DAVID ONEK: Welcome to the Criminal Justice Conversations Podcast, a coproduction of the Berkeley Center for Criminal Justice and the Berkeley School of Journalism. I’m your host, David Onek. The podcast, recorded weekly in the Berkeley School of Journalism studios, features in depth interviews with a wide range of criminal justice leaders, law enforcement officials, policymakers, advocates, service providers, academics and others. The podcast gets behind the sound bites that far too often dominate the public dialog about criminal justice to have detailed, nuanced conversations about criminal justice policy.

Today’s guest is Senator Mark Leno, chair of the California Senate Public Safety Committee. Leno represents the Third Senate District in California, which includes Marin County and portions of San Francisco and Sonoma Counties. He was elected to the Senate in 2008. Among other Senate Achievements, Leno passed SB 678, the California Community Corrections Performance Incentive Act in 2009. Previously he served six years in the State
Assembly, and prior to that, Leno was member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors for over four years. He joins us in studio this afternoon. Mark Leno, welcome to the program.

MARK LENO: David, good afternoon. Thank you for the invitation.

ONEK: You started your public career in city government in San Francisco, and at the city level, the public safety issues you confront are things like homicide rates and policing. At the state level, of course, the focus is on prisons. What surprised you the most about the California prison system when you first got to Sacramento?

LENO: Well, upon my first day in the State Assembly back in early 2003, I became chair of the Public Safety Committee. In this era of term limits, one can take a position such as chair of a committee upon arrival. Having no legal or criminal justice background, I had a steep learning curve, because there was the California Penal Code and endless issues I needed to know very well. But I felt very privileged, because as chair of the committee, I worked with a committee staff, who were all very well versed in these issues, and attorneys themselves, many of them coming from public defenders’ offices, sometimes from a district attorney’s office as well, but actually leaning a little
bit more towards public defenders’ offices. So I had a great education. And one of the things I looked into upon my arrival was the percentage of general fund spending on the Department of Corrections, and this was 2003, not that long ago. And I came to learn that California spent a greater percentage of general funds on corrections than any other state in the country. At the time we were 5.3%.

ONEK: The good old days now, right?

LENO: The good old days. We are now pushing 11. We have doubled the percentage that we are spending of our general fund on corrections, and now rehabilitation. And so there is no cap on this yet. If we don’t change course, and we did take a good stab at prison reform this past year, and we’ll talk about that I’m sure. But if we don’t really contain this, we could hit 15%. And we’ll be spending potentially more on correction than higher education, which I think is a red flag for the entire state. What are we doing?

ONEK: You mentioned some of the progress that was made in the legislature in response to the prison crisis. I want to talk about two bills that passed recently, reform of the state’s parole system, as well as an important community corrections bill that
you cosponsored. Let’s take the parole legislation first. We had Matthew Cate, Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation on the show a few weeks ago, and he called the parole changes a landmark achievement. But some law enforcement and crime victim groups have expressed grave concerns over provisions that provide for the early release and reduced supervision of some offenders. You supported the legislation. Matt Cate said it would improve public safety. Do you feel as he does that it is a landmark achievement?

LENO: Any progress is landmark, and I say that because the politics of the issues we’re talking about are so highly charged that legislators are very cautious to support anything that they think could be in any way twisted or misconstrued in their next primary election. Not even general election, their next primary election, because of course, the fear is that one would be labeled as soft on crime. And so yes, I do believe, if not landmark, certainly a significant step forward, and important reforms. And especially in this era of huge budget deficits, with an anti-tax drumbeat coming from my Republican colleagues. So ever fewer dollars to support ever greater demands for all sorts of service, educational, healthcare, our social safety net. And of course, first and foremost, many would say comes public safety. But short of locking everyone up forever longer periods of time, which we
cannot literally afford, even if it were considered good public policy, which I don’t think it would be, this is unsustainable. So we’ve got to thoughtfully crafts some public policy, attempt to step outside ourselves, and think for the better of the state and not just for our own next reelection, because we’ve got a three judge panel telling us, reduce your prison population by 40,000, from the current approximately 170,000, which is new 200% capacity, or we will do it for you. And it will be much less thoughtful. So it was a pleasure working with Secretary, Matt Cate, and I have to tell you, though, I’m a big critic of Arnold Schwarzenegger. And we’ll get to that, too. In fact, Governor Schwarzenegger was bolder in many aspects of these proposed reforms than we, the Legislature, finally took action on. And again, I think very simply, you can see the level of politics, just differentiated between the Senate and the Assembly. Now, the Senate is the upper house, the more senior house, but I wouldn’t suggest that we’re any bolder or more seasoned or have more backbone than our Assembly colleagues. Simply, we’re up for reelection every four years. They’re up for reelection every two years. And many of them are going to running against each other to get a Senate seat, because there’s half as many Senate seats as Assembly seats. So they’re watching their votes in the Assembly I think a little bit more than we feel we need to. I think we also, in the Senate, like to think of ourselves a bit more senior, but I
won’t get into that conversation. Nonetheless, we passed a very solid reform package in the Senate that got significantly whittled down in the Assembly. But for example, where the Governor was bolder, in dealing with these wobblers, wobblers, of course, being those crimes that can, by discretion of the District Attorney, be charged either as a felony or a misdemeanor. The Governor wanted to take about, I think there were 15 or 18 on his original list, and make them misdemeanors, which means that the maximum punishment would keep them in country jail, not coming to the state prison system. That would lower our prison population. By the time it left the Senate, I think there were three or four property crime related crimes, and I don’t believe the Assembly passed any of those.

ONEK: Well, you still were able to get something significant through, which must have felt like an excellent achievement, given the environment that you just described. I have a question, though, about one of the provisions of the parole reform legislation, which has created some controversy, which is one of the early release provisions, where different counties have interpreted it differently. Some have said this only applies to prisoners in state facilities, and others have said it actually applies to inmates in county jails. There have also been some issues about how that time should be calculated. So we have some
countries not releasing any inmates. We have some releasing quite a few inmates, and some releasing only a trickle. Everyone is interpreting it differently. What was the intent of the Legislature on this? Was it supposed to apply only to inmates in state prison, or also to inmates in the jails?

LENO: Sure, what we’re talking about here are day for day credits for time served. So we have day for day credits in the state prison system, and we have some state prisoners doing their final months at times in county jails. It seemed like it would be inconsistent to have some prisons side by side getting day for day credits in a county jail system getting one for three. So we thought everyone understood. There was no opposition expressed from law enforcement, or anywhere really, and we set the date of January 25th, clearly with any legislation, unless you put a retroactive clause it in, it is understood to be prospective. And keep in mind, everyone needs to understand this first and foremost, with all of these reform ideas, whether we’re talking about parole or otherwise, they’re always for those who are in categories of non-violent, non-serious, nonsexual offenses. So more serious and dangerous offenders we’re not talking about. But again, we’re trying to be judicious. How can we best manage this prison population, which every study and every panel and everyone expert in the field, from law enforcement to every other kind of
advocacy groups, we must lower our prison population. So how are we going to do it? So the idea being that these folks are coming out, and they’re coming out in a couple of weeks or a couple of months. If they are completing some course work, if they are getting their GED, if they’re completing their remedial reading work, if they’re getting job training, they’re completing something, well, then they’ll get day for day credit. We want to give them incentive to not only be model prisoners, but also to prepare themselves for successful reentry into the community, which is the definition of rehabilitation. And so we did pass this. Colleagues were very nervous there, this talk of early release. People get this idea in their head that we’re sending dangerous criminals into the streets. And I wonder where they get those ideas. I remember one of my Republican colleagues on the Senate floor, saying, if we do this, there will be, his words, mayhem in the streets. So not an unfamiliar tactic to spread fear, to spread fear to prevent reform. So then subsequently, of the 58 country sheriffs, 47 decided not to consider this retroactive, that it would only start January 25th, so it would take some weeks, if not months, for these credits to build up. So anyone who would get out, and again, we’re probably talking releasing maybe a week or two or three ahead of what they would have otherwise, of those who attained that threshold of accomplishment and behavior. So they’re coming out. Can we
afford to keep them every day? I also point out, whether someone’s sentenced to six months or 12 months in the county jail, or some triad of 16 months, two years, three years in the state prison system, these terms of imprisonment did not come down engraved in stone from the heavens. They’re arbitrary numbers. Who is to say it shouldn’t be 18 months, 26 months and 40 months, as opposed to 16, two years, three years.

ONEK: Well, I’m going to ask you about a sentencing commission, which may change some of that in a little bit. But let me turn now to another recent achievement that you were heavily involved in, which was SB678. And that bill has won bipartisan praise for incentivizing country probation departments to improve outcomes from the probationers they supervise and reduce costly prison admissions. The state will share the resulting state savings with local probation departments. Tell us more about the bill and why you thought it was necessary.

LENO: It’s very exciting to have a success in the midst of all of this partisanship and overlays of intense politics. The terminology is community corrections, and it’s not a novel idea. It’s literally been around for decades. But there’s never been the political will or the bipartisan support to move it forward. Our good fortune of being in the right time at the right place
may have been positively impacted by the financial crisis. And there’s always opportunity in crisis, we know that. So this deals with a population of felony probationers. Felony probationers are those who have been convicted of felonies, but rather than be sent to state prison, they’re given some county jail time. So it’s likely they’re first or second or third offenders for lesser crimes, otherwise they would definitely be going to state prison. They get some county jail time, and then are given some probation time in the county as well, under the supervision of the chief probation officers in each county. It came to my attention that 40% of all our new prison inmates in the state system each year, accounting for 20,000 inmates are failed felony probationers. So obviously, if we could invest in the evidence based programming that would keep felony probationers successful in their probation period, we have a win, win, win. What happens is, these individuals will be back on their feet, able to better support themselves, their families and their communities. By definition of the success of their probationary period, there is less crime in our communities. The other benefit is, they won’t be coming to state prison. We will lower our prison inmate population. We will have state savings, and the program would have the state share 50% of that savings through a competitive grant program to have county chief probation officers apply for that money, so they can invest in remedial reading and GED
programs, job training, job placement, so people can successfully reenter into the community. The big question, of course, is where is the upfront money for this? And we were able to collectively, I think unanimously, agree that we would use 45 million out of 90 million federal stimulus dollars for public safety, otherwise known as burn jag funds, for this community corrections program. So we now are just about to implement this $45 millions where we think we can have a success here.

ONEK: It is an exciting development. It’s very rare to see Democrats and Republicans working together on criminal justice issues. But you cosponsored the bill with a Republican colleague, John Benoit. And he’s not just any Republican. He’s a retired California Highway Patrol commander. What lessons can be learned from this about breaking through barriers to work across the aisle on criminal justice issues?

LENO: Well, again, I think it was right time, right place. My former colleague, Senator Benoit, is now a county supervisor in Riverside County. So we don’t know who will be replacing him. A Republican primary, it is a Republican district, is ongoing as we speak. And one of the candidates is a little more tough on crime, further to the right, and will play to the right in the Republican primaries, so I have my own favorite in that race. But I hope
that he is as enlightened as John Benoit, whoever he may be, as enlightened, and will be able to work with us. But there’s not a lot of common ground when it comes to these public safety issues. For example, you brought up the sentencing commission, which I have to tell you, I think was one of the most significant accomplishments to have gotten out of the Senate. And again, to Governor Schwarzenegger’s credit, he supports the sentencing commission, which I’ll describe in a moment. Unfortunately, it got caught up in the politics of the Assembly and did not get across the finish line. So it never got to the Governor’s desk. Sentencing commission is an independent commission that would review the sentencing scheme of our entire penal code. You could imagine, after decades and decades of legislators looking for headlines, responding to crises in their communities, horrific crimes, citizens rising up and demanding that something be done statutorily to make sure such a horrible crime never happens again. How could we have let it happen? But honestly, of course, in a free society, there’s no foolproof way. If there was, we would have figured it out long ago. So horrible things will happen. It’s our job to minimize them and keep our communities as safe as possible. Nonetheless, over all these many years, our penal code has been amended and amended and amended. The opportunity for legislators of make every misdemeanor a felony, to make every a felony a longer sentence, and so we have
inconsistencies in our sentencing schedule now, and also it’s unsustainable, clearly. We have 200% capacity. So nothing that has been passed by voters, such as our three strikes law, could be considered by the sentencing commission. But otherwise, they could review it all. Now, my Republican colleagues, not a one of them who supported this idea, just the Governor with support on the Republican side, would suggest that this is going to lower and lessen the terms that convicted criminals will serve in prison. And in fact, not. Maybe some of the more horrific crimes will get longer sentences. The lesser crimes maybe would have lesser sentences. But let’s have someone else do it. And I just want to give you a brief example of why --

ONEK: Please do.

LENO: We are, I am here to admit, collectively unable to manage sentencing here in California. So a few years ago, when I first arrived in the Legislature, I had a colleague from Los Angeles, West Los Angeles, Paul Koretz, who wanted to make a very minor amendment to the definition of incarceration as noted in the preamble to the California Penal Code. So this bill was symbolic at best, but important. So what Assemblyman Koretz attempted to do was to change the then definition of incarceration in the preamble of the California Penal Code to read, from punishment,
period, to punishment and rehabilitation. This was in 2003. So
seven years ago rehabilitation was such a highly charged concept
and word for Democrats, moderate Democrats as well as Republicans,
he could not get sufficient votes to get it off the Assembly
floor. Again, politics infusing our work, and destroying our
work, in my opinion. So what happened to Koretz’s bill was, he
had to amend it down to read that incarceration was punishment and
successful preparation for reentry into the community. That’s
crazy.

ONEK: Couldn’t have rehabilitation in there.

LENO: Couldn’t say, it took the Republican governor to add it to
the title of the department. So your question was?

ONEK: So the question was, sentencing reform, given this
dynamic, what can we do differently to actually get a sentencing
commission?

LENO: Well, I hope that we can continue to work with my Assembly
colleagues. And again, so many of our problems in so many issue
areas in Sacramento go back to term limits. If legislators
weren’t restricted to just three two year terms in the assembly,
with a potential two four year terms in the Senate, 14 possible
years, what if, and we’ve tried this before, and I think we’re going to see it on the ballot again in a slightly different and improved fashion, allow legislators to served up to 12 years in any combination of houses. So they’ll be some, much more stability in both houses, especially in the Assembly, so they’re not so frightened of every vote they cast, that they’re going to get kicked out their next election. If that were the case –

ONEK: Let me just say something else about that, because that’s part of it. But the other part is what you described at the very beginning of this interview when you talked about your first day on the job as chair of the Public Safety Committee, really not having a lot of information about it, and luckily there is terrific staff and stuff to bring you up to speed. But that’s the other part of all this churning is, you have people coming in who are very bright, perhaps, but don’t have the background.

LENO: Uninformed, unaware. And so term limits need to be amended, and I think that would improve things rather quickly. But even without that, we need to continue to work with our Assembly colleagues. Now, the argument against the sentencing commission that we hear from our Republican colleagues is that it abrogates our elected responsibility to protect the people of California, that we would be abrogating it to an unelected,
unaccountable commission. But that is not true, because the commission, whatever they decide, we could overturn any moment by a simple majority vote. By a simple majority vote, we could disband the commission. So we’re not abrogating any responsibility. It’s just letting this independent commission, without all of the politics driving them, give us a more thoughtful read so that we can in fact, the goal is safer communities, less crime. If we’re scatterbrained about it, we’re not going to be able to do that, and we’re going to pour more and more of our precious general fund dollars into the Department of Corrections, fewer dollars for higher education, few dollars for K-12. And what is the best and most effective crime prevention program known to humankind? Education.

ONEK: Well, let me pick up on that, because one of the severe cuts this year is something we were just talking about previously, which is rehabilitation, a $250 million cut to the prison rehabilitation programming will lead to approximately 800 layoffs. A recent draft report from the California Rehabilitation Oversight Board, which is charged with overseeing rehabilitation programs in the state, states that this, quote, may well mean that the hoped for reduction in recidivism will not be achieved anytime soon, and that without the reductions, quote, it seems likely that California will be unable to get control of the inmate population
crisis. Now, this report is going to be presented to you at the Legislature and the Governor on Monday. Everyone understands we have a budget crisis. But won’t these cuts cost the state more in the long term by increasing recidivism rates?

LENO: I’m afraid I have to agree with you. And this is another bit of collateral damage in our ever growing budget problem. Again, 2/3 majority vote to pass a budget, 2/3 majority vote to raise revenue in the Legislature. The majority party’s hands are tied. The minority party rules. And this minority party have all signed pledges to a guy named Grover Nordquist, a K Street lobbyist, best friends of Jack Abramoff and Karl Rove, Grover Nordquist who’s famous for saying he doesn’t oppose government. He just wants to reduce it to a size where it can be drowned in the bathtub. Well, if you’re drowning government in the bathtub, not only are you going to destroy our educational system, our social safety net, but also our ability to rehabilitate our inmates when they’re in our system. And when you realize that upwards of 75% of all of our inmates, when they leave our system, and keep in mind, 90% leave our system. They’re all coming out. There are determinate sentences, 75% are functionally illiterate. They can’t even read a sign to direct them to an employment office, much less fill out an employment application. They have a substance abuse problem. They are in fact unemployable. Is
it any surprise we have twice the national average recidivism rate, close to 70%. We must invest in rehabilitation. And if we got time, and I’m not sure that we will, I want to suggest, I know where there’s a pot of money, close to $140 million annually, which would not impact public safety one bit, but would save us that much general fund money, which we could put into rehabilitation.

ONEK: Do tell, please.

LENO: Do we have just a couple of minutes for that?

ONEK: Absolutely.

LENO: So there’s something that California invented back in 1977 called permanent imprisonment, or otherwise known as life without parole. So one could be sentenced to life without parole, and it means what it says. Since 1977, those sentenced to life without parole, not a single individual has ever been released, short of through exoneration, proven innocence. Beyond that, no one has gotten out. So we are spending $140 million by keeping inmates on Death Row and keeping alive our capital punishment system. Now, there are those who support the death penalty. I don’t happen to, but out of respect for those who do, they need to understand that
for every 100 convicts sentenced to death in California, one will be executed. 99 will die of old age in prison. We in fact have de facto permanent imprisonment. We don’t have an actual death penalty in California. And that’s for many reasons, which we can get into if you like. But because of this, why not just be honest and realize that we don’t have death executions in this state, and for those who want that kind of retribution, who think that they’re going to have more peace in their hearts, well, aren’t we cruel to pretend that we’re offering them that hope of seeing someone executed who has killed a dear family member, when in fact 99 times out of 100, it’s not going to happen. So we need to elevate our consciousness on this, whether you support the death penalty or not, first and foremost, anyone who’s convicted of death or life imprisonment, should never have the opportunity to come out. There are those severe criminals who never should see the light of day and should die in prison. But why squander $140 million that we could invest in rehabilitation programs, so we could reduce our recidivism rate, which means we would reduce crime in our communities? Wouldn’t that be wiser? So we need to begin to have this conversation, and I am doing this with the police chiefs and with the chief probation officers, and with the sheriffs. I’m talking to not only our law enforcement community, but I also need to begin having this conversation with the victims advocacy communities, too. And if they were to say, well, let’s
invest and make sure that we do kill these folks who have been sentenced to death, the fact is, and this is a number I can document and resource for you, that it would take us about $90 million every year for ten years, so almost a billion dollar investment, to reduce the appeal time, which is currently 25 years. Death Row inmates can stretch out their appeals, which is their legal right, on average 25 years. So what peace is a victim’s family getting over 25 years to reduce it to 12 years, a billion dollar investment over ten years would reduce it to 12 years. The appeal time for life without parole, 18 months. Throw them into the prison cell, throw away the key, and be done with it and get on with your lives and save the $140 million.

ONEK: Now, you talked about working with victims. We just have time for a couple of more questions, but I do want to talk about the leadership you’ve taken on the issue of trauma recovery centers, which provide services to victims of violence. San Francisco’s model, UC San Francisco Trauma Recovery Center is in grave danger of closing due to city budget cuts. The center lost its state funding several years ago. The city stepped in to fill the gap. But with the city’s budget problems now, it is on the chopping block once again. You sponsored a bill, SB733, to fund the San Francisco center as well as three other centers in the state. In these tough fiscal times, why are trauma recovery
centers a good investment?

LENO: First let me tell you what the Trauma Recovery Center does, and what its alternative is. We have a victim compensation board and a restitution fund. And the restitution fund, of course, is to assist victims in getting their lives back together after they’ve been victimized. But our current system is as such, and I use an extreme example. A young mother standing on her front yard, holding her toddler, surrounded by her young children, husband’s underneath the car working on it in the driveway. Drive by shooting, boom, he’s dead. Imagine. What does she do next? She’s traumatized. She’s frozen. The current system, current state system, which deals with victims traumatized by crimes is that the victim should be able to assess her emotional, physical and mental needs, along with the needs of her family, be able to determine where she can resource those services to deal with those needs, access those services, have the money in her pocket to pay for those services, gather her receipts, and then take them to the state and apply to get her money back. It doesn’t happen. I’ve seen the restitution fund grow from $75 million when I arrived in Sacramento seven years ago, to $125 million. It just kept growing, because victims couldn’t access it. So enter the Trauma Recovery Center, a novel program designed by the head of psychiatry at UCSF, Robert Okun, Dr. Robert Okun, who’s seen this
working abroad. And what it does is provides a holistic approach to dealing with the needs of victims of violent and traumatic crime. In fact, they actually do outreach. They go to emergency rooms looking for people to come into their program, and they would take that young mother, who’s just been traumatized on her front yard, bring her into their program and take care of all of her needs. And I have heard the testimony of folks who have had their lives saved, rape victims, mugging victims, people who have been shot, who have been stabbed. Sometimes, if you’re so injured yourself in a crime, you can’t leave your apartment to go get the services. The Trauma Recovery Center goes to you. And so it has been documented that they can provide for lesser unit costs, greater results, meaning they get people back to work faster. They stabilize their lives to keep them off alcohol and drugs more so than they would otherwise, to keep families intact after these violent and horrific crimes, even so stabilize the lives of the victims that they are comfortable working with law enforcement so they can actually help find and prosecute the perpetrator of the crime. They’ve won national awards. The state invested $3 million for a pilot project. It was successful. You can document it. Now we have no money, and we’re struggling to keep this program alive. So what our bill would do is clarify in state law that the monies in the Restitution Fund can be used for this alternative means of assisting victims. And actually, it is that
much more important, the Trauma Recovery Center, for those who have been victimized in a more traumatic and more serious fashion. For lesser crimes, the fee for service works better. But for the more serious crimes, it does not work. And I think to have the option of using the Trauma Recovery Center makes good sense. So my colleagues supported me in a bipartisan fashion, because my Republican colleagues from Orange County wanted their county to duplicate what we’ve done in San Francisco. We could do one in four or five parts of the state at $5 million each, $20 million, and still have money in the Restitution Fund.

ONEK: So what’s the status of that bill now?

LENO: Well, the problem is, in our current fiscal crisis, the Governor, and with the Legislature with few options, have taken monies from the Restitution Fund and taken them to balance our general fund. And so we’ve seen a significant depletion of funds in the Restitution Fund. So our bill now is on the Assembly side. We got it through the Senate last year, and we’re still hoping we can get it to the Governor. We’ve reduced the amount of money available for grants to duplicate what we’ve done here in San Francisco from five million down to three million, and hopefully the Governor will sign it.
ONEK: I want to close by asking about an issue that could determine if you will continue in your role as a statewide leader on criminal justice issues. A recent poll showed that you would be the front runner in the San Francisco’s mayor’s race, should you decide to enter the race. Are you planning to run for mayor?

LENO: It is a question I’m asked more and more often, and I think it’s a little premature. We’re uncertain what’s going to happen now that Mayor Newsom has decided to enter into the race for Lt. Governor. He seems to be the front runner in that race. And there would be an opportunity for the Board of Supervisors to determine who would serve out the remainder of Mayor Newsom’s term, which would amount to about ten or eleven months next year, should he be elected and sworn in to his statewide office. So what I can honestly tell you, David, right now is, I have to look at it, knowing from some polling that there is interest in my candidacy. But I have to say first and foremost, though some would say it’s a diagnosable condition, I love my job in the State Senate. It’s a horrific time to be there because of our budget crunch, but I feel very privileged and honored to be able to a part of the discussion and to be get involved in issues like criminal justice reform, to be able to get a greater understanding of what the issue are and how we can improve upon things, work with other talented people. And so I’m very committed to my
Senate work.

ONEK: Mark Leno, thanks so much for joining us.

LENO: Thank you, David.

ONEK: Please tune in next week when we’ll be joined by San Francisco police chief George Gascón. Thank you for listening to the Criminal Justice Conversations podcast. You can find this episode of the podcast, and all prior episodes on our website at www.law.berkeley.edu/cjconversations. You can also become a fan of the Criminal Justice Conversations podcast on Facebook. The podcast is engineered by Milt Wallace. Our editor is Callie Shenafelt, and our program intern is Eve Eckman. I’m David Onek. Thanks for listening.