



Qualitative Research

Focus Group #1

March 8th, 2020

Interviewer:

JeH. [inaudible 00:00:12] Hey, thanks so much for coming out, thanks so much for figuring out the time because I just heard somebody forgot to set their clock forward and didn't make it so I appreciate you guys being on the ball. My name is Interviewer, you met my colleague Interviewer. Actually it makes things really easy around the office. She's behind this glass with some other colleagues of mine they're just watching and she will likely come in at various times and give us a note but don't worry about that it doesn't mean we did anything wrong, it just means there's something they want me to ask you more about.

Interviewer:

If you guys have never been in a focus group room like this, so this is two way glass there's people on the other side. There's recording up there. We're doing a few of these groups over the next few days and so the main reason we record is because it really helps us go back and remember what different groups said. But it's not going to turn up on YouTube or anything crazy like that. It just stays with the research team. They are going to say a few things because this is a little different than the typical group that I do.

Interviewer:

There are going to be things that you guys all agree on and that's cool and there are going to be times when you don't agree and sometimes that's even more interesting. I really want to encourage you if you have a different perspective on what we're talking about to please speak it as much as you can and to please listen to each other as non judgmentally as you can. One of the things about a focus group that's cool is you're all strangers and you'll probably never see each other again unless something was going on that I didn't know about at the beginning. But you're not going to see each other again so anything you say in here is not going to be heard by your parents or your girlfriend or your friends or anything like that.

Interviewer:

So this really is an opportunity to be your honest self as much as possible. The other thing about it all being strangers is you don't have to convince anybody of your position and you don't have to defend yourself. The reason I'm saying all this is because we're actually going to talk about politics and it can be a little explosive and a little divisive. We'll just see where it goes but as much as possible we want to be respectful. That's all I ask. The last thing too is it's not school you don't have to raise your hand if you need to use the restroom or step out, get another snack, something like that, just go it's totally fine but

please come back because I actually have had people just disappear in the middle of the group and it's really weird. Because I have to go look for you and-

JeH:

That's awkward.

Interviewer:

It is actually really awkward so feel free to step out but come back. We'll be here for a little less than a couple hours. So the first thing I want to do though, I want to try and get to know you just a tiny little bit so we're going to go around and I want you to tell me what you do, how long you've lived in the Spokane area, excuse me, if you had a perfect day all to yourself what would you do? JP, why don't we start with you.

JP:

All right, I am JP, [inaudible 00:03:04] the name tag. I've lived here about four years now. And then what we do?

Interviewer:

If you could.

JP:

So I'm a full-time student, studying to be an aircraft mechanic.

Interviewer:

That's cool. And if you had a perfect day what would you do?

JP:

Perfect day, all right, it would be rainy because I love the rain because I'm from California so it never happened. And I'd be in a coffee shop with a good book.

Interviewer:

Nice and how often do you actually get to do that?

JP:

Not very often.

Interviewer:

That's why it's the perfect day. RJ.

RJ:

Name's RJ, I lived in Spokane area my whole life. I moved away once for a year but now I'm back. Love's what had me coming back.

Interviewer:

What's your perfect day?

RJ:

My perfect day would be probably out on a jet ski on Priest Lake.

Interviewer:

Nice.

RJ:

Just ripping it up and having a blast.

Interviewer:

Do you get to do that much in the summer?

RJ:

Oh yeah.

Interviewer:

Do you own a jet ski?

RJ:

No, but my buddies we have three of them out at their house. They're all super charged and we-

Interviewer:

That's even better, buddies with jet skis. That'd be better than having to own one right?

RJ:

I don't have to pay for any of the maintenance.

Interviewer:

Exactly.

RJ:

And we get to go out every weekend and enjoy the fun.

Interviewer:

Nice.

RJ:

We go fishing out there too, it's a good time.

Interviewer:

Cool. Hi, GA.

GA:

Hi, my name's GA. I've lived here my entire life as well. Let's see, I'm full-time-

Interviewer:

You're a student.

GA:

I'm a full-time.

Interviewer:

Cool.

GA:

And then my perfect day would be photographing the animals out at the local animal shelter.

Interviewer:

Cool. Do you volunteer out there?

GA:

Yeah, I do.

Interviewer:

Nice. Are you a dog person or cat person?

GA:

Dogs. They're easier to photograph.

Interviewer:

Really?

GA:

They listen.

Interviewer:

Why?

JP:

Big surprise.

Interviewer:

I know, that's a surprise, why are dogs easier to photograph than cats?

This transcript was exported on Mar 18, 2020 - view latest version [here](#).

GA:

Because cats won't do anything you ask them to.

Interviewer:

It's an obedience thing. I see. Do you have dogs at home?

GA:

I do.

Interviewer:

What have you got?

GA:

Two dogs, three cats, it's a zoo.

Interviewer:

Very nice. Hi TP.

TP:

Hi, I've been in Spokane for six years. My perfect day would be pizza and movies with my boyfriend.

Interviewer:

How often do you guys get to do that?

TP:

Not very often. He's deployed.

Interviewer:

Wow.

TP:

But 30 days.

Interviewer:

He'll be back in 30 days?

TP:

Yeah.

Interviewer:

That's exciting, wow. Cool. JOH?

JOH:

JOH, I've been in Spokane pretty much my entire life with the exception of three years when I went down to Tennessee, very, very different down there. Substitute teacher. Hoping to get a full-time gig.

Interviewer:

What do you teach?

JOH:

Social studies and English but realistically whatever I can get into.

Interviewer:

Elementary school?

JOH:

No, high school.

Interviewer:

High school.

JOH:

Elementary's tough. I've done a few times there and I'm always exhausted. Their energy is just so different. My perfect day would probably also be a rainy day watching new movie or maybe binging Lord of the Rings with my five cats. [crosstalk 00:06:50]

Interviewer:

Are they all rescues? Are they all from the same family? How do you have five cats?

JOH:

Various odds and ends. A couple of them were from coworkers, it's a long, one came out of a bush and I said, "Oh, we're keeping you." Another one I rescued. So basically all kind of rescued.

Interviewer:

They just came from all over.

JOH:

Yeah.

RJ:

They found you.

JOH:

Pretty much. We don't pick them, they pick us.

Interviewer:

Clearly a cat person. They know what they're doing.

JOH:

Ironic I'm allergic to them though. I've got five but it's worth it.

Interviewer:

If you say so, talk about that later. JeH.

JeH:

I've been here six or seven years now in Spokane. Perfect day I'd probably be camping. I like to camp.

Interviewer:

Where do you like to go?

JeH:

Out past the Bumblebee Campground is where we usually go. Way past the campground. We don't like to camp with people. We try to avoid that.

Interviewer:

Alone.

JeH:

There's a really nice spot out there that's right on the water so you can just let the dogs go, you don't have to worry about them.

Interviewer:

Very cool. I'm going to launch right into it we're going to watch some videos and get your reaction to the videos. I have a handout, hold on. Sorry, you guys are the first group so bear with me, everything's a little. Get this started. And I have to remember not to lick the page, do that things where you ...

GA:

I've seen that video so many times.

Interviewer:

Have you?

GA:

She's like, "Just avoid touching your face."

Interviewer:

Don't touch your face.

JP:

It's awesome, I know. I kept watching it over and over.

Interviewer:

There's hand sanitizer over there if anybody feels like they [crosstalk 00:08:49]

GA:

I always touch my face. It's bad.

Interviewer:

So let me say a couple of things about these videos before we watch them. I'm going to show you three. They're only about 30 seconds long so we can play them again if you want me to. These are very much works in progress so try not to focus too hard on wordsmithing it or making sure it's the perfect words. We want to know what you're getting basically from the video, what the message is. And then think of it as something that you might see on Instagram or something like that. It's not necessarily a TV commercial although I don't know ultimately what will happen to them.

Interviewer:

And then on your sheet, here I'll put it up here. These are the questions that go in each box. What's your reaction? What are they trying to tell you? What's the main message? Did you learn anything? Is this different from videos you've seen? And then, how much does it motivate you to vote? We're going to talk about voting too. Let's watch the first one is, let's see which one is going to be first? The first one is M, M like Mary, so if you'll just put M down. Everybody got a pen that works?

JOH:

Video M.

Interviewer:

Video M. the other thing too to tell you guys is that I want you to keep your poker faces on as we do this if you will. We're going to talk about them obviously together as a group but I really want you to write your notes and make that your personal thing. Right, so be stoic as you're writing. Here we go with M.

Interviewer:

Sometime, sorry. Sorry, is that [inaudible 00:11:20] surface though. Let's try this again. That's it, you guys are the first group.

Interviewer:

Does anybody want to see it again?

Interviewer:

(silence)

JP:

Could I maybe see it again?

Interviewer:

Absolutely.

GA:

What happens if we run out of room?

Interviewer:

Keep writing and I'll give you another sheet.

GA:

I write big.

Interviewer:

You can write on the back.

GA:

Sorry.

Interviewer:

Whatever works, no, no, that's totally fine I realize we didn't give you that much space.

TP:

Are you looking for complete sentences?

GA:

That's another good question. [crosstalk 00:14:20]

Interviewer:

It's really not an essay piece, I promise.

RJ:

I just wrote [crosstalk 00:14:27]

Interviewer:

As long as it's legible that's totally fine.

GA:

That they're all in order.

Interviewer:

Feel free to flip the page over and do more or whatever you need to do. Are you guys almost ready for the next one?

JoH:

Do you want us to try and get all of those?

Interviewer:

As much as you can-

JoH:

Just to get our ideas flowing?

Interviewer:

More to get ideas flowing.

JoH:

I put little dots next to each one of mine. They just look a little jumbled.

Interviewer:

Ready for the next one? GA you want me to give you another minute?

GA:

Just 30 seconds would work.

Interviewer:

JP you ready for the next one?

JP:

One minute.

Interviewer:

The next one is P.

Speaker 9:

There are 331,000 jobs directly attributed to clean temp. Each one of these turbines cost about three million dollars, the problem, most of them have been built overseas.

Interviewer:

Does anybody want me to play it again?

TP:

Can you?

RJ:

Yes, please.

This transcript was exported on Mar 18, 2020 - view latest version [here](#).

Interviewer:

Yup, okay, ready.

Speaker 9:

There are 331,000 jobs directly attributed to clean temp. Each one of these turbines cost about three million dollars, the problem, most of them have been built overseas.

Interviewer:

That was me, sorry.

GA:

I thought it was me.

Interviewer:

All right the last one is, I'm sorry, it's not the last one. It's the last one of this set. But it's U, it's super short so I will probably play it more than once but after you write U look back up at the screen because it's going to come and go very quickly.

Interviewer:

Let me play that again. Is everybody ready?

Interviewer:

(silence)

Interviewer:

So before we start talking about them at the bottom of the page you'll see a star and what I want you guys to do is put a star next to the video that, if you saw it as an ad for a candidate or you saw it connected to a candidate on Instagram, whether it was a presidential candidate or a local candidate, would most make you want to know more about them or make you likelier to support them. So star the one that's the most motivating.

Interviewer:

RJ, which one did you put a star next to?

RJ:

I put a star next to video U.

Interviewer:

Next to U. GA, which one?

GA:

Same one.

Interviewer:

U. TP?

TP:

M.

Interviewer:

M. JoH.

JoH:

M.

Interviewer:

M. JeH.

JeH:

U.

Interviewer:

U. And RJ, sorry, JP.

JP:

P.

Interviewer:

JP did P. Let's start with U then, since that's the one that got the most stars. What did you guys think? What did you think it was trying to tell you? Now we talk. You've been writing, now we talk. So those of you who said U, what was it about that video that was working for you?

JeH:

It wasn't right versus left.

Interviewer:

It was not right versus left and why did you like that better, JeH?

JeH:

Because it works off of anything but anger. People tend to get angry when they see the opposite of whatever they believe but this is very much universal, it affects everyone. I think that's kind of the point.

RJ:

That is also what I took away from that. I liked how it was not saying, I wrote, it's unique. It's saying, "Vote red or blue." And not one or the other. It's just saying vote who's best for the world as itself.

Interviewer:

Does that sound like something different than you're used to hearing?

RJ:

I'm used to just slander from one side to the other about, they do these issues and then, that's actually all a lie, here's stuff against that. And we do this and they don't do that and this is more, I like it because it's more neutral. It's neutral ground.

Interviewer:

It's neutral.

RJ:

I think that's the best word to describe, it's a neutral commercial.

JeH:

And it literally affects everyone. It's not one side's job to fix it I feel like.

GA:

That's what I liked. I agree with you guys, it wasn't a red issue or a blue issue, it's a people issue. It's something, like you said, that affects us all. And it was really about unity I thought. Just coming together to solve this issue.

RJ:

With the B roll they showed the views from the hurricane help, stuff like that and people banding together just in a time of disaster need we don't care who is who as long as it's being helped.

JeH:

It's not your people versus our people.

Interviewer:

It's not you versus us. And what's the, this is going to sound like a dumb question but what don't you like about the you versus us? What's wrong with [crosstalk 00:25:02]

JeH:

I think everything's a people issue. That's how I feel. I think everything's an everyone issue. Most of the time.

Interviewer:

Everything's and everyone issue. It's not a red issue or a blue issue or democrat or ...

JeH:

Or even a race issue, any one group of people I think most issues quite literally affect everyone and I don't think people look at it like that. It's someone else's job to fix it versus everyone.

JoH:

This is one of those few issues that really it's nonsensical that it has become so divisive. We all need earth. We all need clean air. We all need clean water. That used to never be in dispute but somehow it's gotten to the point where it is in dispute. The fact that we need to have an ad that says, "Hey, we should all care about the air." [inaudible 00:25:45] fighting over this. I think everybody would appreciate getting onto some solid ground, both in terms of metaphorically, we can finally agree on something. But also we don't want giant sink holes opening up. We don't want horrible natural disasters occurring. It is controversial but I like the fact that this is trying to undo the years of controversy.

Interviewer:

Undo the controversy.

RJ:

It shared a lot of the same qualities with video M as well too though with the nature impact and the climate impact of it. What I draw from that is they shared it a lot, all three videos shared the same similarities but U stood out the most as the neutral standpoint. [crosstalk 00:26:27]

JeH:

All different kinds of people also.

Interviewer:

What do you mean when you say that, JeH?

JeH:

The M video obviously it feels because it's a kid, I feel like that's pretty obvious for a lot of people that kids are easy to feel something for. Adults maybe not. But different races, people working, people being helped, helping people. It's just different points I think.

Interviewer:

Let's see. It sounds like you guys are saying U is pretty different from other political messages you're seeing lately.

RJ:

Much different.

JP:

I think the other videos that we see are, "Oh, to get the vote I'm just going to entrench myself in this side or I'm going to entrench myself in that side." And I like the idea of going in the middle in that way. Or "Hey, this is an issue that isn't going to be solved by just entrenching ourselves in our sides and so we need to just come together on this issue. On other issues too but on this issue is important."

Interviewer:

How do you think you would feel about a candidate who had this kind of, it's a human problem or we should all come together, it's not a this side problem, that side problem.

JeH:

As long as it didn't end with, also I hate this person. That's how often they lead in with really good stuff and you're like, "Yeah, that makes sense." And then at the end they're like, "Also, we hate them." [crosstalk 00:28:01] So that throws it off because you're like, "Yeah, I get that." And then you're like, "Oh, you suck too."

Interviewer:

So you want just that's the message, it's enough. Just say-

JeH:

I think the point should just be the message not about how someone else is not. The more you have to point out someone else's issue the less you're really focused on the issue I feel like.

RJ:

Save that for the debate.

JeH:

Right.

RJ:

Save that for the actual presidential or political debate between parties where questions like that can be answered.

JeH:

It just puts you in a bad mood. When you see stuff like that because it sounds good and then you're like, "Hm, this is kind of irritating." It's not different from the person that you're talking about. It's all the same just a different point of view.

JoH:

I can't help but wonder how much the political system makes life almost impossible because the fact that there are basically two major parties. If somebody's going to step up and become a politician they have to go with one side or the other. That automatically makes it an us versus you sort of thing. In the whole attacking thing even if somebody comes out as not necessarily, "Oh, I don't like you." If you are in one side and you're talking about this issue that we need to do something I think that automatically becomes something that the other side can then use against you. It's how much ...

JeH:

Do they have control?

JoH:

Exactly. Or even if somebody came out and said, "Hey, just vote for the person who's going to do the best for the planet but I'm running and I'm going to be with this party so you got to vote for me on this party and not them." It's almost like, how can we do that. We almost need a third party agency that's

not involved with the politics that promotes this. A lobbyist group that would actually promote this instead of just private interests. Maybe a public interest lobby.

Interviewer:

Help me understand. So you're saying we need something, we need somebody in the middle who's not beholden to either side-

JeH:

Because you can't expect them not to ask for votes at the end. I feel like that's what you're saying, right?

Interviewer:

Not ask for votes at the end.

JoH:

Yeah.

JeH:

During their ad or whatever it is, even if they're trying to be neutral like that at the end they're still going to say, "Hi, my name is-

Interviewer:

And I approve this message."

JeH:

Right.

JoH:

It's like, you need to support the person, "I am that person. And if you're not voting for me you're not supporting the right person."

JeH:

And you can't really expect them not to do that. They're trying to get votes. So if you had someone in the middle that's an interesting thought I've never really thought of that.

JoH:

Independent.

Interviewer:

I guess I don't know all the ins and outs of campaign finance law and all that stuff but it seems like potentially you could have a third party present something like this and not necessarily say, "Vote red, vote blue." But just say, "Vote."

JoH:

Yes.

Interviewer:

[crosstalk 00:30:55] vote for somebody who will work for the planet. Does that work for you kind of?

JoH:

Because obviously they could say do that but then it's like, you sound like the person who'd probably be best to do that but you're the independent and you can't, the whole system, there's just the two main ones and if you're outside of that you're ultimately going to either funnel away votes from the right person because they share so many opinions but that's kind of where we're at with this whole Bernie Sanders thing. He was the outsider for a long time, "Hey, just do smart stuff, make smart choices." Now he's like, "Yeah, that wasn't working out so well so I'm going to throw my hat in the ring but I've got to do it with these guys. So now I'm on this side's and I can't really be the independent person who could have agreements on both sides. Now I'm on this one side."

Interviewer:

You have to pick a side. You feel like you have to pick a side.

RJ:

In order to win you have to choose a side it seems.

JoH:

Even in the primary thing before you can actually vote for the candidate you need to say am I a Democratic supporter, am I a Republican. There's not even a third choice anymore.

TP:

I've always thought that was ridiculous.

Interviewer:

How many of you guys voted in the primary or have voted yet in the primary?

RJ:

I filled it out this morning.

Interviewer:

You filled yours out this morning.

GA:

I haven't sent mine in.

Interviewer:

You have one? Did you get a ballot? You haven't done it, GA?

GA:

It's filled out. I've just got to mail it.

Interviewer:

You haven't sent it in yet. How about we hear from the end of the table about this idea. Just this idea of is it enough for somebody to just say, "Vote for people who," maybe in a way of, "We don't even care whether they're Republican or Democrat. We want you to vote for people who are paying attention."

TP:

That's why I like that because they didn't say which way, it said, "Vote red or blue." It's not telling you which party to support. [crosstalk 00:32:34]

Interviewer:

You like that.

GA:

Leaving it up to people to do their research too. I think that's another problem.

Interviewer:

Is that a good thing? Oh no, it's a problem.

GA:

I don't know, it could be a good thing or a problem. It depends on who's voting. Because if you just see that stuff and then you know who puts it out there and you're like, "Oh cool, that makes sense." But if you don't actually ... because then you actually have to know past an ad because everything is supposed to sound good in an ad, that's why it's an ad.

Interviewer:

Let's talk about M, the couple of you who had put a star by M. Tell me about the little boy.

TP:

The babies, it just pulled, I'm not even a mom but it just pulled at the maternal in me that I want to protect my future children. Who cares what happens to me, whatever. But I want a better world for him.

JoH:

And that seems like one of the few things everybody could agree on. I doubt you're going to find somebody who's anti children. [crosstalk 00:33:36]

RJ:

I've one or two [inaudible 00:33:39] of kids.

JoH:

Even people who are iffy on the whole climate change issue they're still going to be like, "All right, I don't really want to leave an earth that's partially on fire and partially under water for my kids. That sounds bad."

TP:

Most people care about their kids.

JeH:

Most people care. No one's anti kids.

TP:

It was a good way to go. It makes sense.

Interviewer:

GA what did you think of that one?

GA:

I liked it. That was actually the one I was going to star before I saw the last one. I like the words, the verbiage they use. It was short and to the point. I think that really was one of the, and the song behind was also-

Interviewer:

You liked the music too?

GA:

Yeah, it just really complimented each other.

Interviewer:

Other thoughts about M? Or the kids?

JP:

I think it was a little weak in its message. I like the idea and the stance of taking the, let's look at the future generation and that's the reason why we should try to clean up the earth is for the future generation but it was a little, I don't know how you could correct it but just having a boy walking around was a little weak. [crosstalk 00:34:47]

JeH:

Easy, I feel like.

Interviewer:

What was? You got to say more. What was?

JP:

I just thought it was ...

Interviewer:

JeH said it was too easy, is that what you're thinking or?

JP:

Not too easy. I thought it was a little too soft in approach. It didn't really, "Here's our message, here you go." It was easily to just like, "Oh, look there's this cute kid." But not really paying attention to the message as much. I thought.

RJ:

M was my least favorite commercial out of the three. I thought it was the least motivated and I didn't like it.

Interviewer:

How come?

RJ:

The fact-

Interviewer:

You don't have kids do you?

RJ:

No, I don't have kids but I think the overall message was to vote is what I got from it but I think using future generations is almost a fear tactic in the getting voting done and that's why I did not like that approach at all is because it's enticing fear that if you don't vote the right way you're kid's going to grow up in a shitty area. Pardon my language. You know what I mean? That's what I got from that. And the music behind it, having words inside of the song, not a music band, that was very distracting as well from reading the message. I didn't really learn much from that one. I retained the least from that commercial and I didn't like it the most out of all the other three.

Interviewer:

That's interesting.

TP:

So that one appealed to women.

Interviewer:

Is that what you feel?

TP:

Well, it sounds like. Because as you explain that [crosstalk 00:36:20] Totally. But as you explain that actually I'm like, "Actually that makes a lot of sense." That's what it was, it was weak but I was like, "Kids though. Oh, the cute little blond boy."

JoH:

Won't someone think of the children is such a common-

TP:

I don't like that it was a fear tactic actually now that you say that. I like, okay, they took advantage of me.

RJ:

And true for you if you already currently have kids or have a child that is in that age range of what that commercial was, you're looking at more than an eight year time zone to be more than two terms for anything to be even put into effect or to be effecting your kids. It's more of a too long reach. Too long term. They need to show that 16 year old individual that's ready to go out of high school and venture on into the world and be something. Not the children that are-

JeH:

But we're not all going to go "Kids are cute at 16." We're going to be like, "We don't like them."
[crosstalk 00:37:13]

RJ:

It wasn't real, they steered toward the message that I partially received from it was trying to promote.

Interviewer:

That's really interesting. Then you just said, "Wow, now that I think about it I feel like they took advantage of me."

TP:

I was being a little sarcastic but kind of because I'm like, "Yeah, that just makes sense, women like that stuff."

GA:

I fell into a mushy little ball over here and he was like, "No."

TP:

Mostly, I guess I wasn't that mushy I was just like, "Well, that's obvious." But I felt like it was, at the moment, I felt like it was strong because it was obvious. This is an obvious thing to shove in your face. But it's also shoving it in your face so it makes sense.

Interviewer:

And then what about P? What were your reactions to that?

JoH:

I liked that because I know I've had a lot of conversations with people who tend to lean a bit more conservative and tend to be iffy on the whole climate change and one of their big things is the economic aspects of it. Is it more profitable to do the status quo or to mix it up? I think talking about we can be creating jobs, we can be investing in the future, we can be going ahead of the curve instead of trying to do catch up. I think that would appeal to people who might question, "Oh, is this apocalyptic in nature." But just a practical standpoint of even if it's not this could make us money and provide jobs and stuff.

JP:

I liked P because where the environmental issue seems to be more of a blue issue for whatever reason and I like the stance that it's like, "Okay, hey, let's look at this issue that we should all be caring about but look at it from a conservative kind of view. Hey, this is how it can strengthen our economy." And I feel like you can get both sides in that way. "Hey, we're strengthening the economy, we're furthering the economy, we're bringing jobs." Which is what the red side or what I feel like the red side is-

Interviewer:

More focused on.

JP:

More focused on and then also, "Hey, we can also improve jobs and improve the environment."

Interviewer:

When you think about conversations with people you know who might think differently politically about it, is that economic, if there was such a thing as green jobs or a way we can invest in green technologies, whatever, is that believable for them?

JoH:

Ish.

Interviewer:

Ish.

JoH:

There's a lot of complaints. There's like, "Oh, solar panels heat up the surrounding area and can cook birds." And stuff like that. And it's like, "Maybe in Arizona or something like that but the vast majority of other places probably not." I hear the turbines. "Oh, they disrupt the natural beauty of things." It's like, "Who's cutting down forests and stuff like that but you all don't usually have an issue with deforestation." Or that it's-

JeH:

There's always a counter.

JoH:

There's always some sort of negative that it's like, "Well, nuclear plants could potentially explode and fossil fuel stuff poisons the air. You can literally go to any place and you see there's an uptick in respiratory illnesses and stuff like that." So there's not going to be a perfect solution but if you can say that there's ultimately more benefits to one solution over another they tend to listen to that. It just takes a while because they've got a lot of defensive stuff they've had built up that [crosstalk 00:40:37] exactly.

GA:

It doesn't matter what side you are I think that's the case for everyone. [crosstalk 00:40:42] I know what you're going to say so I'm preparing a response, I'm not really listening to you. So once you get past all the prepared responses then you can usually get to a conversation, sometimes get to a conversation.

Interviewer:

How hard is that? How much do you find that you just end up talking to people who think the same things you do and it's harder to talk to people who don't?

RJ:

I don't normally try talking to people about issues like this because my-

Interviewer:

You just don't try at all?

RJ:

A lot of times [inaudible 00:41:15] in my head I think I'm more superior than a lot of people I talk to about things. Such as climate issues and other stuff like that and a lot of people-

Interviewer:

You feel like you just know more?

RJ:

Yes, exactly. I'll fully admit to that. I feel like I know a lot and other people don't seem to agree with that and so it doesn't really work out for me so I just quit.

GA:

That's a really honest statement.

RJ:

I just quit trying to argue with people because I just get way too verbal and you know what I mean? It escalates and people get, I have a loud booming voice and a lot of people that talk to you will have that same voice back at you and when we're talking about an issue, per se. And it just doesn't lead to many places.

Interviewer:

That's interesting.

GA:

Throughout my high school, so four years I participated in a YMCA youth legislator program. So we talked about politics and creating bills that we would then discuss. We did discuss a lot of political issues. We would meet over at the Capitol actually in Olympia and meet with other delegations, groups of kids from all over Washington where we would then discuss these politics. Throughout those four years it was a really cool program but we all learned how to communicate with kids our age with different ideas. Because we all had a problem that we wanted to solve but a lot of us just had different ways of going about it and so discussing it and discussing why we thought this was the right way really helped me and I think the other kids on how to tackle serious issues. Because we were all talking about the problem not attacking the person.

Interviewer:

And I was just going to ask, so what is it that you guys learned? How did you guys learn how to do that?

GA:

No one wants to destroy America. No one wants to bring it into the ground. We all want the best. We just have different ideas to get there. I think understanding that and understanding that the person who has a different belief than you really helps facilitate a conversation. It is difficult, as you said, when you're trying to talk to someone and they don't want to hear what you're saying. All they do is shout back at you what they believe. When having that conversation both partners in the conversation have to be receptive. You have to have that open mind. And you have to go into it with an open mind and even if you strongly believe what you believe you've got to, why do they think this way? There has to be a reason.

Interviewer:

So trying to dive a little deeper into what their motivation is, what's behind what they're thinking.

TP:

I think it's always more sensitive when you talk to someone close to you too. Unfortunately I think you're less likely to listen, more likely to respond and-

Interviewer:

Why do you think that is when it's someone close to you?

TP:

I think we often take it for granted, that relationship that you think that you can just talk to them however you want because you're close to them. Whereas a stranger I'm not going to walk up to them and be like, "So by the way did you hear this?" And if the response isn't what I was expecting, unleash. People don't generally do that with people they don't know. Or you just avoid it completely and don't talk about it. Because you don't want to deal with that.

Interviewer:

Well, you don't want to fight-

TP:

But it's easier to fight with your significant other or your sibling or your mom.

Interviewer:

It's easier to fight with them?

TP:

Because it'll be fine. They'll be fine.

Interviewer:

So it's almost safer in a way even though it's also-

TP:

Meaner.

Interviewer:

Right.

TP:

It's not very respectful to just think you can talk to someone however you want but I think it tends to be when you're closer to someone it's easier to let that ...

Interviewer:

I'm surprised.

TP:

And sometimes just expect that they're going to think the same way because you're so close.

Interviewer:

That's the thing I was wondering about. Tell me when you talk to your friends do you just assume that they think like you do when it comes to stuff like this or politics.

TP:

Some of my closer friends I do, my outsider friends I just don't talk about it because I know that we have different views. So we know that each other are complete opposites and we just don't discuss it.

Interviewer:

Any other thoughts about these three? And then I'm going to show you guys the last one. Did we cover everything? Here come Interviewer.

Interviewer:

Sorry.

Interviewer:

No, that's totally fine, thank you. That's an interesting question. We were talking about how you guys like the U, the unity one that was, "Vote red, vote blue." Do you think a message like that or a candidate that had that kind of message would actually get you to vote across a party line? And is it any different at the local level or the state level for governor, senator and at the presidential level?

RJ:

Is it different at the local compared to presidential level?

Interviewer:

In terms of your willingness or interest in, "Oh wow, I saw this message from the candidate I really want to support that candidate, oh by the way, they happen to be not what I-

JeH:

Just across party lines.

Interviewer:

Just across party lines.

RJ:

I think on a local level, yes, I would more support a candidate that's more neutral because they're not saying, "I'm part of one of these parties. But I'm saying open your eyes to both." So I think it's ...

JeH:

An ad wouldn't make me, no. But it would make me more receptive I think. But I wouldn't see an ad and be like, "That's how I'm going to vote now." There has to be followup still I feel.

RJ:

In the thought process.

Interviewer:

Absolutely. You need to learn more about the candidate or whatever's behind it.

JP:

I think just having the message of, "Oh, just vote anyone." Isn't really as, "Oh, wow, I am going to vote for them." Right. But I'm saying if someone had a message, like the P video, of "Oh, hey, vote for me I'm also showing these issues and oh, hey, I'm a different party than you might think." I might look into that.

JeH:

I think that's a better lead in. I agree. I think that video had a better way of crossing party lines a little without you really knowing it. Whereas the other one was openly, "Do what you want." Which, everyone likes to be told to do what they want.

JP:

But then cross party lines I don't think they would.

Interviewer:

RJ, you said it might be different locally versus state wide or nationally. Say more about that.

RJ:

At a local level if I saw a commercial or ad that was for voting red or blue, for option A or B I'll call it. It would make me do more research at a local level. But when it comes up to the presidential level those are much bigger decisions to be made than at the local level is. So the presidential level helps impede the local level decisions because it's a trickle down effect.

Interviewer:

So you're generally stick with your party?

RJ:

I would generally stick with my party for the presidential but for local I'd be open to looking at more options to see what would be best for me locally because I know the things the president's going to do is going to take some more time to get down to a local level to affect me. So I'm not going to have the time to be affected by a new policy to it actually being put into place where I'm going to see results from it are two different things.

Interviewer:

That's fair. TP what do you think about, would something like this make you consider somebody-

TP:

It would open the door for sure.

Interviewer:

It would.

TP:

Because I'm I would say slightly one way but not so far over. So I'm still in that line where, "Oh, I can see that opinion." And same with local. Local I think I have a bigger understanding. But presidential it's basically you're right or you're wrong, you better get the right one. So that one's a little harder to discuss.

Interviewer:

That's interesting actually. I want to make sure I understand so you're saying at the local level, so we're talking about city council or mayor or school district or whatever it is that you vote for locally, it's not quite as red on one side, blue on the other side and you can't live in this center.

TP:

They're more inter mixable and everything, I think.

Interviewer:

And then what keeps that, hang on just a second JoH, what keeps that from trickling up? Why isn't it like that at the state level? Why isn't it like that, what do you think?

TP:

I don't know.

Interviewer:

Is that a scenario you wish were true? That is was this mixable, I like that word that you used, as mixable at the higher levels as it was at the local level.

TP:

I wish it wasn't so right or wrong.

GA:

I don't think there should be red or blue. I think that's the biggest problem actually that there is such a divide and there is no room for anyone in the middle. As far as presidential goes.

Interviewer:

Go ahead, JoH, I cut you off.

JoH:

Local versus national when we talk about Democrats versus Republicans, Democrats and Republicans at the national level have to represent everybody from every state. Whereas local Democrats and Republicans they're just representing this area and we tend to have way more in common with our neighbors here in Spokane than we do with people down in Alabama or California or New York. So the whole talking points that have come to define that Democrats and Republicans largely don't represent the average American's interest or needs. It represents the large, big talking points that can get people riled up in social media circles or the dinner table or whatever.

JoH:

Ultimately the local politicians they're not running on Roe v. Wade getting repealed or national health care. They're going on, "Yeah, we need to probably put some more money into fixing up these streets. The potholes are horrible." [crosstalk 00:51:56]

Interviewer:

We're going to talk about this a little more later but when you go to vote are you pulled more by wanting to vote locally or are you pulled more by that at this national level we have this huge divide and I need to make sure I end up on the right side of it.

JoH:

Probably national for me because I'm constantly getting bombarded with stories that are making me panic about there's a new epidemic going around and did you hear what Trump said about this country? Now their banned and all that sort of stuff. Every day, oh my god, we got to do something about this. The country is falling apart. [crosstalk 00:52:37] don't hear much about local elections. You don't hear

about it's heating up the TAV taxes or whatever. You hear a little bit about that but I was ill informed until right about the voting day and it was like, "Oh, wait, this is actually serious. I wish I knew a little bit more about this because this is going to impact the funding that we're going to have for the Department of Transportation and stuff." I didn't hear about that because I was so burnt out hearing about how the country is going to end tomorrow if we don't go out [crosstalk 00:53:13]

RJ:

You don't focus on this-

JoH:

Exactly.

RJ:

It's going to destroy us.

Interviewer:

GA what do you think about that local, state, national?

GA:

I think they're both equally important but I do agree that local is more personal because it affects you spot on. But I do think that presidential has a place of importance because it is those big issues that they're talking about and I think that-

Interviewer:

Do you think if you go out in November, are you going out mostly because you want to vote in the national election or further down the ballot or is it just the whole voting exercise?

GA:

For me it's the whole voting exercise because my vote matters I think.

Interviewer:

TP what do you think? What pulls you in if you do? Or at the same time, which one keeps or makes you throw your hands up? "I'm not voting, I [crosstalk 00:54:14]

TP:

The national. I'm just like, "I'm just a small fish in a big pond with the local it's affecting me it's my community, my neighbors." That one definitely pulls me in more.

Interviewer:

Let me show you guys the last one. I think I know what you're going to say about it.

RJ:

The perfect time to open this it's going to be loud.

Interviewer:

They're super focused on getting you to cross party lines. One question is-

GA:

Of course.

Interviewer:

Well, yes or no, whatever. Is climate change important enough of an issue to get you to consider crossing party lines or voting for candidates you might not have otherwise considered? If they talk about climate change, is that important enough?

JoH:

Yeah.

GA:

Yes.

JP:

No.

JeH:

I'm not a stick with the party person. I do usually but I'm not. I don't-

Interviewer:

It's more a question of if you think about all the things you want a candidate to talk about and say they're going to address. Where does climate change fall in that list?

GA:

That's harder.

Interviewer:

That's harder?

RJ:

Middle to the bottom.

Interviewer:

Middle to the bottom. It's not high enough on your list.

RJ:

I know we need a healthy planet and healthy world but what we can do in the US is, due to our population size and the land masses that we own and have and can take care of, it is no where near a

type of debt that we need to make. We can make it better for ourselves in little sectors and areas but the whole rest of the world's climate and all that is all going to crap, it's all going to affect us either way.

Interviewer:

So you're saying we don't have control over the whole planet.

RJ:

No, we don't we're a small, even though we're the US of A we're small in numbers compared to everybody else in population size, in land mass ownership, you know what I mean in all those areas. Where our actual carbon footprint in the US, I've heard very different numbers, but it's relatively a lot lower than other countries are so you would need to continue to do our part but I don't think that that should be our big issue for us as our own country. I think more of our economics do, you know what I mean, plays a bigger role. The economy is number one on my list when it comes to voting for a president. Is what they can do for our economy, not what issues can they fix with the different birds out here or different things like that. I care about that but it's lower down on the list.

Interviewer:

What do the rest of you guys think about climate change? Is it higher up on your list or lower, in the middle?

JP:

I would say it's a little higher than-

Interviewer:

A little higher than for RJ?

JP:

Yeah but it isn't like, "Oh, I'm going to choose the candidate based on his stance on climate change."

Interviewer:

That's not the only thing.

JP:

It wouldn't be the only thing, no. I'd look at the other things. I would definitely look at it too but [inaudible 00:57:04]

Interviewer:

JeH what do you think?

JeH:

I think that makes sense. I don't disagree with that. I think on a whole world level that makes us smaller. But I don't think it's not important enough to do it because we're not the whole world. I think I wouldn't say that it's at the top of my list now that I think about everything but I would say it's somewhere in the

middle. I still think it's important enough to do more than what we're doing even if it's not going to change the whole world, no.

Interviewer:

That makes sense.

JeH:

But people see what works too and if it works then maybe it changes someone else's view and then that's how the ball gets rolling. I don't know.

JP:

I think there's also the point of us being the United States of leading by example is also what I thought of when you were saying that. And so we aren't the whole world but we can at least lead by our example. And what we can do to help the world is, "Hey, we're cleaning up our environment and look how great it is for us." And then maybe, because we can't control the rest of the world, but that's the way that we can impact it. Lead by example.

JeH:

I feel like we often act like we're this superior nation so maybe, I don't know. I think we should lead by example, I think that's a good way of putting it.

Interviewer:

Let me show you this last one. This is R for your sheets.

Interviewer:

Go ahead and write for a minute first and then we'll talk about it. Does anybody want to see it again?

RJ:

Yes, please.

Interviewer:

You ready RJ?

RJ:

Yes.

Interviewer:

(silence)

TP:

Could I get a different pen?

Interviewer:

You need a pen?

TP:

Yeah. It ran out on me I think. Well, it works on here but not on here.

Interviewer:

You know if you stick the pad underneath it, it might work better too.

TP:

I was trying that and it wasn't but thank you.

RJ:

Restroom real quick.

Interviewer:

Sunday afternoon, right. It's nap time. JP I'm going to let you keep writing but we're going to start talking. GA what'd you think?

GA:

I thought that it was interesting. It was definitely, I felt like it was different. I'm not sure if I can pinpoint why but it just seemed like a different ad. My reaction to it was at first I thought it was interesting because I felt like it was combining the elements from the other videos of the technology, of the unity. But then it was a little off putting for me, it felt a little divisive when it was saying voting against Trump. It just seemed a little divisive and a little off putting. Casting him as an enemy and maybe even the Republican candidates as an enemy.

Interviewer:

So you think it went beyond just Trump and to all the stuff we've been talking about how [inaudible 01:03:36] divisive. TP what did you think?

TP:

I felt the same. I was like, "Oh this is a really good ad." And then when they came out with that I was like, "Okay, you lost me." And also it's like, "No, I didn't know that stuff." I want to go research it but I feel like you just threw him under the bus on that one. Give me why he made it easier. I know it's just an ad and it can't go in depth or anything but it did leave me [crosstalk 01:04:00]

Interviewer:

So you were interested [crosstalk 01:04:03]

TP:

Right, but it's also don't put his name on there without the whole picture I guess you could say. I'm not saying he's innocent by any means but it was just-

Interviewer:

Not enough information.

TP:

It was very off putting to see that.

Interviewer:

That's interesting. Other reactions.

RJ:

I didn't like that video.

Interviewer:

How come?

JeH:

I didn't either.

Interviewer:

You didn't like it either.

JeH:

It's a sure way to make people defensive no matter what side you're on. You're just pissing people off.

JoH:

If you're already pro environmentalism you're probably already kind of anti Trump so this is not reaching the people who need to be convinced to support this issue. It's going to instantaneously alienate them because they're going to see, "Oh, it's anti Trump, this is fake news, this is for [crosstalk 01:04:44] media."

JP:

It's in that realm.

RJ:

What I got from that is president Trump currently now is trying to destroy the USA with these policies.

JeH:

It's very ... it's not unique either. It's very much like we've seen. I feel.

RJ:

That is not unique at all. They're just pointing the finger at somebody else that's in power.

Interviewer:

Whereas the other, excuse me, the other ones did have the newness to them that we hadn't seen before.

JeH:

There's nobody's stamp on it. That's the only thing that's different about it.

RJ:

I'm a bunch more receptive to these first three commercial to entice me to vote in a good way than this one. This actually made me very motivated to vote because I wanted to vote-

Interviewer:

Mad.

RJ:

Yes, exactly. I was getting mad.

Interviewer:

This might be kind of a funny question but if getting mad is going to get you to vote then why wouldn't they just want to make you mad?

JP:

But it's getting mad for the wrong reasons. It's like the Bloomberg ads that just flooded the media and it was like, "I'm going to stop Trump, I'm the one who did." Eventually the [inaudible 01:05:56] like, "No you're not, we don't want you, go away and stop." I get that you're seeing that hating on Trump is in fashion-

Interviewer:

It didn't work.

JP:

That was all that he had.

JeH:

It almost did at first because that's what he ran off of. It made sense. The only motivation I would have is to shut that down. Shut down the ad. Nobody wants to see that I feel like.

RJ:

The way it motivated me differently is the ad was obviously looking to motivate people away from Donald Trump. After seeing that ad it makes me very motivated to vote for Donald Trump given my anger from the ad of seeing them point the fingers at any of their sources. If they were going off that type of impulse vote which a lot, I guarantee a lot of people are impulse voters. People impulsively do everything and we love it. It's new, it's fresh but that one it motivated me in the wrong direction of the initial ad was probably trying to take me to. I imagine the main source that I was trying to steer me in one direction but now due to base not having sources or reputable facts I'm going to look into this

research more. But if I find that research to be false I'm very motivated to vote for the person that was in that video because their information was lies.

JeH:

If someone would have stamped that at the end, this is my ad. I wasn't going to vote for Trump anyways let's just throw that out there. But I would ultimately think that's someone I don't want to vote for. That's a blue party I don't want to vote for. This isn't how you do it. It's almost a moral thing to an extent. And I know they don't have control over everything but if all you're doing is pointing the finger you're not really telling me what you're going to do. You're not really telling me anything about you. You're just saying this person sucks. We already have that.

RJ:

Point the thing to the Department of Energy that's the one in charge of a lot of these decisions and letting these gas companies make these choices. The President has some say but it's all these different sectors that-

Interviewer:

Before it started bashing Trump, the early stuff about rolling back protections for water quality and air quality. How much was that new to you guys. It's something you had not really heard about or knew about or anything like that?

JoH:

When I heard who he was going to put in charge of the EPA I knew that this sort of stuff was going to happen. I haven't heard about these specific instances but if you're going to put somebody who's pro coal, who doesn't believe in climate change, who is literally the head of a gas company just before doing this, obviously he's not going to have the environmental interest in mind. It's going to be the corporate interest. So this was not too surprising.

Interviewer:

If you had to pick one or the other.

JoH:

I wouldn't say that too.

Interviewer:

I guess what I'm asking is, is it worth keeping some of what's in the front at the beginning of that video, that educational stuff about here are some things that have been happening.

JoH:

Propose solutions, don't just finger point. We've got so much projection, deflection and being like, "Oh, well what about what they're doing." We need solutions we don't need more finger pointing. We don't need more insults. It's gotten so childish. I think everybody just wants somebody to step up and be an adult and be like, all right, I could point the finger, I could do the easy thing be like, "Bad Donald Trump, he's really bad vote for me." But I want somebody up here being like all right, well, what are you actually going to do about it? Are you going to reinstate the old things. Are you going to take it another step

further and actually undo whatever damage has been done? I didn't see anything about that I just saw there's this problem, he did it. So be mad at him.

Interviewer:

Not here's how we're going to fix it or here's what we're going to do to make it better.

TP:

I think part of it could be kept if it led like that. This is what I'm proposing, this is what happened to make me propose it. Solution before problem maybe. Everyone knows what the problems are. I feel so overdone. This sucks, this sucks, this sucks, this is why. It's exhausting. It's so old. Nobody's doing anything different. They're all doing the same thing.

Interviewer:

Let's talk a little bit about where you guys are in the whole climate change discussion. On a scale of one to 10, where one is, "No, it's really at the bottom of my list of important things and I don't really think we need to be worrying about it or investigating or doing anything like that." And 10 is, "It's absolutely at the top of my list, there's nothing more important for us to be working on." Write down the number on your sheet first and then tell me what-

RJ:

On the bottom or back of it?

Interviewer:

Doesn't matter just write a number somewhere I'll remember what it is. So JP, where are you?

JP:

I'm about a six.

Interviewer:

You're a six? JeH what are you?

JeH:

I wrote five but I feel like it really depends on what you give as, what are the options? There's a million things, topics, important topics.

Interviewer:

I'm just asking at a most basic level, do you think that we should be doing absolutely anything and everything possible to address climate change? That would be a 10. Or, "No, don't even know why we're talking about it, everything else is more important." That's a one.

JeH:

I'll give you five.

Interviewer:

You're a five. JoH, what are you?

JoH:

Eight.

Interviewer:

You're an eight. TP what are you?

TP:

I wrote two but I think that's just because I'm not nearly as informed.

Interviewer:

There's no judgment, you can be a two. That's okay. GA what are you?

GA:

I wrote five hyphen six. Somewhere in between.

Interviewer:

RJ, what-

RJ:

I almost wrote six and then I wrote five.

Interviewer:

You're also a five to six.

RJ:

Six was my first thing and then I was like, you know what I'm going to knock that down one.

Interviewer:

I want to ask this in a different way because we're still trying out this new way of asking it. Ordinarily, if I was in sales, I would say, "What I have to do to get you into a 10?" Right? "What do I have to do [inaudible 01:12:07] But I actually have the opposite question which is, "TP, why aren't you a one or even a zero? What is it-"

TP:

Because I know it is important. People are talking about it.

Interviewer:

Well obviously people are talking about it but why do you say, "I know it is important." Why do you even say that?

TP:

I went to California and the paper straws. I get there are steps so I understand we're working towards it but I guess I don't understand the whole, why it's being pushed so hard right now.

Interviewer:

So you feel like, I don't want to put words in your mouth so let me make sure I understand where you are. So you feel like it's not as critically important to take action. You feel that might be because you don't feel like you know enough about what's going on or why it would be more critical than you feel like it is. Got it.

Interviewer:

And those of you who are in the five to six, why aren't you twos? Why does it get you to be in the middle of the scale? What is it about what you know or what you think about climate change or how we should address it? Why aren't you a zero?

RJ:

Why am I not a zero? I'd say because I want to see a brighter future because I'm still young. I'm 24 years old and I hope I live until 80, you know what I mean? Let's say the average life span's 79, I hope, by that time anyway. So I'm planning to live another 45, 50 years hopefully and see what can happen with that. Hopefully that's feasible for me to watch and see happen. It's not something I'm going to be dead and gone and my kids are going to see it. It's so that I can actually will be able to see a change up.

Interviewer:

When you hear the phrase climate change and you think about, I put it as relatively important, what is it that you're thinking about? Is it pollution? Is it species loss? Is it deforestation? Is there one thing? Is it just a giant thought? Is it seasons being different?

RJ:

My main importance is looking at the rainforest and these special zones of forestation and plants and species that are used to make most of the vaccines and other different things like that that we are running out of. I'm looking at it that way is we have special resources that are being destroyed and we aren't doing anything about it. And to preserve those resources that we're using them and growing more of them in those areas to harvest them basically but for the greater human good.

Interviewer:

Got it. That's interesting.

RJ:

So that's my point on that. I see that we have a lot of stuff we need to utilize and we need to protect that. But we have a few more things that need to get taken care of before that, that's why it's in the middle but not at the bottom.

Interviewer:

How about the other fives and sixes?

JP:

I think I put it as not a zero, to answer your question, because seeing the deforestation and the loss of populations of animals is just like I want to be able to see that. I want to be able to go down to the Amazon rainforest or something like that to see it. I don't know. And to have it there for my children or the next generation is important to me. But, again, there's other topics I feel` are more pressing for right now that it's more in the middle. Where, if it was literally on fire all around us it would be more about a 10.

Interviewer:

You think it would be different if we lived in Australia? For example, if we lived in Australia?

JP:

Yeah. Because you're seeing it right for yourself. Or I'm more of a five because I'm more hearing about this stuff rather than ...

Interviewer:

Than actually experiencing it.

JP:

I think if I was living in China with the fog of the smog around me then I'd feel a little different about it.

Interviewer:

GA were you the eight?

GA:

No, five to the six.

Interviewer:

You were also five to six. Why are you in the middle? Why does it even get your attention?

GA:

I jump back and forth between it's super important to a five, maybe not so much because I am a huge animal lover and so the deforestation and the animals losing their habitat and then species going extinct and seeing what's going on in Australia just tugs at my heart strings and I want to do something to help. But it's not like I can buy a plane ticket and fly down to Australia and start rescuing baby koalas.

Interviewer:

So that's why you're in the middle? That takes me to another question which is that, I guess on a scale of one to 10 how helpless do you feel to actually as an individual have an impact on it? Where one is, "There's nothing I can do." And 10 is, "Yes, I can fix climate change."

GA:

I would say maybe four to a five because some things I can do is vote, I know voting changes it in the law. And I know that lots of non-profit organizations they're organizing drives like cleaning up the beach and there's ways for me to help but finding those ways and getting plugged in can be a little difficult.

Interviewer:

Sorry, who was the eight. Was that you JoH?

JoH:

Yeah.

Interviewer:

Why not a five or a six? What tips you up into the higher end of the scale?

JoH:

Because there's so many different facets of the climate change issue a lot of people just talk about rising temperatures, carbon [inaudible 01:17:54] there's so many other aspects to it like the acidification of the oceans, the degradation of the coral reef, the over fishing and the collapse of the food chain in the ocean which is going to have ripple effects on, there's all kinds of stuff like that. Then there's, of course, the intensity of the natural disasters we see more hurricanes hitting the southeastern United States we've seen. And then I also know about the history of the entire earth and mankind and stuff like that and how lucky we actually are to have even gotten to where we are-

Interviewer:

Really, without decimating ourselves.

JoH:

There was so many times that we should have died off and gone extinct-

RJ:

Diseases all that stuff.

JoH:

Yeah, major volcanic eruptions that causes temporary ice age. So we take everything we have for granted right now. We live in a particular era of comfort and excess that has never been achieved ever and, not only that, but even just more recent history. If you look at the dust bowl and stuff like that and how it reflects how ecologically unsustainable our system of agriculture is and how we just doubled down on it and used to be we'd have 50% of the population supporting the other 50%, we have 2% of the population supporting 98% and they do-

Interviewer:

You're talking about the population of farmers.

JoH:

Yeah and the way that they do it is by using heavy amounts of chemicals, pesticides, coming up with new resistant strains of crops and stuff like that. That in and of itself is not sustainable. The actual economics of the farming system is not sustainable because they are crippled by debt and then the amount of subsidies that it takes to actually keep, that alone is crazy.

Interviewer:

You seem to know a lot about all of these definitions or at least you have a grasp of the breadth when we talk about climate change. How much of this list of things JoH was talking about, TP, have you [crosstalk 01:19:49] that's really interesting. So then the question is, who do you think is responsible for implementing what needs to happen to take action on climate change? Who's responsibility is it? Is it governments, is non-profits, is it you guys sitting around the table, you and your friends and your family? Who's?

JP:

I think the environment issue is such a huge issue because there's so many facets as you were saying and I think going government is not the best response but I think it's the most effective response.

Interviewer:

Government is.

JP:

Because they can set forth bigger, I don't know the name of it, programs. Where a non-profit or a for-profit type they wouldn't get the vastness of-

Interviewer:

It's about who's got the resources to actually [crosstalk 01:20:49]

JP:

They have the most resources out there.

Interviewer:

Government has the most resources. What do the rest of you guys think? TP who do you think?

TP:

I think the government has the biggest push. They can regulate it everything.

Interviewer:

With regulation itself. If the spots that we had watched actually had candidates talking about these things, imagine the U version with a candidate saying, "Climate change isn't a blue issue or a red issue it's a everybody issue." Or a candidate talking about, "We can invest in new technologies and there are jobs to be had and we can address climate change that way." Right. Or a candidate talking about, "We need to protect the earth for our future kids." Which of those things do you want to actually hear candidates talk about? Or is it more about let's talk about agricultural system or maybe it doesn't matter, maybe it could be any of those things?

JeH:

I think pointing out the, he obviously knows more about that than I do but I think that's the point. Nobody's talking about all of these things. Someone's talking about the ocean and someone's talking about the literal change that we're seeing and someone's talking about this or that but nobody's talking

about all of it. Everyone's going to react to each of those things in a different way, like she was saying, like the koalas, they pull out your heart strings. That's one way to appeal. But there's a lot of different issues, that's probably not even the tip of the iceberg. So a different approach talking about all of it would be different it would be something I would want to see.

Interviewer:

Not just using that blanket statement we have to fix climate or we have to address climate change or we have to take action.

JeH:

Because it's easy to say, "That's not a thing. I don't see that, that's not a thing." If I don't see it, I don't feel it, it's not real kind of thing. But when you really point out these are all the reasons why I think it's more real. Someone's going to have a different reaction or feeling or whatever to that. Some way to connect to it.

JoH:

Make it more personal. Like you're saying, climate change is such a big general nebulous term. But if you say we need to fight forest fires and people remember, "I remember a few years ago when it was so smokey I couldn't step outside. Yeah, we should do something about that."

Interviewer:

That makes sense.

JeH:

And you don't just get a yes or no. It is or it isn't when there's all these different little things you can see and touch and feel and have, I don't know.

Interviewer:

So find a way to connect it first essentially. So if one of these had been like, "Hey, remember those forest fires a few years ago when none of us could breathe all summer long?"

RJ:

Yeah, that was terrible.

Interviewer:

Your vote could influence that or your vote could make a difference in helping that not happen more or something like that. I got a couple more things I want you guys to look at. This goes a little bit along with the P video. Sorry I licked it, sorry. Totally I'll put those here and pass those down. Every time I touch my face, have you guys seen the Anna Kendrick thing? She's like, I think it was on Twitter, right? And she was like, "You're telling me not to touch my face now all I'm going to do is touch my face."

JeH:

She's hilarious I love her.

Interviewer:

She is pretty funny.

RJ:

Especially when you have a bruise, ouch this hurts, but, again, I'm going to touch my bruise a few more times until I just forget about it.

Interviewer:

Read through these things, again, they kind of go with the P is for prosperity is the way that we're thinking about it. Just a prosperity message, it's an economic opportunity. Do any of these also grab your attention or how do you feel about these if they put these in?

RJ:

Wait, can you repeat the question?

Interviewer:

The question is just what do you think of these statements as well along with that idea of economic opportunity. Are there any of these that really jump out to you as like, "Oh this is, yeah."

GA:

Jobs.

Interviewer:

Jobs.

JoH:

The saving money.

RJ:

Yeah, that one.

JoH:

Do you know how many people are just counting every penny, working paycheck to paycheck? The concept that you could save a sizeable amount of money every year just by having solar panels that would speak to the vast majority of people. They look at carbon footprint, the average person doesn't even know what that means. They kind of know what carbon means and they've probably made a footprint before in the sand, that's as far as they get. The 10 million jobs, that's also so abstract. Is that going to be 10 million new jobs in my town? Am I going to be able to get a new job?

Interviewer:

But that, "Hey, wow, 30 K a year."

JeH:

If you're talking left or right I feel like the jobs matters. If you're trying to swing right I feel like jobs matter, I don't know.

Interviewer:

Does that feel, like JoH was saying, what do you think about the idea that 10 million jobs is just too abstract a number? Or is it just like, "Wow, 10 million new jobs?"

JeH:

I don't know. It doesn't speak to me personally but I could see why that would help, I don't know. I'd want to know more information about it but in ads you don't get a lot of information it's very just here's the point now go look at it or research it.

Interviewer:

GA what do you think?

GA:

For the first one the 10 million it is a big number and so when we hear such a huge number like that it's sometimes hard for us to wrap our mind around it. Maybe connections, this new job could help your family, your friend, your boyfriend, your sister or your mother in law. By connecting it in personally, people are like, "Oh, I know that." And then it brings it in a little more. For the last two just looking at those just statements in itself are suspicious for me. I look at it and I think, "Okay, so Home Swiss solar panels save 10,000 to over 30,000 a year on energy costs. Well, who saves? Is it the home owners? Is it the government? Who's saving that because it's just vague. Because you look at homes with solar panels and those things are expensive. Same thing with the electrical vehicles. Those things are also really expensive and so they cost less, what, after you buy one? They cost less to-

TP:

When do you start seeing the savings?

Interviewer:

When do you get those savings?

TP:

And I don't feel like those apply to me. I have never had a solar panel, I probably won't ever have a house with a solar panel, nor will I ever drive a Tesla but a job, I need a job.

Interviewer:

That makes sense, TP, thanks. Doesn't apply to me.

JeH:

But the money, I mean maybe not the actual statement but the money part I think is still big because people associate a high expense with fixing it up. If we can say that we'll spend money here more specifically, not in 20 years you'll see some savings from this electric car. People need immediate gratification. They just do.

RJ:

It's on the windows.

Interviewer:

[crosstalk 01:28:29]

RJ:

I have a slight fascination with electric vehicles. I'm planning to purchase one in the next two years. This is almost accurate. I've seen numbers and done a lot of research on it. You're looking at about a 70% energy savings. Or 30% less fuel costs compared to electric for your power because you have to pay for your power to charge your car. Per mile type difference though you're looking at about 30% less which, overall, is savings over time. 30% less is 30% less no matter which way you look at it.

Interviewer:

When we're talking about electric vehicles, this is a total side track but I'm curious. Is it more important to talk about it being cheaper to own one than it is to talk about how they don't put out any CO2 emissions?

JoH:

The cost.

JP:

The cost.

RJ:

The cost.

JeH:

I feel like to reach everyone I think it's easier on price point.

Interviewer:

It's going back to that, "Tell me how you're going to save me money." That's what this is about.

RJ:

The new Nissan LEAF for 2021 is supposed to be under \$25,000 price point brand new for a 2021 year with all the technology in it too.

JeH:

That speaks to people.

RJ:

They're going for affordable rate. The new Chevy Volt, you can buy a used Chevy Volt for under five, six grand now. And still have a 200 mile range on it. You're looking at cost, yes, Tesla's are super expensive

but, yes, does Tesla also make very cheap, affordable cars? A brand new model three dual motor is \$35,000 with your tax rebates if you're a certain resident.

Interviewer:

You really have spent some time.

RJ:

Hours and days of research on EVs.

Interviewer:

But that's the kind of thing that can sell people. Because people care more about money.

RJ:

And I was a car salesman in the past too. But I look at this because with electric it's helping out with that environmental impact with is. If something can last you longer and I don't have to go fill up at the 7Eleven right there on Division specifically, ever again in my vehicle, then so be it. Joe Rogan drives a Tesla but he's like, "Do you know how much life changing this is? I haven't gone to a gas station or convenience store in over four months." You're saving money right there that way too.

Interviewer:

That would be an instant [crosstalk 01:30:48]

RJ:

You look at this recently, just one last thing, sorry, I'm off on a little tangent but the 10 million jobs, that's worldwide by 2026? I don't care about worldwide jobs, I care about jobs right here in the USA. Nine million of these jobs could be in China. You know what I mean? And 500,000 could be here, another 500,000 could be in Russia or somewhere else.

JeH:

It needs more information.

Interviewer:

I see that.

RJ:

If you're talking about US jobs, how many US [inaudible 01:31:20] will be employed there-

Interviewer:

Talk to me about the farmland one. So JOH, you were alluding a little bit to what's going, the degradation of farmland and pesticides and all that kind of stuff. What could we say about farming, changing farming practices or something like that that would be meaningful? If anything? This statement has a lot of science behind it, if we optimize farming for cropping pasture. Basically what that means from what I understand it's farmers typically till up everything at the end of the season and if they just left it to compost they'd have to use fewer pesticides they could keep more carbon in the soil.

It's that kind of stuff. So changing farming practices might reduce how much carbon goes into the atmosphere. But is that just not personal enough.

JOH:

I really don't think so.

Interviewer:

You're not farmers, your families aren't farmers.

JOH:

That's one of the big issues with the climate change. Not only do people not understand it but the average person cannot afford to care about this stuff. They cannot afford to invest in the expensive or potentially cheap electric car. It used to be really expensive. They can't afford all this stuff. It's sort of like Maslow's hierarchy of needs. If people are generally just paycheck to paycheck worrying about how they're going to keep the roof over their head and food in their mouth. They don't care about worldwide lofty goals about reducing numbers that they can't even conceive of, stuff like that.

JOH:

They care about stuff like saving money, getting cheaper food that is healthier for them. That sort of stuff. And I think that's where, ultimately, the discussion about climate change gets lost from Washington, D.C. to the average person's home is, "Yeah, you all don't have to worry about basic necessities." Or you can have all these conversations about what we need to be doing but for the average person they don't care about that. It's more like if you're going to do something about it make sure we have a job. That's what they care about. More personal.

Interviewer:

If I ask somebody to make it personal.

RJ:

Sure, for the money. Farmers are in it not to reduce their carbon footprint they're in it to find the best and most effective way to grow crops year after year and improve those numbers. They're not looking to redo their whole way of lifestyle they've been farming their whole generational lives on that same land. They're looking at how can I fit more on here and do that? They're looking at for the buck. Not for, "I wonder if I redo my farm and invest this four million dollars into my one million dollar farm am I going to reduce my carbon footprint?" That's not I don't think for a farmer that's a high note, do you know what I mean? Unless you a tax breaks from the government.

Interviewer:

There you go. That's what I was going to say. Then you've got to start getting into incentives or policy changes that move these things along. GA anything else on here? I have one more handout for you guys, I'm going to check with the folks in the back, we're just about done.

GA:

Nope, I'm good. Don't have anything.

Interviewer:

All right, on this last one I really want to invite you guys to be honest. Nobody is going to see this but us. It is a question about how likely you are to vote in the next election. And you don't have to share if you don't want to when I come back. Please be honest. I'll be right back.

RJ:

This is interesting. This is not what I expected it would be. Actually I didn't know what to expect but I'm glad I participated.

Interviewer:

You guys have been totally awesome, thank you so much. We are done unless anybody wants to talk more about voting or not voting or what gets you to vote.

GA:

We already managed to have this many people without an argument. I feel like [crosstalk 01:35:32]

Interviewer:

I would say we should high five but we're not supposed to so should we just do elbow bumps on the way out? Thank you so much it's really been incredibly helpful we really appreciate it. I will just say please vote.

RJ:

Do your part. [crosstalk 01:35:51]

Interviewer:

Whoever it's for. Go vote. Thanks. Leave all your stuff.

RJ:

[inaudible 01:35:55] to the P. Diddy vote campaign, the vote or die. When P. Diddy did that.

Interviewer:

That motivated you?

RJ:

Vote or die. [crosstalk 01:36:04]

Interviewer:

In Australia you get, you're supposed to vote, you get a