wants me to provide a signature or my contact information, I would be happy to do so.

15 OneAmerica is still working with our lawyers to determine precisely the project that was  
16 approved and to quantify the impact of the project on OneAmerica members. Our lawyers have  
17 explained that because EPIC has standing in this matter, it is likely unnecessary for each group to  
18 show standing. If the Hearing Examiner wishes further information our organization's interest in  
19 this matter, we can provide that upon request.  
20

21 STATED under oath this 9th day of February 2017.

22  
23 By:  \_\_\_\_\_

24 Richard Stolz  
25  
26  
27  
28