

GOVERNMENT
OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

JULY 27, 2004

+ + + + +

The Public Meeting convened in Room 220 South, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 9:33 a.m., Geoffrey H. Griffis, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEOFFREY H. GRIFFIS, Chairperson
CURTIS ETHERLY, JR., Board Member
DAVID ZAIDAN, Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBER PRESENT:

ANTHONY HOOD, Zoning Commissioner

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

Beverley Bailey, Office of Zoning
John Nyarku, Office of Zoning

D.C. OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL:

Lori Monroe, Esq.

(This transcript constitutes the minutes from the special public meeting held on Tuesday, July 27, 2004)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>APPLICATION NO. 16970 OF THE NATIONAL CHILD RESEARCH CENTER - MOTION TO DISQUALIFY CHAIRMAN AND VACATE VOTES (MARCH 9, 2004 AND APRIL 13, 2004)</u>	5
<u>VOTES</u>	
MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE CHAIRMAN	44
MOTION TO VACATE PREVIOUS VOTES	61

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:33 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Let me call to order the Special Public Meeting of the 27th of July 2004 of the Board of Zoning Adjustment of the District of Columbia. My name is Geoff Griffis, Chairperson. Joining me today for this Special Public Meeting is Mr. Etherly. Representing the National Capital Planning Commission with us on this case and the business before us is Mr. Zaidan, and representing the Zoning Commission is Mr. Hood. Good morning to you all.

Let me just first lay out a couple of things that are important. Of course, people are here for our regular hearing, which was to start at 9:30. We will get to it very quickly. This is some business that is before the Board, and all business before the Board, of course, happens in the open and before the public. So we had scheduled this public meeting to dispense with that.

Copies of today's hearing agenda are available for you and they will give you an idea of what else we are going to accomplish with the rest of our day today.

I am going to be very concise in this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 because my opening for the public hearing will repeat
2 an awful lot of this, but there are several important
3 things to understand with the parameters of a public
4 meeting.

5 First of all, public meetings are called
6 for this Board to deliberate on cases that have
7 already been heard or to take up business of cases
8 that have already been heard. This is not an
9 opportunity for any sort of participation by, frankly,
10 anybody except Board members. So we would ask that
11 everyone be patient with us and listen intently, and
12 hopefully we will make some sense with what we are
13 saying this morning.

14 Also, please be aware that we are being
15 broadcast live on the Office of Zoning website and, of
16 course, everything that's conducted before this Board
17 is being recorded by the court reporter who is sitting
18 to my right. So to that, I would ask that people turn
19 off cell phones and beepers or any sort of satellite
20 transmitting devices that may make some noise and we
21 can proceed without any further interruptions.

22 Let me say a very good morning to Ms.
23 Bailey, who is with us from the Office of Zoning. She
24 is going to keep us on track, not only this morning
25 but the rest of the morning, the afternoon, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 probably into the evening. Ms. Bailey, a very good
2 morning to you.

3 Do we have any business before us this
4 morning?

5 MS. BAILEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we do, for
6 the Special Public Meeting, and should I call that
7 case now?

8 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: If you would,
9 please.

10 MS. BAILEY: And good morning to you as
11 well as the other members of the Board.

12 APPLICATION NO. 16970 OF THE NATIONAL
13 CHILD RESEARCH CENTER -
14 MOTION TO DISQUALIFY CHAIRMAN
15 AND TO VACATE VOTES
16 (MARCH 9, 2004 AND APRIL 13, 2004)

17 MS. BAILEY: This is Application Number
18 16970 of the National Child Research Center. This is
19 a motion to disqualify Chairman Griffis and to vacate
20 votes on March 9, 2004, and April 13, 2004, pursuant
21 to 11 DCMR 3104.1, for a special exception approval to
22 continue an existing child development center, last
23 approved by BZA Order Number 16307, with morning and
24 afternoon programs for 120 children at any one time,
25 ages two and a-half to five years and 38 full-time

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 equivalent staff on all floors of the existing and
2 proposed buildings on the site and for new
3 construction of an addition and new building pursuant
4 to section 205; and for relief from 2100.6, which
5 requires the provision of parking spaces for the
6 proposed additional principal structure on the
7 National Child Research Center property. It is
8 located in the R-1-B District at premises 3209
9 Highland Place, Northwest, also known as Square 207,
10 Lot 30 (855 and 856).

11 There is a motion before the Board for
12 consideration at this time as indicated, Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFIS: Indeed. Thank you
14 very much, Ms. Bailey.

15 Board members, what I would like to do is
16 just read, actually, opening remarks regarding this
17 case and then we will proceed with processing the
18 motion that is before us.

19 Let me lay out a little bit of the
20 history. First of all, on June 16th, 2004, the Board
21 of Zoning Adjustment of course received a motion to
22 disqualify me, as Ms. Bailey has adequately said, for
23 Case Number 16970 -- that is the application of the
24 National Child Research Center -- and to vacate the
25 votes that were taken in March on the 9th, 2004, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 on April 13, 2004. The original vote on the NCRC
2 case, as we are well aware, was taken on January 6,
3 2004.

4 On March 9, 2004, the Board voted
5 unanimously to reconsider the original denial of the
6 construction requested by the applicant. On April 13,
7 2004, this Board voted 3-1-1 to grant the preschool
8 the partial relief.

9 I know we spent a lot of time on this and
10 we have read it numerous times, but in essence, the
11 motion before us now alleges that I have a personal
12 bias towards an NCRC trustee that taints the last two
13 decisions in this case, both of which were unfavorable
14 to the opposition parties or that party that has
15 brought this motion before us. They do not move to
16 vacate the January vote as it was favorable to them.

17 I can state for my Board and for the
18 entire public without equivocation or hesitation that
19 my personal life and my personal relationships in no
20 way influence my thinking or votes on the NCRC
21 application. I voted as I did based only on facts
22 adduced on the record of this proceeding and on my
23 application of those facts to the zoning regulations
24 as I interpreted them. I was not influenced by
25 anything outside the four corners of the hearing room.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 No one could reasonably question whether
2 my deliberation and conclusions were based extensively
3 and exclusively on the facts in the record. My
4 deliberations and conclusions were exhaustive in
5 reference and not based on emotions, gut feelings, or
6 outside pressure.

7 As a mayoral appointee and Chairman, what
8 is of greatest concern to me is preserving the
9 integrity and functioning of this Board as well as
10 ensuring the public that every party will receive an
11 objective, unbiased, thoughtful, and fair
12 consideration of his or her case.

13 No one has complained about how I have
14 managed this case. All parties were given equal and
15 ample time to present their cases and cross-examine
16 witnesses. In the mind of an average citizen, my
17 conduct did not appear different in this case than in
18 any other case that I have presided over.

19 Nevertheless, several individuals in
20 opposition to this application who have consistently
21 maneuvered to remove members and impede or, worse,
22 prohibit the processing of this application. Vice
23 Chairperson Miller, the D.C. Attorney General, the
24 applicant's attorney have all been victims of false
25 accusations, fabricated controversies by the same

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 people now bringing this motion against me.

2 As the motion before us illustrates, I am
3 now the target of the party in opposition. Their
4 current maneuver, which has included hiring a private
5 investigator to videotape and document my private
6 life, is not the proper way to decide the outcome of
7 an application or to overturn a decision by this
8 Board. If a party in a case believes that a decision
9 has been rendered in error, personal attacks will not
10 remedy that matter. Our deliberations and decisions
11 are public record. If there is not faith in our
12 reasoning, then offer it for review to the Court of
13 Appeals and have the substance and the fruit of our
14 labor legally challenged. A hollow personal attack on
15 my impartiality is not the proper, honest, or
16 appropriate means to appeal a decision of this Board.

17 The malicious actions taken by Steve
18 Hunsicker, Sallie and Bruce Beckner, Henry Little, and
19 Linda Badami, collectively referred to as the
20 opposition party, seriously threat the authority and
21 proper functioning of the Board of Zoning Adjustment
22 in this and in all future cases.

23 It's kind of creepy to think that someone
24 has been outside of my house 24 hours at a time for
25 who knows how long and who knows if they are still

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 there, following me around, photographing and
2 videotaping who talks to me and who I talk to. I have
3 nothing to hide, but who wouldn't be unnerved by
4 something like this? I sometimes wonder if they are
5 photographing my daughter.

6 And what is happening with the videotapes
7 and the photographs? Who gets them and what are they
8 going to do with them? How can I not worry about
9 that?

10 The photographs of me distributed across
11 this city evidenced that wonderful period in a new
12 romance, and if my personal life is to be explored, it
13 should be noted that I am not married. These pictures
14 were taken in June, two months after the final vote on
15 this application. No further action or proceedings in
16 this case occurred since.

17 There is a sworn affidavit in the record
18 submitted by an Anna Evans. It's interesting -- she
19 has children in the same school as my daughter and
20 opposes the application, something now that I think
21 maybe I should have brought to the attention of the
22 Board. The affidavit states that I engaged in an
23 animated conversation at my daughter's school on 23
24 January 2004. I do not dispute that I was animated.
25 As I recall that day, I had just left my daughter's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 first grade Martin Luther King assembly where all of
2 the classmates and parents had watched a two-hour
3 performance. In leaving the school with all the other
4 parents, I can't imagine I wouldn't have been anything
5 else than animated.

6 Bruce and Sallie Beckner and Steve
7 Hunsicker and Linda Badami have shown the type of
8 people that they are, but it is not my place to judge
9 them. I can certainly let others do that.

10 What is clear is that they have lots of
11 time and money and resources to try and get what they
12 want, but our charge here is not to give privileged
13 individuals what they demand; our charge is to
14 impartially hear the presentations of applications
15 both for and against, weigh the facts, deliberate, and
16 decide. We do not base our decisions on popularity
17 contests. We don't sit in the back room and count how
18 many letters are for and how many letters are against
19 and then figure that's our decision.

20 What I fear is that this malicious type of
21 maneuver may be used by others to frustrate and
22 manipulate the process. Mr. Hunsicker, with his 600-
23 attorney firm, is trying to force this Board to work
24 outside of our established process by creating a
25 threatening and fear-filled environment where they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 control and they manipulate the facts to influence an
2 outcome without regard to regulations or civility.

3 We, this Board and all future boards,
4 cannot and should not be bullied into action. We must
5 rely on the strength of our process, deliberations,
6 and decisions.

7 Much is asked of mayoral appointees to
8 boards and commissions. We sacrifice our time and our
9 energy, and believe me, we do so with enthusiasm and
10 pleasure. We render decisions that cannot always
11 please everyone, but we do so objectively, fairly, and
12 before the public.

13 We Board members do not live socially
14 sterile lives. We mix with members of our community
15 in various aspects, both socially, professionally,
16 politically. Relationships develop at different times
17 in various contexts. I have not hesitated to disclose
18 when a relationship that I am aware of or involved in
19 with a case that's in front of us might create the
20 appearance to a reasonable person that there would be
21 a bias.

22 The false perception is being created that
23 I alone hear and decide on cases before this Board.
24 This is not the case. There are five independent
25 members on this Board in most cases, four on this one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 One represents the National Planning Commission, one
2 represents the Zoning Commission, and there are three
3 mayoral appointees. We are five members that
4 volunteer 10 to 20 hours a week to prepare for cases,
5 and we hear applications every Tuesday for 8 to 12
6 hours. We hold full-time jobs outside of our
7 volunteer service here on the Board, and we are but a
8 small element of the larger zoning relief process.

9 There is the Office of Zoning with its
10 director and full-time staff. I daresay they are
11 probably the most critical and essential. The Office
12 of Attorney General, which offers a bank of attorneys
13 for legal advice. That I have been accused of
14 controlling this Board, the Office of Zoning, and the
15 entire Land Use Division of the Attorney General is
16 flattering but clearly a delusion on the part of Mr.
17 Hunsicker, the Beckners, and Ms. Badami.
18 Sensationalism, connecting information and facts and
19 events in a vacuum is the vehicle here to support the
20 accusation that I and I alone control the entire
21 zoning and approval process. Again, I am flattered,
22 but I assure you it's not true. Our decisions are
23 votes publicly voiced and recorded.

24 This Board should not be reduced to this
25 level where it is forced to react or, worse, to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 potentially be rendered unable to function because a
2 few unsatisfied people forced the removal of Board
3 members. All contentious cases before this Board
4 invoke great personal passion and dedication, but most
5 participants conduct themselves with civility,
6 maturity, and respect for our process, and they are
7 met with the same from this Board.

8 This case has created thousands of pages
9 in transcripts, hundreds of submissions of evidence,
10 hundreds of letters. I and all the Board members
11 read, re-read, reviewed, and deliberated on the
12 evidence. There were no back-room deals. I have
13 nothing professionally, monetarily or personal to gain
14 from the success or failure of this case or for the
15 400 others, quite frankly, that we're going to hear
16 this year.

17 There is a difference between being
18 prejudiced and being invested in a case. We all
19 invest our time, our attention, and we all conduct our
20 own analysis of cases. We agree and we disagree and
21 we call a vote, all in public. I think all applicants
22 before us expect that and would accept nothing less.

23 What is of utmost importance to me is to
24 protect the authority, the integrity, and the
25 functioning of this Board, as well as preserving the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 public's confidence that every party will receive
2 objective, unbiased, thoughtful and fair
3 consideration.

4 Although I do not believe that there is
5 any reason or legal basis for my votes to be vacated,
6 the fact that a circus has been created outside the
7 authoritative process of this Board by manipulating
8 facts, dates, and drawing conclusions without any
9 context, I believe that it is in the best interest of
10 this Board for it to decide if my votes should be
11 vacated, and to do this without my involvement.

12 I will, therefore, recuse myself from any
13 further processing of this case. I stand behind this
14 Board and have full faith that it will continue to
15 conduct business in a professional, judicial, and fair
16 way, as it has done and will continue to do.

17 This is a low point, but this is not the
18 Board's doing. This Board must maintain its authority
19 even when those who do not respect it try to take it
20 away.

21 So it is, Mr. Etherly, because of how I
22 feel about the invasive tactics of this motion and
23 because of the pictures of me taken in June have
24 resulted in creating an appearance of impartiality, I
25 do recuse myself prospectively and ask that you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 preside over the motion to disqualify me and vacate my
2 votes.

3 Thank you very much.

4 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr.
5 Chairman. For my colleagues, let us proceed forward.

6 As we undertake what is most certainly an
7 extraordinary deliberation, I think it's very
8 important, perhaps, to offer some guiding words as we
9 move forward. We're going to move forward
10 expeditiously, we're going to move forward in a very
11 focused way, and it is my hope that regardless of the
12 outcome of our deliberation, that this Board speaks
13 with one voice, that it's unequivocal, unquestioned,
14 and most certainly very decisive.

15 I am perhaps guided in our movement
16 forward by the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson who wrote
17 that it is very easy in the world to live by the
18 opinion of the world.

19 "It is very easy in solitude to be
20 self-centered. But the finished man is he who in the
21 midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the
22 independence of solitude. I knew a man of simple
23 habits and earnest character who never put out his
24 hands nor opened his lips to court the public, and
25 having survived several rotten reputations of younger

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 men, honor came at last and sat down with him upon his
2 private bench from which he had never steered." The
3 words of Ralph Waldo Emerson.

4 My colleagues, we have two critical
5 questions before us. Let me begin by noting that I
6 believe it was entirely appropriate for the Chairman
7 to voluntarily recuse himself. As we are all
8 familiar, recusal is critical to preserve the
9 integrity of the judicial process, not only against
10 actual impropriety, but also the appearance of
11 impropriety, and I believe that it is in that vein, in
12 that spirit that the Chairman undertook the
13 extraordinary action of recusing himself prospectively
14 from not only our deliberations today but any further
15 action on this case should such action be necessary.

16 We are left, however, with a very
17 critical, perhaps unprecedented question of
18 retroactive action, and that is, first, the
19 disqualification of the Chair, and secondly the
20 vacating of the Chair's votes on March 9th and April
21 13th.

22 I would like to as we proceed lay out the
23 standard of law with regard to the inquiry first with
24 respect to disqualification. So with leave of my
25 colleagues, if there aren't any further comments, I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 would like to walk us through what our standard will
2 be for the question of disqualification, and it's a
3 very clear standard that has been adopted by D.C.
4 Superior Court.

5 First, the facts alleged must be material
6 and stated with particularity.

7 Secondly, the facts must be such that if
8 true, they would convince a reasonable man or woman
9 that bias may exist.

10 Third, the facts must show the bias is
11 personal as opposed to judicial in nature.

12 My colleagues, I would open up for
13 discussion with regard to the question of
14 disqualification. My ultimate objective here is to
15 suggest that we deal with both motions separately, one
16 then the other. So if my colleagues are in agreement
17 with that, and with that, I would like to open it up
18 for any comment with regard to the standard that has
19 been laid out on the issue of disqualification.

20 Once again, we are all in receipt of
21 briefing that has been submitted by both parties.
22 Once again, this is a deliberative posture that the
23 Board is in, so there will be no public comment or
24 testimony taken pursuant to any of the briefing
25 materials or other general public comments.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 With that, I will open the floor up to my
2 colleagues.

3 Mr. Hood.

4 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I wanted
5 to actually say something on the statement made by the
6 Chairperson before he left, and now that we've gotten
7 into an organized format in which we're proceeding --
8 maybe this may be inappropriate, but I feel this on my
9 heart to say.

10 As the Chairperson said and my colleagues
11 know, and I've said this before, even before this
12 incident event even came up, we spend a lot of time
13 down here. We try to make the best decisions for the
14 best interests of the District of Columbia as a whole,
15 and someone who has been in that position myself,
16 having to recuse myself of some things that people
17 went back into 1997 and 1996 of things that I've done
18 in trying to make this a better city in my
19 neighborhood and make a better quality of life,
20 increase the quality of life in my neighborhood, I was
21 appalled. As the Chairman said, this is a real low
22 point because this is even lower than that.

23 In 1996 -- I was not even considered to
24 come on the D.C. Zoning Commission until 1998. I was
25 doing things in my neighborhood, as everyone else that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 comes down here does, to increase the quality of life.
2 I will tell you that I have mixed emotions on this
3 whole issue, and I will tell you that after we made
4 the decision -- and I haven't forgot that. That
5 resonated with me, that one of the opposition, when I
6 walked to the rest room, would grit on me, as we
7 called it when I was growing up, would actually stare
8 me up and down, turn around and look at me and grit on
9 me. The neighborhood I come from, we don't tolerate
10 that.

11 That's for a preliminary bout, and I just
12 wanted to put that on the record, and I'm not being
13 compassionate, emotional; I'm just telling you what we
14 have to do with. And I want that person who is in
15 here -- and they're sitting in here and I want them to
16 understand: I haven't forgotten you for that, and I
17 won't. But I have a bigger job and a biggest task for
18 the best interests of the city, so I disregard it.

19 To hire a private investigator because
20 certain things don't go our way sometimes -- and
21 again, I'm not talking about this, I'm talking in
22 general -- I take exception to it because other
23 citizens of the city, for example, and I always go
24 back to my neighborhood -- you come down here and talk
25 about the trash that we have to smell. Yesterday it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 was -- I don't even think it was 90 degrees and my
2 neighborhood smelled like a dump, and we have to sit
3 there and tolerate that, we have to deal with the
4 decisions that are made. And yes, we try to deal with
5 them accordingly, but sometimes when the board is down
6 here, ABC Board, Zoning Commission, BZA, the court, we
7 have to live with it.

8 I know that's not the direction you were
9 going with, Mr. Chairman, but I wanted to get that out
10 of my system because I really believe that when I was
11 gritted on, I took exception to that, because I call
12 myself -- and if anyone knows me, I have always -- I
13 come from a neighborhood, too, and I have always tried
14 to make the best decision for the best interest of the
15 District of Columbia. No more, no less. And trying
16 to make that balance up here sometimes is difficult,
17 and we've got a lot of kids in this city who are
18 dying, and I think if you have that kind of pull that
19 you can get Channel 4, 5, 9, the Washington Post --
20 let's direct some of that towards that instead of
21 looking at Mr. Griffis' love life. Let's try to help
22 some of those people who are losing their lives.

23 I know I digress, Mr. Chairman, but you
24 can go back to where you were.

25 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you. I thank you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for your remarks, Mr. Hood. They are, indeed, well
2 taken. There is an extraordinary level of passion,
3 I'm certain, among my colleagues and myself with
4 regard to this important matter.

5 I think it's very clear and very important
6 to state that it is indeed entirely appropriate to
7 question the conduct of our judiciary, be that in the
8 setting of the strict confines of the courtroom of law
9 or be that in a quasi-judicial setting that we find
10 ourselves in today, and I believe that this Board is
11 united in understanding and acknowledging that it is
12 entirely appropriate.

13 The protection and the guidance that is
14 offered by the rule of law with regard to that
15 inquiry, however, is very critical, and I believe in
16 the context of Mr. Hood's comments, he said what is
17 most important -- that despite that passion, despite
18 the discomfort that may exist, there is, indeed, a
19 higher duty here, and once again, that duty is shaped
20 by the need to ensure that our processes here, as
21 would be the processes in any judicial or legal forum,
22 are conducted without impropriety in actuality or
23 without impropriety in terms of appearance.

24 So your comments are well taken, Mr. Hood,
25 and I think they do lead us, despite perhaps what you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 may suggest, I think they do lead us in the
2 appropriate direction here.

3 Once again, the test has been set out
4 under -- Superior Court law has been very well
5 articulated I think in both our briefing materials and
6 once again in terms of our own preparation for the
7 case.

8 First, the facts alleged must be material
9 and stated with particularity.

10 Once again, we have the motion in front of
11 us which alleges in pertinent part that, first,
12 incontrovertible evidence, quote, that the Chairman
13 does have today and has had for many months a close,
14 personal relationship with a trustee of NCRC who has
15 been deeply involved in the school's effort to seek
16 favorable action from the BZA with respect to the
17 school's application to expand.

18 I would offer that that is perhaps the
19 central pillar, if you will, of the motion for
20 disqualification, that relationship. I think it's
21 further important to note that with regard to the
22 standard that we are reviewing this motion under, the
23 facts must be such that, if true, they would convince
24 a reasonable man that a bias exists.

25 What I would offer as the next step here

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 for my colleagues is looking at the motion and
2 accepting for the moment just for the sake of
3 deliberation and discussion that all of the
4 allegations alleged herein were true, would those
5 allegations convince a reasonable person that a bias
6 exists. And, of course, the facts must show that the
7 bias is personal as opposed to judicial in nature.

8 Mr. Zaidan.

9 MEMBER ZAIDAN: I think you have laid out
10 the first two tests, and that's where I would like to
11 kind of chime in, and also, you know, not to get into
12 more of the dialogue, I think, although I am not the
13 current sitting NCPC member, I think my tenure may be
14 being defined on this Board by this case, as I'm sure
15 we'll be having to deal with it again once the order
16 comes out.

17 As we sat through the hours and hours of
18 testimony, you know, this case was defined by strong
19 passions and opinions, and because of that, it was
20 kind of tough to sit through. I mean, it was tough to
21 deliberate on because we had to sift through a lot of
22 these strong opinions and strong allegations and at
23 times childish allegations, you know, that were flying
24 around from both sides to really look at the facts,
25 and I think we have to do the same thing here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 We can only look at this in a strictly
2 factual manner and cannot try to interpret some of
3 these accusations, you know, as somebody who is
4 anticipating something to happen. I don't know what
5 that exactly means, I don't know how to quantify that
6 or how to deliberate on that factual or what an
7 animated conversation may imply or, in fact, what an
8 animated conversation may look like. I may have my
9 own opinions of what an animated conversation is, but
10 they may differ from people to people.

11 So I think Mr. Etherly has laid this out
12 correctly. We have to be somewhat cold in looking at
13 this and look at the facts and look at what we
14 experienced being sitting Board members as we went
15 through this very long and tedious hearing.

16 Although I am not a political appointee,
17 which is a rare trait to have on these types of boards
18 -- you go anywhere around the country, and these
19 boards are usually made up of political appointees.
20 All five of them normally would be political
21 appointees, which means the stakes in these types of
22 issues would be even higher in other cities where you
23 could, you know, potentially have the whole entire
24 board recused in some instances. Political appointees
25 by their very nature and basically by necessity are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 civic-minded people who are active in their
2 communities, and you want them to be that way. I
3 don't see how you would want -- I don't see how
4 somebody who is civic minded and is active politically
5 or active in the community could be ones who do not
6 have relationships and do not see people and do not
7 run into people. So in that nature, it is not
8 uncommon that members have dealings with or
9 associations with people who come before the body in
10 which they serve. Therefore, observations of
11 encounters or random conversations among participants
12 do not disqualify them or do not present a factual
13 basis for disqualifying them, animated or not.

14 Again, I don't know what "animated" means.
15 You know, as the Chair stated, he had just seen his
16 daughter in a play and he could have been jumping for
17 joy. So I don't think that that establishes a factual
18 base on which a bias is proven.

19 Now, evidence has been submitted, and
20 this is the one particular, that there has been a
21 relationship beyond this type of chance encounter or
22 random association that people who are active in their
23 community usually have, but the facts are that that
24 encounter or that relationship, that one particular
25 occurred after the hearing was closed in June. That

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is the facts and that is the evidence that we have to
2 use in order to deliberate, and the Chairman has
3 rightfully recused himself prospectively as I'm sure
4 we and this Board will have to deal with this case
5 again at some point. So he has rightfully recused
6 himself from this deliberation as well as dealing with
7 this case moving forward.

8 Now, in terms of another -- I think
9 looking at the second test, which is that the bias
10 exists, there were a lot of accusations or part of the
11 particulars that were submitted to us were that the
12 Chairman was an advocate for the case or for NCRC's
13 cause or was biased to leading the hearing. I take
14 great exception to that because I think that the
15 Chairman did not act in a biased way. I think he gave
16 great leeway to everybody in their testimony, in their
17 cross-examination, in their presentations to the
18 Board, so much so that we were here until eleven
19 o'clock at night.

20 You hear a lot of these complaints to City
21 Council and to the papers about, you know, how long
22 it's taking to get through the BZA. Well, the reason
23 is because we really defer to allowing people to come
24 and speak their minds to us, to present their
25 observations and their testimony, and I think it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 critical that we do that, and I certainly hope that,
2 you know, the call for expediency does not limit that
3 in the future years of this Board, and I certainly do
4 not think that the Chairman acted in any way that was
5 indifferent to other cases that have been before us.

6 Furthermore, Chairman Griffis, like most
7 intelligent, you know, civic-minded, active people is
8 an opinionated person, and he's not an advocate for
9 applications, he's an advocate for his position, which
10 when you are opposite his position, which I am
11 sometimes, can cause you great heartburn.

12 So I think that if it came across to
13 anyone that he was advocating for an application, I
14 think that was a misinterpretation. If you look at
15 any of the cases that he has sat on, particularly ones
16 where the stakes are so high, you will see these Board
17 members, especially Mr. Griffis will advocate for what
18 he thinks is the right way to go, and I think that
19 that is the way that he has acted in this case and all
20 the other cases before it.

21 I hope that addresses the two tests that
22 you have -- at least my position on the two tests that
23 you have laid out, and I will leave it to you guys to
24 talk further.

25 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Zaidan. I think that helps to focus our inquiry here.

2 I am going to echo your comments, but let
3 me take a little more of a scalpel as we move through
4 the first aspect of this test here, which once again
5 is the facts alleged must be material and stated with
6 particularity. Let me deal with the material aspect
7 first with regard to my perspective on the motion and
8 the supporting documentation that has been offered.

9 First in the motion that was offered at
10 the outset to disqualify the Chairman, once again, the
11 critical sentence was, "Chairman Griffis does have
12 today and has had for many months a close personal
13 relationship with the trustee of NCRC."

14 I think the issue of recusal and the
15 Chairman's decision to recuse himself prospectively
16 deals with the very important question, the very
17 important issue that was raised with regard to the
18 existence of a relationship today. I think that has
19 been put to rest. I think what is left is what, in my
20 mind, is a rather ambiguous and amorphous phrasing of
21 "has had a relationship for many months."

22 Once again, the critical issue here is
23 with regard to the March 9th and the April 13th votes.
24 I think in order for the first aspect of this motion
25 to satisfy that first part of the first prong of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 test for disqualification, a relationship for many
2 months does not pass muster in my estimation.

3 The evidence that has been offered once
4 again I think speaks somewhat to the existence of a
5 relationship at present but does not rise to the level
6 of supporting the jump, if you will, to the conclusion
7 that a relationship existed at the critical times of
8 March 9th or April 13th or, for that matter, at the
9 outset.

10 An important unspoken but subtle aspect of
11 this question is, should, of course, the Chairman, if
12 there was a relationship that existed, have disclosed
13 such a relationship and disqualified him at the
14 outset? While that is not the precise question before
15 us, that's part of this calculus, in my thinking.

16 Once again, I think the evidence that has
17 been offered with regard to supporting the allegation
18 that the Chairman has had this relationship for many
19 months and as such that relationship in turn would
20 impact or affect his ability to rule impartially on
21 this case, I do not believe that the evidence as it
22 has been proffered rises to satisfy that first aspect
23 of the first prong of the test -- i.e., one, material
24 and stated with particularity.

25 Let me actually reverse there. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 allegation, of course, is material. It's
2 "particularity" that I'm concerned about here, and I
3 think it's "particularity" -- that is the ground upon
4 which the first prong of the test is not met.

5 With regard to the additional information
6 that has been offered both in the supplemental
7 documentation and the motion as originally offered,
8 let me move forward to a couple of other allegations
9 that have been contained here.

10 In addition to the broad allegation that
11 a relationship has existed for many months, there is
12 also an allegation with regard to the Chairman's
13 actions with regard to the prosecution of this case,
14 if you will -- as Mr. Zaidan noted, the Chairman
15 advocating on behalf of the applicant.

16 While I look for the relevant quote in the
17 supplemental documentation, I am very comfortable in
18 the belief as I review the document that much of what
19 was pointed to on behalf of the Chairman from an
20 action standpoint falls squarely within the confines
21 of what the Chairman is statutorily and by regulation
22 required to do in his role as chairman.

23 Some of the allegations, and I'm
24 paraphrasing once again as I look to find the precise
25 language, speak to the Chairman once again advocating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 very passionately, speaks to the Chairman setting
2 agendas, determining order of questions, demonstrating
3 willingness or an untoward desire, perhaps, to prolong
4 discussion. Once again, I would remind my colleagues
5 that it is very clear within our regulations and
6 within our rules what the Chairman's role is in
7 shaping and guiding our discussion.

8 I think Mr. Zaidan offered a very
9 important statement with regard to the expectation on
10 the part of any Board member to argue passionately for
11 a position that he or she thinks is the appropriate
12 position, and it is through the deliberative process
13 that we arrive at a conclusion or some consensus,
14 whether it's by majority or whether it's by unanimous
15 decision, regarding any particular case or outcome.

16 So I think with respect to the first
17 aspect of the test, once again, that the facts must be
18 material and allege with particularity, I think that
19 the motion as offered falls on that face.

20 Mr. Hood, anything to offer with regard to
21 that particular aspect of the inquiry?

22 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I
23 probably would not articulate it as eloquently as you
24 have done, but I will say that I find -- I accept the
25 evidence and have read both submittals, all the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 submittals that have been submitted, but I just find
2 the timing and the relationship are irrelevant to the
3 proceedings. I think that the Board -- we deliberated
4 like we usually do. No one, chairman or no chairman,
5 dictates my vote, and I think -- and the first time we
6 dealt with this issue, I remember specifically saying
7 that we were doing this for four and a-half hours, to
8 the point where we were exhausted.

9 If I can digress back to a prior case
10 which Mr. Griffis and I disagreed on wholeheartedly
11 somewhat like what we did on this one, he has been
12 consistent in his voting, and I just think that, like
13 I said, the timing of the relationship and all that,
14 I accept that, but I think it's irrelevant to the
15 proceedings in this case.

16 MEMBER ETHERLY: I would agree with you,
17 Mr. Hood. I think what is important to note both for
18 the benefit of my colleagues and for our listening
19 audience is the allegations that we have in front of
20 us, in my mind, consist of photographic evidence and
21 simply assertions. The photographic evidence, in my
22 mind, does not speak to the existence of a
23 relationship on the critical dates of March 9th or
24 April 13th or, for that matter, speak to or ratify or
25 validate the claim that a relationship did indeed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exist at the start of this proceeding, at the outset
2 of the NCRC application. Fortunately, once again, we
3 have a very clear rule of law to follow here.

4 The second prong says that, well, okay,
5 that's fine and well, but if the facts are true, if
6 you presume that they are true for the sake of
7 discussion, would they convince a reasonable man or a
8 reasonable person that bias exists. I think it is
9 here, as Mr. Hood's comments have begun to lead us in
10 the direction of, I think it is here also that the
11 allegations as contained in the supplemental material,
12 in the original briefing, simply fail to pass muster.

13 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Mr. Etherly?

14 MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes?

15 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Before you get off these
16 two points, I think in regards to the Chairman's role
17 in setting agendas and shaping discussions, I think it
18 was the motion in opposition to the motion to
19 disqualify summed it up best, and that is that that is
20 his job, that's the Chair's job to do that. The Chair
21 does set agendas, does identify issues to be addressed
22 in coordination with the Board, does frame
23 discussions, and you clearly want a chairperson to do
24 that.

25 Secondly, just to touch again on this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 whole advocacy argument, it troubles me because the
2 more I reflect back on -- and I have been trying not
3 to do this in the last couple of months, but the more
4 I reflect back on the original deliberation back in
5 January, it was a very almost heated exchange between
6 all of us, and I certainly hope that my advocacy for
7 my position, which was in opposition to the
8 application, does not reflect a bias in favor of the
9 opposition because that's surely not the case. I felt
10 that the opposition had made their case in the January
11 deliberation.

12 I think that those two issues can be put
13 to rest in the motion.

14 MEMBER ETHERLY: That's an excellent
15 point, Mr. Zaidan, and I think it probably should not
16 go unstated, of course, that with regard to the second
17 vote at issue here, I was indeed the lone dissenting
18 member with regard to that application. It is perhaps
19 ironic that I now find myself in the position of
20 chairing this particular aspect of the proceeding.
21 But your point is well taken.

22 With respect to --

23 COMMISSIONER HOOD: A clarification, Mr.
24 Chairman.

25 MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Mr. Zaidan, you were
2 speaking to the January -- the first vote.

3 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Yes, I was speaking to the
4 January vote. Exactly.

5 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Because there were two
6 or three -- I'm getting confused now. How many votes?
7 Two votes taken.

8 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER HOOD: All right. And you
10 were speaking to the second vote.

11 MEMBER ETHERLY: To what would actually be
12 the final vote.

13 COMMISSIONER HOOD: The final vote.

14 MEMBER ETHERLY: The April vote. Yes,
15 that is correct.

16 COMMISSIONER HOOD: All right.

17 MEMBER ETHERLY: But I think both points
18 are of note but perhaps not critical to the discussion
19 at hand.

20 Once again, the second prong of the test
21 requires that the facts must be such that, if true,
22 they would convince a reasonable man that bias exists.
23 So I want to encourage some discussion with regard to
24 that particular aspect of the test here, and that is
25 that if you look at the facts as they exist in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 motions, both the original motion and the supplemental
2 motion, and you were to accept that these facts were
3 true, would you find that there was the existence of
4 bias?

5 I would be more than happy to start off
6 that particular dialogue by once again reiterating
7 portions of my statement with regard to the first
8 prong of the test. I simply do not see the case, the
9 argument in the pleadings that have been argued.

10 I want to be very clear about that
11 particular aspect of the point here. While there is
12 no, shall we say minimal threshold that is set forward
13 regarding the issue of an evidentiary hearing, while
14 there is I think no vehicle, for that matter,
15 regarding the establishment of an evidentiary hearing
16 process, I don't view this inquiry as simply creating
17 a threshold or minimal level of allegation that you
18 must satisfy in order to get to evidentiary hearing.
19 I think what is incumbent, what is part and parcel of
20 this inquiry, is you shoot all your bullets the first
21 shot. You don't seek to establish a minimal level of
22 proof and then hope to get to an evidentiary hearing
23 where you can conduct further fishing. I simply don't
24 subscribe to that theory.

25 I want to be very clear that the movants

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of the motion did not suggest that. There was no
2 statement to that effect. However, I think it is very
3 important to be sensitive to what the practical effect
4 of the motion would suggest because there is an aspect
5 of the motion which speaks to if, indeed, the Board is
6 not swayed or convinced by the facts as they alleged
7 in the pleadings, let us go to an evidentiary hearing.
8 I simply do not believe that that is the rule which we
9 follow with regard to the administration of the
10 three-part test.

11 But importantly, that second prong I think
12 also encapsulates a little bit of Superior Court Rule
13 63-1, which once again speaks to the legal sufficiency
14 of what would otherwise be viewed as an affidavit in
15 this kind of situation -- once again, that if you
16 accept the alleged facts as true, and if the statutory
17 standards are met, the judge must recuse himself even
18 if he knows the allegations are false. But if you
19 accept, and it's my argument here for my colleagues
20 that if you accept the facts as they alleged in these
21 two documents as being true, is there the existence of
22 bias, and I simply do not see that case here.

23 Once again, as Mr. Zaidan has spoken to
24 and as I have referenced, there is the allegation that
25 a relationship has existed for many months. The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 support for that allegation comes through the
2 submission of letters for the record that have been
3 submitted by Ms. Bloch. The allegations regarding Mr.
4 Griffis' conduct of the case with regard to perhaps
5 demonstrating a favoritism, if you will, as the motion
6 would allege. If you presume all of these allegations
7 to be true, do you find bias? And in this particular
8 instance, based on the conduct that Mr. Zaidan has
9 alluded to, as we have gone through the prosecution of
10 this case, I simply do not see that.

11 Mr. Zaidan or Mr. Hood, anything further?

12 MEMBER ZAIDAN: I think my statements that
13 have -- I think my statements to this point reflect
14 the fact that I agree with you.

15 There is one other thing that I would like
16 to address because if it wasn't directly referenced in
17 the motions, I think it was kind of intimated, and
18 that is the cause or the alleged role of the Chairman
19 in our -- I believe our March or April -- I'm sorry --
20 our March decision to reconsider and then the
21 subsequent reconsideration. The Chairman had no role
22 in us doing that, period. That was a decision of this
23 Board and we acted and we even discussed this when we
24 were deliberating on whether or not to reconsider, we
25 discussed why we were doing that, and that was because

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of advice we received from staff to this Board, which
2 is absolutely appropriate.

3 We received advice to move into that
4 reconsideration. We accepted that advice and we have
5 the authority to either accept advice that we get from
6 staff or reject it, and we decided to accept it as
7 they had a compelling reason, and that is why we moved
8 forward with that reconsideration.

9 I just wanted to make sure that that was
10 clear on the record because I do believe that that was
11 part of some of the accusations in these documents,
12 and I think it's important that we clarify that
13 because that reconsideration I think caused us all,
14 everyone from the Board to the parties in the case, a
15 little bit of confusion and a little bit of heartburn,
16 so to speak, because there were some definite
17 technical nuances that we had to address and we had to
18 be clear to make sure that we were making the right
19 decision.

20 I just want to say that the Chairman did
21 not play a role in us doing that in terms of
22 influencing the Board to do that.

23 COMMISSIONER HOOD: You are right, Mr.
24 Zaidan. And let me just piggyback, because the
25 Chairman was in the minority on the first vote as far

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 as the reconsideration, he couldn't even bring it back
2 up, and that was mentioned to him. So you are right,
3 he had no role in that; that was the Board because of
4 the advice that we had gotten.

5 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Right. And actually, I
6 think, just to maybe try to inject a little bit of
7 humor in this, I think the assumption that Mr. Griffis
8 could have that much influence on the three of us to
9 do that I think is a huge leap. I think that we are
10 all pretty, you know, ideological people who stick to,
11 you know, what we believe, and I think that if Mr.
12 Griffis would have brought a motion on his own accord
13 to reconsider at a later time, that would have not
14 flown, not that he -- he did not do that obviously and
15 that was not his position to do so. I am giving
16 hypotheticals here.

17 I just think that trying to assume that he
18 has that much influence over the three of us I think
19 is a stretch.

20 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Board Member Zaidan,
21 it is ironic you would mention that because when I
22 read it, I was actually -- I felt like I was being
23 slapped in the face. I took exception to it because
24 I stand alone and I have a vote just like the Chairman
25 has a vote, and our regulations specifically say, like

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you mentioned earlier, what the roles and
2 responsibilities are of the Chairman of this Board and
3 the Zoning Commission. But at the end of the day, we
4 all have one vote.

5 MEMBER ETHERLY: I know. I agree with
6 both of those comments. I think what is important
7 with regard to this second aspect of the test that
8 we're reviewing here is once again taking all the
9 facts that are alleged as being true, would you still
10 find the existence of bias, and I think the comments
11 that have been offered with regard to the proceedings
12 on reconsideration and, of course, the ultimate vote
13 I think are indeed very supportive of finding an
14 absence of bias in this particular regard.

15 As my colleagues, of course, will recall,
16 I spoke very passionately during the reconsideration
17 about the rationale for that reconsideration as it
18 related to support on the record for the decision that
19 we have reached and concerns that had been expressed
20 on the part of the then-Office of Corporation Counsel
21 that our deliberation needed to be more involved, our
22 deliberation needed to be more detailed on the
23 particular question of the approval of the building,
24 and that was the rationale for the reconsideration,
25 and I think that's very important to note here.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I think what is also important to note is
2 that the case law is not silent on the issue of the
3 obligation that a member of the judiciary has in not
4 recusing him- or herself when the situation does not
5 require it. There is case law which speaks to the
6 fact that mere rumors and gossip do not rise to the
7 level that would invoke the need for recusal or
8 disqualification. Once again, I simply believe that
9 the record as it has been proffered in the motions and
10 the supplemental statement simply do not rise to the
11 appropriate level.

12 With regard to the third and final prong,
13 once again, the facts must show the bias is personal
14 as opposed to judicial in nature. I don't think there
15 is any disagreement here that allegation itself speaks
16 to a personal aspect as opposed to a judicial aspect.

17 With that in mind, for the benefit of my
18 colleagues, I think we have moved through a fairly
19 exhaustive discussion of the first motion, which would
20 be a motion of disqualification. If there is not any
21 further discussion, looking to Mr. Zaidan and then to
22 Mr. Hood, if there is not any further discussion, then
23 it would be my motion to deny the motion for
24 disqualification of the Chairman, and I would invite
25 a second.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 COMMISSIONER HOOD: I will second it.

2 MEMBER ETHERLY: What I am going to do at
3 this point is once again -- the motion is on the
4 floor. Any further discussion, Mr. Zaidan, Mr. Hood?

5 (No response.)

6 MEMBER ETHERLY: Hearing no discussion,
7 all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

8 (Chorus of ayes.)

9 MEMBER ETHERLY: Opposed? Abstentions?

10 (No response.)

11 MEMBER ETHERLY: It is then by consensus
12 of the Board that the Chairman is not to be
13 disqualified from the proceedings of March 9th and
14 April 13, 2004.

15 Ms. Bailey, would you record that vote for
16 us, please?

17 MS. BAILEY: Sure, Mr. Chairman. The vote
18 is recorded as 3-0-2 not to disqualify Mr. Griffis'
19 vote as it pertains to decisions made on this case on
20 March 9th and April 13th, 2004. Mr. Etherly made the
21 motion. Mr. Hood second. Mr. Zaidan is in agreement.
22 Mr. Griffis is recused and Ms. Miller is also recused.

23 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Ms.
24 Bailey.

25 I appreciate the engagement and passion of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 my colleagues with regard to that particular aspect of
2 the motion.

3 We still do, however, have a second
4 component of the motion with regard to the vacating of
5 the votes taken on March 9th and April 13th. That
6 would be in relevant part the March 9th vote, which
7 was the vote of reconsideration, and the April 13th
8 vote, which was the ultimate disposition of the
9 question of approval of the new buildings on the NCRC
10 campus.

11 If I could, I'm going to follow the
12 structure that we utilized with regard to the first
13 vote, and that is to once again lay out my
14 understanding of what the relevant legal test is with
15 regard to this particular question, and the relevant
16 standard here is set forth in the Liljeberg case,
17 Supreme Court jurisprudence, and it states in relevant
18 part that the decision of a vote can be vacated, but
19 the determination is based on three factors. The
20 first is the risk of injustice to the parties in the
21 particular case. The second is the risk that the
22 denial of relief will produce injustice in other
23 cases. And thirdly, the risk of undermining the
24 public's confidence in the judicial process.

25 Once, again, the risk of injustice to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 parties in the particular case, the risk that the
2 denial of relief will produce injustice in other
3 cases, and the risk of undermining the public's
4 confidence in the judicial process.

5 With regard to that test, let me start us
6 out on the discussion there. I think the relevant
7 inquiry is the third prong: the risk of undermining
8 the public's confidence in the judicial process. I
9 think that is where the game is here. I think that is
10 the important and perhaps most critical inquiry, not
11 only for the benefit of this case but for the benefit
12 of the Board as it continues to move forward in the
13 conduct of the District of Columbia's business.

14 The risk of injustice to the parties in
15 the particular case if the votes are not vacated. Let
16 me open the floor up to any comments or any remarks
17 with regard to that particular prong of the Liljeberg
18 test.

19 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Can you repeat that?

20 MEMBER ETHERLY: The risk of injustice to
21 the parties in the particular case. So if the votes
22 of March 9th and April 13th were not vacated, would
23 there be an injustice to the parties in this
24 particular case?

25 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Well, through our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 deliberations, I think we have established the fact
2 that we do not feel that there was a bias that existed
3 during the course of the public hearings, so I think
4 that stands on its own in terms of, you know, the
5 April and March votes. Again, there was no
6 substantiation of any type of bias or relationship
7 through the outset of those votes, so I don't see how
8 that test would pass, so to speak.

9 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay.

10 Mr. Hood?

11 COMMISSIONER HOOD: I would agree with Mr.
12 Zaidan. The record was clear, it was sufficient. We
13 deliberated and dealt with on the merits everything
14 that was in the record. So I don't see anybody having
15 -- there being a risk of being injustice through the
16 process.

17 MEMBER ETHERLY: I would agree with both
18 Mr. Zaidan and Mr. Hood in that respect. Once again,
19 I think the conduct of the case, as we discussed
20 within the disposition of the first motion, was very
21 clear, was very fair, was very impartial. There was
22 passion and disagreement on all sides. I think in
23 essence if you were to sum up this case, some people
24 won, some people lost.

25 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Mr. Chairman?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Isn't that typical in
3 most cases?

4 MEMBER ETHERLY: Quite honestly, but
5 perhaps I was being a little too flip with that
6 statement. What I want to be clear to note is that I
7 think there was a little bit that was won and lost by
8 both parties here. Clearly the outcome is not the one
9 that inures to the complete application, the complete
10 benefit of NCRC, but at the same time, clearly there
11 were some aspects of the case that I think gave this
12 Board pause with regard to the issue of an enrollment
13 increase, and the Board acted appropriately in that
14 respect. I simply do not see the issue of an
15 injustice, a risk of injustice to the parties in this
16 case if the votes were not vacated.

17 With regard to the risk that the denial of
18 relief will produce injustice in other cases, I would
19 take a similar position. I do not think that there is
20 anything that has happened in this case that would
21 establish a concern that perhaps would lead to
22 injustice in other cases. In fact, I think perhaps
23 all of our actions to date, including the recusal of
24 the Chairman prospectively, indeed reaffirm the
25 commitment of this body, the commitment of this Board

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and its members to ensuring that the process is held
2 beyond any type of question or any type of suggestion
3 of impropriety.

4 So I would also assert that the risk of
5 denial of relief in this regard would not produce
6 injustice in other cases and once again look to my
7 colleagues for any comments on that particular aspect.

8 COMMISSIONER HOOD: I would just simply
9 just agree with you, Mr. Chairman.

10 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr.
11 Hood.

12 It is the third prong that I think is most
13 critical -- once again, the risk of undermining the
14 public's confidence in the judicial process.

15 Clearly much of the motions practice that
16 has been presented before us, much of the discourse
17 that has taken place publicly within the confines of
18 the media and other places I think clearly speaks to
19 a concern that there is an undermining of the public's
20 confidence in the judicial process.

21 It is here, perhaps, that I take a more
22 nuanced approach but nevertheless finding in my own
23 opinion that there is not an undermining of the
24 public's confidence here but, in fact, a reaffirmation
25 of this body's commitment to a fair, open, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 impartial process.

2 As I said at the outset, and once again
3 I'm speaking just as one member here, as I said at the
4 outset, it is entirely appropriate to question our
5 judges, to question our administrative law judges, to
6 question anyone in a position of decisionmaking
7 authority. That is not before this Board here, and I
8 think if it were we would be in unanimous agreement.
9 But I think it is very important and it has been said
10 in numerous law journal articles and by other
11 commentators that that questioning, that criticism,
12 should be based on fact, it should be based on an
13 understanding of the proper and limited role of the
14 institution, of the courts, or in this case of this
15 institution. I think personal attacks on the
16 integrity and motives of judges, as has been written,
17 undermine authority and independence of the body
18 because in the end, the legitimacy of this Board is
19 dependent on the perception that we engage in
20 principled decisionmaking.

21 What is so critical here is that I do not,
22 speaking as an individual, I do not want to set the
23 precedent that personal attacks on integrity are to be
24 awarded, and perhaps I step out on a limb somewhat
25 presumptuously by saying that I hope that statement is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 heard unequivocally and is perhaps accorded an
2 additional level of weight because I would remind our
3 audience as well as my colleagues that I voted in
4 dissent on the issue of the building. It would do me
5 from the standpoint of my position no harm if there
6 were to be a re-vote and that vote were to fail for a
7 lack of majority. The outcome would be the outcome
8 that I supported because I also did not support on
9 traffic grounds the issue of the enrollment increase
10 that was sought by the applicant.

11 However, once again, I think very
12 importantly here, the inquiry with regard to public
13 confidence in the judiciary or any body is a two-way
14 street. We have the protections of recusal, we have
15 the protections of disqualification, and we are
16 engaged in that inquiry as we speak. That's one
17 protection.

18 The other protection is ensuring that our
19 individuals who serve, be it in a judicial capacity or
20 be it in a quasi-judicial setting as the Board of
21 Zoning Adjustment finds itself in, those individuals
22 should continue to be accorded the ability to act
23 independently and to act in a way that is free from
24 and insulated from where appropriate personal attacks
25 on integrity.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Once again, it is appropriate to question
2 our judges in any forum, in any setting. That is not
3 the issue here. But the questioning and the criticism
4 should come with support. It should come with a basis
5 in fact and understanding of the roles.

6 I think the motions as they have been
7 offered, as we have talked about before with regard to
8 some of the conduct that was alleged by the Chairman,
9 with regard to how he conducted cases, that, to me,
10 evidences a lack of understanding of what the role of
11 the Chairman is.

12 There is a necessary leadership aspect to
13 the chairmanship of the Board of Zoning Adjustment,
14 and all of the Chair's conduct in this regard was very
15 consistent with that expectation, with that
16 responsibility, I might add. However, I think the
17 confidence of the public in the judicial process --
18 once again, as a two-way street, we have to ensure
19 that these types of personal attacks are not rewarded.
20 I think that's a very important aspect of the
21 Liljeberg discussion, perhaps one that found more
22 credence in the dissenting opinion of the Liljeberg
23 case as opposed to the majority opinion. So I want to
24 be very clear about that. I'm not speaking from that
25 standpoint to offer Liljeberg in support of that, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I think that in my assessment of the third prong, the
2 risk of undermining the public's confidence, I think
3 that inquiry is something of a two-way street.

4 When you look at Liljeberg and you look at
5 the line of cases that relate to judicial misconduct,
6 when you look at the canons of conduct set forth for
7 U.S. judges, federal judges, I think it's a very
8 important aspect that is perhaps very quiet, very
9 nuanced that it's a two-way street, and part of that
10 street is ensuring that our judges and the arbiters of
11 the great questions of the day that confront us are
12 free from personal attack or, in the event of personal
13 attack, still have the strength, the personal
14 fortitude, and the integrity to withstand those
15 attacks and issue a decision as they see fit.

16 I would open up the floor on that
17 particular aspect to either of my colleagues, Mr.
18 Zaidan or Mr. Hood.

19 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't
20 know how much more -- I mean Vice Chairman -- I don't
21 know how much more I can add to that, but there is a
22 process, and the process -- when people disagree with
23 decisions that this Board makes, they take it on to
24 the other level, there are checks and balances, and
25 that's due process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I will tell you that, as you stated, Mr.
2 Chairman, the personal attacks are, as far as I'm
3 concerned, not in the process, and I don't have all
4 the legal case law and the legal jargon and everything
5 behind that, but I do think that Board members make
6 their decisions within the realm of the merits of the
7 case and move to that point. But as far as because
8 someone didn't like a decision that someone makes and
9 to go and make a personal attack on them, I have a
10 problem with it.

11 I will tell you that, again, we do our
12 jobs the best we can down here. We have full-time
13 jobs. I don't know, I may be getting off a little,
14 Mr. Chairman, but I believe there needs to be some
15 protection for Board members when they make those
16 types of decisions.

17 And fortunately, like I said, there is
18 another avenue, there is an appellant court, and that
19 is the process, the checks and balances, to make sure
20 that the decision that came from this Board can be
21 checked on if someone disagreed with it. But the
22 personal attacks should be disallowed, and I actually
23 think that they should be discontinued because this is
24 not the first one, and hopefully this will be the last
25 one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr.
2 Hood.

3 Perhaps before we move forward with a vote
4 on this final aspect of the motions before us that
5 will conclude our deliberation today, I would like to,
6 with leave of my colleagues, offer I think what is an
7 excellent assessment in summary of the problem, the
8 concern, the slippery slope that confronts us as we
9 deal with these motions.

10 I am going to read in part to you part of
11 an article that was offered by Judge Paul Friedman,
12 who has been a frequent commentator on issues
13 surrounding civility, civility in our judicial -- our
14 legal systems. Clearly for the benefit of those in
15 the audience civility has been a very important and
16 critical point of discourse over the last couple of
17 years, dating back to, of course, the decision in Bush
18 v. Gore as well as in recent decisions that involved
19 the question of recusal of Supreme Court Justice
20 Antonin Scalia and the case involving the vice
21 president.

22 There is a wealth of commentary on this
23 issue, but I think it's Judge Friedman's comments
24 which perhaps summarize very expertly what I am
25 attempting to get at with respect to this particular

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 last prong.

2 Judge Friedman writes in part, and you've
3 heard me paraphrase before, that "Judges do make
4 mistakes and fair criticism of judicial decisions
5 certainly is appropriate. But criticism should be
6 based on fact and on an understanding of the proper
7 and limited role of the institution of the courts.

8 "Personal attacks on the integrity and
9 motives of judges undermine the constitutional
10 authority and independence of the courts because, in
11 the end, the courts depend for their legitimacy on the
12 perception that they engage in principled
13 decisionmaking and on their reputation for
14 impartiality and non-partisanship. The attempts to
15 intimidate judges in the hope of achieving outcomes
16 for clients or causes or of undermining the legitimacy
17 of courts and their decisions run counter to the
18 delicate balance that the founders of our system
19 intended."

20 As Professor Stephen Bright has written,
21 quote: "Distorted attacks for political gain endanger
22 judicial independence and public confidence in the
23 courts and ultimately undermine the rule of law."

24 Judge Friedman continues to write: "In my
25 view, it is the basic responsibility of the bar and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 individual lawyers to ensure that the courts are not
2 intimidated or subjected to political pressure by
3 defending the independence of the judiciary and of
4 individual judges when those judges are wrongly
5 attacked or when their motives, character, or
6 integrity are impugned. It is the obligation of the
7 bar, lawyers, and judges to ensure that our courtrooms
8 and legal proceedings are civil and civilized
9 engagements. The public must be given no reason to
10 doubt either by judges or by those who disagree with
11 their decisions that the system is anything less than
12 rational, civil, and independent. We all have an
13 investment in an independent judicial system, and
14 without such an understanding, the rule of law itself
15 is at risk."

16 Former Chief Judge Mikva of the D.C.
17 Circuit also said that judges must follow their oaths
18 and do their duty. He listed editorials, letters,
19 telegrams, picketers, threats, petitions, panelists,
20 and talk shows.

21 "In this country, we do not administer
22 justice by plebiscite. We judges need the lawyers and
23 the leaders of the bar to help us in this important
24 endeavor so that everyone's day in court is a fair
25 one." Judge Paul Friedman.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 For my colleagues, then, if there is no
2 further discussion, I would also move to deny the
3 motion to vacate the votes on March 9th, 2004, and
4 April 13th, 2004, and invite a second.

5 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Second.

6 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Second.

7 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much --
8 Mr. Zaidan?

9 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Mr. Zaidan.

10 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr.
11 Zaidan, for the second.

12 I think we have had adequate discussion.
13 Once again, any further discussion on that question?
14 Any further discussion?

15 COMMISSIONER HOOD: I just have one
16 question. Also what was submitted -- I don't know if
17 this is the appropriate venue to do this, but there is
18 an issue about the enrollment of 120 which was --
19 actually I voted to deny any expansion of the
20 enrollment, and I wanted to make sure it was clear,
21 and I think Board Member Zaidan, on page -- I don't
22 know what page it is, but in the supplement to the
23 motion to disqualify Chairman Griffis and to vacate
24 votes taken May 9th, I think it's the third -- page 3.
25 It mentions something I think that you asked be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 incorporated in the order, and I just wanted to make
2 sure that that was where we were before we close out
3 on this.

4 MEMBER ZAIDAN: In regards to the
5 expansion of the enrollment?

6 COMMISSIONER HOOD: Yes. I want to make
7 sure we had an understanding.

8 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Yes. That was my position
9 in the deliberation and that's my position now.

10 COMMISSIONER HOOD: A hundred and twenty,
11 right?

12 MEMBER ZAIDAN: Yes. That's my reading of
13 the two previous orders.

14 COMMISSIONER HOOD: I just want to make
15 sure. Okay.

16 MEMBER ZAIDAN: And just --

17 MEMBER ETHERLY: Yes.

18 MEMBER ZAIDAN: And just to kind of I
19 guess maybe -- you know, we have laid out a lot of
20 philosophical references and good philosophical
21 discussion here, but I think, like a lot of the things
22 that come before us, this issue comes down to the fact
23 that this city is doing pretty well right now. D.C.
24 is definitely in a renaissance, and unfortunately this
25 Board has to deal with some of the negative aspects of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that. Because there is activity and because there are
2 people wanting to move back to the city and put
3 additions onto their houses and enroll their kids in
4 schools, et cetera, we have to deal with the negative
5 aspects of that, and that is how to balance the
6 impacts of this positive energy with the needs of the
7 neighbors and of the city as a whole. It's my
8 recollection that this is coming back in 2006. The
9 special exception expires completely, and I certainly
10 hope that at some point, this extremely bad blood can
11 be taken care of because it's not going to get anybody
12 anywhere in the next go-around of this application
13 because I don't envision and I certainly don't
14 anticipate anybody moving off of that street and I
15 certainly would not encourage that.

16 I just hope at some point everybody can
17 step back and look at what the issues are and try to
18 take into account how best everybody can coexist
19 because this is a product of a good thing that we're
20 experiencing in this city and I hope that it can be
21 managed the next go-around.

22 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr.
23 Zaidan.

24 If there is no further discussion on the
25 motion, I would like to ask for the vote. All those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in favor, please signify by saying aye.

2 (Chorus of ayes.)

3 MEMBER ETHERLY: Opposed? Abstentions.

4 (No response.)

5 MEMBER ETHERLY: Hearing none, Ms. Bailey,
6 if you could read the vote, please.

7 MS. BAILEY: Thank you. The Board has
8 voted not to vacate Mr. Griffis' vote as it pertains
9 to the March 9th and April 13th decisions on this
10 case. The vote is 3-0-2. Mr. Etherly made the
11 motion, Mr. Zaidan second, Mr. Hood is in agreement,
12 Mr. Griffis is recused, and also Mrs. Miller.

13 MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Ms.
14 Bailey.

15 I would like to thank my colleagues for
16 what has been a very difficult discussion but a very
17 important one. I would like to thank the members of
18 the public for your engagement. I think it is safe
19 for me to say that the Board has spoken very clearly,
20 very cogently, and unequivocally with regard to its
21 distaste for the tactics that have been engaged. Once
22 again, that is in complete acknowledgement of the
23 appropriateness of questioning the judiciary that acts
24 as the arbiters of the great questions of our day.
25 But when those tactics move to the level that I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we have seen here -- and once again, this is from
2 someone who spoke as a supporter of the opposition
3 because I thought the position was right in terms of
4 the outcome of the case although I didn't prevail --
5 but I stand united with my colleagues here in wanting
6 to be sure that we reaffirm to you that there is
7 perhaps no louder, no more unequivocal action that
8 this vote has taken since I have been a member of the
9 Board than what it has done today to support the
10 Chairman and ensure that subsequent servants of the
11 District of Columbia are not subjected to tactics such
12 as these and that these tactics are not rewarded.

13 Thank you very much for your
14 participation. We are going to take a brief recess
15 and we will return shortly to begin our public
16 hearing.

17 Thank you. We stand adjourned.

18 (Whereupon, at 10:52 a.m., the special
19 public meeting adjourned.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com