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, policy makers, advocates, service providers, academics, and others. The Podcast gets behind the sound bites that far too often dominate the public dialogue about criminal justice to have detailed nuanced conversations about criminal justice policy.

Today’s guest is San Francisco Police Chief, George Gascon. Gascon became chief in San Francisco in August of 2009. Previously he served as Chief of Police in Mesa, Arizona for three years. Prior to that Gascon served for over 28 years in the Los Angeles Police Department, moving up through the ranks to become Assistant Chief in charge of the day-to-day operations
of the department. He is a nationally recognized expert on topics such as police training, police accountability, community policing, and police hiring practices. Gascon also has a law degree and is an active member of the California bar. He joins me studio this morning. George Gascon, welcome to the program.

GEORGE GASCON: Good morning David.

ONEK: Before we get started I just want to be clear about the scope of what we’ll be discussing today. You are Chief of Police in San Francisco, and I sit on the San Francisco Police Commission, the city’s civilian oversight body. The commission and the mayor jointly oversee the department and the Chief of Police. Given that it would not really be appropriate to discuss San Francisco issues in much detail this morning, anybody who wants to hear our views on the leading policing issues in San Francisco at the moment can tune into the police commission meetings every Wednesday night, watch them streamed or archived on the web, or read the local papers. Today we’re going to focus on your overall policing philosophy and on your innovative work in Los Angeles and Mesa. So with that I want to start by talking to you about how you first got into policing. Do you think your detractors would say that you are
talented, ambitious, hard working, and media savvy. You have a law degree, you could have done any number of things and had a successful career. Why did you choose policing?

GASCON: Well to me policing is a calling. I believe that policing is one of those very honorable professions where individuals can actually have the ability to make a real impact on the life of many. I think many times and not to over dramatize this, but it’s really life and death. You know policing when it’s done well can serve to make a difference in the community, it can be a vehicle for unification, and it could be a vehicle for creating an environment where communities can flourish, where people can work together, develop, socialize. And when it’s done poorly it can be a polarizing force, and it could be a force for the destruction of many communities. So I believe that it’s one of those parts of a civilized democracy that can have a tremendous impact on the quality of life one way or the other. Obviously I like to believe that I can be a positive force and to me it was just an incredible opportunity. And as you indicated I’ve had certainly the ability to do other things, but policing is just something that I really enjoy.

ONEK: Let’s talk next about your time at the Los Angeles Police
Department. What was the LAPD like when you first joined in 1978?

GASCON: In 1978 the LAPD was a relatively small department in terms of the size of the city, it was an organization about 6800 people, a city that still at that point was way over three million people in population. It was terribly underfunded, I came right in the middle of the Proposition 13 era where local government was impacted severely by the reduction in the revenue source from property taxes. It was also an organization that was in transition, and still having to deal with some of the problems of the late '60s, coming into the '70s. There were some of the original community policing attempts they had begun with Ed Davis when he was the Chief of Police, when he started team policing. And at the same time it was now going through this major reduction in resources, it was also an organization in some parts of the community was still viewed as an occupation army, and whatever that meant both to the community and the police department. So it was an organization in turmoil economically because of the Prop 13 impact and the funding sources. It was also an organization that was in turmoil because of the political unsettledness that was going on.
ONEK: Jumping forward, you were tasked with revamping training at LAPD in the wake of the Rampart Scandal in the late 1990s and the resulting consent decree. Why is training so important to you as a policing leader, and what specific new training components did you implement in the wake of the Rampart Scandal in L.A.?

GASCON: I think the hallmark of any organization is the quality of the people. And the quality of the people is directly reflected by the norms of the organization, the training that is provided, the models that are the artifacts of the organization. In the case of the LAPD training post Rampart, one of the major concerns that we were confronted with was looking at the norms of the organization and developing a new culture. Developing a new culture within an organization was very difficult, and training if it’s done right should be, and it is one of the major vehicles to do so. Personally I was fascinated by the fact that we have so many shortcomings in the understanding of the cops in the street concerning the fourth amendment, and what is the role of policing this via Constitution? I think that for many years we had trained police officers in a way where the dots were not connected, we would have our use of force training and that would generally be done by people that had an
understanding of the constitutional guidelines, that model police behavior, but then we had the people that were teaching the tactics, and that was a separate group of people, and the two never talked. And then we had perhaps another group of people that were maybe talking about cultural issues, and other people may be talking about report writing. And all this training was done in segments and unfortunately the connection of the dots was not taking place for many people. So one of the things that after looking at this I realized that if we wanted a good high quality police training, and we wanted to ensure that our people understood and embrace the fourth amendment and what our constitutional guidelines mean to policing that we had to do all together as people who do it in real life. So we started developing training with the assistance of lawyers including members of the U.S. Attorney’s Office in L.A. at the time. And basically developed scenario driven training where day-to-day police operations were taking, and where the ability of the officers to interact with suspects in the field with community members were being tested against their ability to apply the use of force policy, their understanding of constitutional issues, as well as their understanding of tactics, and it was a very rewarding experience for us. It was very complicated, a lot of moving parts, but I believe that we actually developed one of
the first real high quality integrated in-service police training in this country where the constitutional overtones of everything that we do in policing was at the forefront, as opposed to being in the background. As a matter of fact people laugh, but initially thought it was a little corny but then people started to understand we actually took the Bill of Rights, and we posted the Bill of Rights in the classrooms where we were having the training. And we would ask our officers to talk about the Bill of Rights. And quite frankly, initially it was very shocking to us how many people really didn’t understand much about the Bill of Rights. And so there were discussions about this, and it was a very rewarding experience for me.

ONEK: It must send a message from the top if you’re posting that in every classroom, that gets a message through to the cadets I would imagine.

GASCON: There’s no question, and we did it not only with the entry level people, we did it with in-service people. We had people that had been in the organization for 20 years that had never actually read the Fourth Amendment and what it meant to the work. They put into operation the principles because we had other training but the dots were not being connected.
ONEK: How much resistance did you get? One of the things you were really trying to do was to integrate ethics into every part of the police training, and I think for a lot of officers who had been there for a long time, ethics was, you take it for a couple hours and then you’re done with it, and then you get to the real police work. How much pushback do you get in terms of trying to really put ethics at the forefront of everything you were doing?

GASCON: Interestingly enough, once we had an opportunity to explain what is it that we were trying to accomplish, it was embraced by most. I think initially it was difficult because integrating ethics, integrating constitutional issues, integrating human rights concerns into police use of force is not usually done, and for many people it was sort of a foreign concept and getting a grasp around it was very difficult. I used to tell people, somewhat jokingly but, that we needed to get the guy with the 18 inch arms, generally the guys that are teaching tactics or use of force, and the guys with the three piece suit to come out together in the same classroom, and it was sort of funny but people started to get the concept. So I think that a lot of the pushback initially was because it’s
hard. It is much more easier to teach all these disciplines in a vacuum than to put it together, and then to test and calibrate the instructors to that integration. It requires a lot of work. After you teach about three hours of a block of instruction where you’re integrating all this stuff, it’s tiring, you feel like your brains are being sucked out, it’s much more difficult. But at the end of the day the quality of that training is far superior.

ONEK: You really made a name for yourself with that training, and when Chief Parks was forced out you put your name in to be Chief, and were backed by Latino and African American employee groups. But Bill Bratton who had previously been New York’s Police Commissioner got the top job. Bratton was on this program several weeks ago and I asked him what it was like to come in and work with a number of people who had wanted his job. His response was quote, I’m very comfortable having people who want my job. I am very comfortable that I can hold it until I’m ready to leave, and then they are welcome to it. And I want them hungry, I was hungry to get ahead. You go where the talent is and you have to have confidence that you can lead them. That was his take on it. How did you readjust after being passed over for chief to develop such a close working relationship with
the person selected in your place.

GASCON: First of all I have incredible amount of respect for Bill Bratton. Bill Bratton is one of the icons of the police profession, and I feel extremely fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with him. In addition to that I feel strongly fortunate that we actually developed a good close relationship that went beyond the professional, and that he saw something in me, and he gave me an opportunity, and I then, and I was able to grow and develop from there. I think one of the geniuses of Bill Bratton was that he identifies talent, and once he does and there’s a trusting relationship he sort of cuts you loose to go out there and excel. And for that was great, that was liberating, it gave me a tremendous opportunity to continue to grow professionally, and the years that I worked around Bill Bratton were very rewarding years for me and quite frankly part of my foundation.

ONEK: Bratton put you in charge of Comstat, the police accountability and management tool that he had implemented with much success in New York. He said on the show that you eat, breathe and live Comstat. What did he do to fine tune Comstat in L.A. and adapt it from that New York model.
GASCON: Well you know, there’s no question that there are cultural differences between the NYPD and the LAPD as there are between the LAPD and the San Francisco Police Department. And I think that one of the initial concerns when Comstat was brought in by Bill Bratton to L.A. is that it was too New York-like. In fact initially Bill brought in consultants from the east coast, and that was creating some difficulties for the LAPD, and I recognized that, and one of the things that I brought to Bratton’s attention, I said, I think that we can arrive at the same outcome, we just need to sort of tailor this to the west coast culture if you will. And Bratton agreed to do so and allowed me to move forward. I think I was just as harsh when I needed to be as the folks in New York were but I used local language, and I used local norms, and I think that was the difference. And the outcomes spoke for themselves. First year we were able to reduce Part I crimes when I took over operations by 17%, and over all during the period of time that I ran operations we reduced crime in L.A. by nearly 27%. And then I took the same model to Mesa, and in Mesa with the culture much like L.A., because Arizona is very similar to L.A. in certain areas, maybe not politically but the work ethics of the police officers. Again I was able to apply the same principles and had
a significant crime reduction in excess of 30% in three years of Part I crimes. And I’m hoping to do the same thing in San Francisco, and that’s where we’re moving forward. And one of the things in fact that I tell people in San Francisco often is that we’re not going to make SFPD LAPD, we’re going to take the things from LAPD that apply to San Francisco just like we took some of the things from New York that apply to L.A., and but we’re going to make sure that whatever we do in San Francisco is based on the norms and the culture of the San Francisco Police Department, and the San Francisco community.

ONEK: You already talked about one of the lessons you learned from Bill Bratton, and that is to identify talent and give that talent the freedom to excel. Can you talk about another important thing you learned about leadership from Chief Bratton?

GASCON: I think another area where Bill Bratton really excels is in his transparency and the way that he deals with the media. LAPD before Bill Bratton was a very introverted organization when it came to the media, and quite frankly that worked to the detriment of the community and worked to the detriment of the organization and the development of the organization. Bill Bratton has a unique style in dealing with the media that is
extremely open, is inviting. He does not avoid the media, he looks for it, he looks for ways both to tell the good stories about the police department, and he quickly also seizes the opportunity to talk about the mistakes. And I think that that proved invaluable for the LAPD over the roughly six, six and a half years that he was chief. And frankly I took that model to heart, I personally used it under his leadership when I was in L.A. concerning a variety of issues, and then I took that to Mesa. Mesa was an organization that was very risk averse, and very much and always almost in an adversarial position with the media. I turned that around and I think it helped the Mesa Police Department significantly, I was able to defuse very critical events including events that had occurred prior to my being there by just being open and being truthful. And I’m bringing certainly the same model to the San Francisco Police Department. I think San Francisco likewise was extremely media shy, and quite frankly not accessible to the media. I take the other route, I’m very open to the media, I gave out my cell phone number to all the reporters that covered policing. And sometimes it can be very taxing, I mean I could sometimes receive nearly a hundred calls in a day when there’s a major event going on. But I think on the other hand we were also able to communicate effectively with the public and have a
relationship with the media that is one of trust, that I think it goes a long way in order to enhance our ability to serve the public.

ONEK: How is your leadership style different from Bill Bratton’s?

GASCON: Well I think I’m a little more hands on than Bill. Bill is very hands off, and I mean that in a very good way. I think he has the ability to delegate to people and very quickly remove himself and move on to the next thing. I think I still have a little hard time doing some of that, although I delegate and the people that I trust, I do set them free and I try to select good people and give them the opportunity to do their own things. I still have a tendency to be more detail oriented. I’m more nuanced, I like to understand the inner working of things, and I recognize that there is a good and bad about that. I think that the downside of that sometimes that I read too much perhaps, and I think that the upside of that is that I also have a very good understanding of the inner workings of the organization on things that I do, so --

ONEK: It’s a delicate balance for a leader.
GASCON: It really is. And I think that Bill is much more, he identifies the right people and then he moves on. I try to identify the right people but I never quite move on fully at any time.

ONEK: Well speaking of moving on, in 2006 you moved on from Los Angeles to become Chief of Police in Mesa, Arizona, and you’re best known from your time there for your battles with the infamous Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio. Sheriff Arpaio conducted raids rounding up undocumented immigrants for deportation and you strongly opposed those raids. But before getting to that I want to talk for a moment about the relationship or lack thereof between immigration and crime generally. Studies by the Public Policy Institute of California and others show that immigrants are actually less likely to commit crimes than those born in the U.S. I know you looked into these issues in Mesa, what did you find?

GASCON: Well you know, this actually started before I got to Mesa. Having lived in L.A. most of my adult life, or most of my life, and within communities that are heavily immigrant populated, I knew intuitively even at a very early age that
immigrants are not anymore likely to commit crimes than the rest of the population. As I became a police officer and actually worked as a police officer in areas that were very heavily populated by immigrants I got to feel and work in those communities and understand the texture and the criminality within those communities. I also worked in communities that were not heavily populated by immigrants and again I knew from being on the ground that immigrants are not anymore likely to commit crimes. In fact many times they’re more like to be victimized which is the other way around. So as I transitioned from L.A., a very immigrant friendly environment to Arizona, a very immigrant unfriendly environment, I got confronted immediately by people talking about why crime was so out of control in Arizona, and how the immigrants and specifically those that were here without authority were the cause of all this crime. And I knew that that wasn’t the case, so I went out to actually research the issue and started to increasingly become more educated. I wrote about it, I wrote about it in The Republic which is an Arizona newspaper. I eventually had an article also published in the New York Times concerning this piece, but it was one of those areas where I was confronted, I had a local assemblyman at the time and one of the individuals that is actually widely known as one of the leading nativists
in the nation who confronted me one day and he was talking about how 90% of our crime in the City of Mesa was committed by illegal immigrants, and that’s the term that he used. And that was very early on. I think I had been on the job maybe for a week or so, we were at a community meeting and I said, you know --

ONEK: So he must have just been making that number up. Obviously that’s not accurate.

GASCON: Well, and that’s the problem. See what I started to realize is that those people were throwing those numbers out, and then I started getting into the internet and seeing some of the blogs that are primarily nativist driven and how people are quoting this outrageous statistical information that has absolutely no basis in real life. So then I went out to start cataloging our own crime problem as well as looking at studies like the ones that was conducted by Rubén Rumbaut in UCI that talked about the paradox of assimilation and how actually early immigrants to this country actually were less likely to commit crimes. And as we became more assimilated, first, second and third generation, regardless of what your ethnic background was, then actually your criminality or your prone to criminality
increase.

ONEK: Yes, that’s a fascinating study.

GASCON: Very much so. And then I looked at Professor Samson in Chicago did a similar study where they follow a large segment of the teenage population and did comparison and contrast between immigrant, first generation, second and those that had been here multiple generations. And again, if there was something that was distinguishable between the two groups was that the right to criminality amongst those that were second, third and fourth generation here were much greater than those that were newly arrivals. And I started to talk about this stuff, and frankly that led to an increasing debate about the truism or not about those concepts and it was very troubling to me because I noticed that the more factual that you tried to be, and the more that you tried to put out information in order to educate people it became more emotional, people just didn’t want to be confused with the facts in this case. So it was a very trying time for me, but it’s also very educational for me, and of course that also led to my battles with Joe Arpaio and his what turned out to be a very racist approach to policing.
ONEK: Well that segues right into my next question. Sheriff’s Office is currently being investigated by the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice in connection with the immigration rates we were discussing. You have been vehement in your opposition to those raids. Why did you find the raids to be so dangerous for public safety.

GASCON: Well the first thing that I found out is that, and just to put it into context for the audience that may not understand, in Arizona much like it is in California you have sometimes overlapping jurisdictions where you have a country sheriff that will police unincorporated areas of the county, and then you have police departments that are policing cities that are incorporated. So you have that dual jurisdiction that is floating back and forth, and then you have the Sheriff also handles the county jails. In this case what we had is we had, and Mesa being a city of nearly half a million people, about 30% of Hispanic ancestry, probably about 10 to 15% of the Hispanic population being here without documents, but many times connected to the larger Hispanic community as well as other parts of the community. And what I found out is that there was tremendous amount of fear for people, especially in the Hispanic community about talking about crimes, and talking to the police.
And one of the things just kind of moving back for a second to my experience in the LAPD and specifically what occurred during the Rampart scandal, is that although for different reasons and there were a different set of circumstances, what we found during that investigation was that there were many people in the immigrant community in the Rampart area that were very hesitant to talk to the police and report crimes because we had a very small group of rogue officers that would use the immigration tools to go after anybody that complained against them and their misbehavior, and that eventually created a scenario where people were afraid to report crimes to the police and to work with the police. And what you do is you sort of create a vacuum within the gang members and the criminal element starts taking over the community and eventually that impacts the entire community, not only the immigrant community. Well I saw evidence of the same things happening in Mesa where people had a hard time distinguishing between the Mesa Police Department and the Maricopa’s Sheriff’s Office, and people were very afraid of approaching law enforcement because of the raids and a lot of the hate speech and all the activities that were going around the anti-immigration raids. And it became obvious to me that I needed to take a stand, and I needed to number one, educate the community on the distinction between the Mesa Police Department
and the Maricopa Sheriff’s Office, and that I needed to challenge what was going on. And this kind of culminated, I probably was in office I think it was maybe less than a year or so, maybe right around a year in office, and the sheriff had done this, what he called immigration raids at the time in Phoenix. And one of the things that I noticed when he did so in Phoenix that the Phoenix Police Department made a policy decision not to confront the sheriff because it was concurrent jurisdiction, they should have backed off and let the sheriff do what they were doing. And that led to a situation where you had families of people that were coming in to protest the activities of the Sheriff’s department. And then you had those people that were supporting Arpaio’s point of view and quite frankly some of those people were carrying weapons, and it got to the point where it became dangerously close to people getting hurt. And I talked to some attorneys, some civil right attorneys that were actually at some of these events, and the fear that they experienced as they were being intimated by thugs quite frankly that were supporting Arpaio’s integration rates. And then Arpaio announced that he was coming to Mesa next because of course he wanted to show me how policing was supposed to be done in his mind, and I was determined not to allow that to occur in Mesa. So what I did is after communicating with a lot of
different folks, both pro and against the immigration issue, I said we’re going to create, where people are going to demonstrate we’re going to create speech free zones, and we’re going to divide it, we’re going to have one area that will be for those that are supporting Arpaio and what he’s doing, and we’ll have one area for the others, and we will put a line of Mesa police officer in the middle so that everybody can exercise their first amendment rights but do so peacefully. And we did so, and of course that became a major issue with Arpaio being terribly upset that he was not able to create the circus atmosphere that he wanted to do. And then eventually that led to sometime later for the Sheriff’s Office actually raided our main library and our City Hall one evening or one early morning at around 2 o’clock in the morning allegedly searching for illegal aliens, and that eventually led to my being invited to testify in Congress concerning those issues and all the hate that I got as a result of that and the threats against my life and many other things occurred during that period of time.

ONEK: I want to ask about a quote in a recent Time Magazine piece titled, What’s Behind America’s Falling Crime Rate? You were quoted as saying, increased sentencing in some communities has removed entire generations of young men from minority
GASCON: Well I’m very, very concerned with the trends for the last 25 or 30 years in fighting crime in America. I believe that we have created a scenario here where we have the highest incarceration rate of any first world nation, and most of that incarceration rate is impacting directly primarily the African American community, and thereafter the Hispanic and other communities. And I think that what we have done, and I’m not sure that it had been the intentional thing but certainly the unintended consequences of this process has been that as we overcriminalize our communities we have created a gap where we have removed entire generations of the male role models, especially in the African American community. And the impact that that has had in the African American Community has been devastating. I think that the norms that we see in many parts of our country in the inner cities where going to prison is not only an accepted fact of life but it’s actually something to be revered and perhaps celebrated. And
what that all means to the rest of the nation I think is extremely troubling. And I think that we need to rethink how do we achieve public safety in our communities, and I think that there needs to be a serious dialogue about what really works and what doesn’t work. I think that sometimes in our quest for reducing the numerical incidence of crime, and I’m not putting that down by the way because there is no question that there is a tremendous value to reducing crime, both in terms of economic value as well as social value. But we have to kind of look and create a balance here where we do no harm in the way that proceed forward, kind of the, sort of the medical approach to curing which is you want to make sure that in dealing with a problem you’re not increasing the harm and through unintended consequences. And I’m a strong believer that we in public safety have both a moral as well as an ethical obligation to start introspectively looking at the way that we approach crime fighting and crime reduction to ensure that we do not continue to perpetuate the trends that have basically taken over for the last 25 or 30 years in our nation.

ONEK: Time for two last quick questions. The first I want to ask you about is the costs of policing, an issue you’ve kind of taken leadership in. We first met a couple of years ago
at Harvard where I was sitting in on a meeting of the Harvard Executive Session on Policing that you are a member of. For that executive session you and Bob Fogelson of Harvard’s Kennedy School are co-authoring a paper on reducing costs of policing. I’m sure you couldn’t have imagined even two years ago the kind of budget deficits we’d now be facing in policing agencies around the country. Can you tell us a little more about the work you’re doing in that area?

GASCON: Absolutely. And you’re right, we’re ready to publish a paper hopefully out of the Kennedy School that will come out this summer. It’s been a work of love quite frankly. We started four years ago actually in 2006 when many people wouldn’t even give us the time of day when we talked about the fact that we believed and certainly I did for some time that the costs of policing in America was increasingly becoming unsustainable. The same thing by the way in Britain and Australia, so it’s not just a problem in the U.S., and that we needed to figure out a way to reduce the costs of policing. And in doing so that we had to start looking for other models and we needed to also look at a greater integration within the criminal justice system. One of the areas that concerned me greatly was that as we increased the costs of policing we were decreasing
the investment in other social services, parks, libraries, and other activities and services that should be provided by local government that actually if done well will eventually have a better impact in reducing crime than the suppression piece or enforcement that the law enforcement brings to the table. So Todd and I have been working on this and basically we’ve come to the conclusion that although there are many questions as there are answers on this issue, and a lot of the things that we do on our paper is actually just kind of provocatively put questions out for the profession to look at. But we have also come to the conclusion that if we continue to increasingly have greater costs for public safety through the models that we currently use that our model of policing in this country is going to be unsustainable, and the impact that that will have on the profession as people start looking for ways to reducing costs without perhaps paying attention to the continued professionalization of policing which is a great concern to me. So we talk about possibly developing different models where you have greater integration within the criminal justice system and other social networks where we start looking at crime sometimes from a very different paradigm, and frankly some of this speaks although indirectly to the issue that we just discussed earlier on the over criminalization within the African American
community and others where it may appear that we’re getting results by reducing crime, but we’re forgetting sometimes not only the economic costs but the social impact that we’re having with the over criminalization. Because arguably some people will tell you that economically it’s cheaper to perhaps reduce crime by warehousing people even though jails and prisons are very expensive, I know that there are studies out there that would actually if you monetize the whole process you can make an argument that this is still a cost effective way of doing business. I know others who will argue against it, but even if you put the monetary piece aside and you look at the social impact and the social cost in our society over long periods of time, I think it’s untenable.

ONEK: Final question. Given all that you have learned in your career thus far, can you give a succinct vision of where you see the San Francisco Police Department in three to five years?

GASCON: Well my goals at the San Francisco Police Department three to five years will be one of the most technologically savvy police departments, that we will have very high training, that we will have an organization that is increasingly smarter about the way that we deal with public safety and reductions
in crime. And over all that we will become a model for other agencies to look to. I think we’re at a tipping point, we’re at a good time in our life, and I’m very excited about the future for the San Francisco Police Department.

ONEK: George Gascon, thanks so much for joining us.

GASCON: Thank you.

ONEK: Please tune in next week when we’ll be joined by San Francisco District Attorney Kamala Harris. 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 Ekman. I’m David Onek. Thanks for listening.