



**Clean &
Prosperous
America**

Qualitative Research

Focus Group #3

March 12th, 2020

Interviewer:

[inaudible 00:00:18]. All right. Let's see. Perfect. We're all set. We're good. Do we all feel good? Excellent. All right. Well, first thank you for coming down today. My name's Interviewer and I will be leading our discussion today. First I want to just thank you so much for coming down here. I know it's been a fun week, for lack of a better way of putting it. So we'll be here for two hours.

Interviewer:

I couldn't be asking you a bunch of questions. There are a few rules about focus groups. I don't know. Has anybody been in a focus group before? No, I don't think so. You're young enough where you haven't gotten into the filter yet. Okay. Perfect. So the fun thing about focus groups is, I'll be asking you questions, but this isn't school, this isn't... I want to talk to you and I want you to talk to each other, and I want to have a good conversation over here.

Interviewer:

So feel free to talk to each other. But there's a couple of rules and that is, try to speak one at a time and respect each other's time, but we don't need to raise our hands or anything like that. Everything is being recorded and that's just to help me. We transcribe all of these things and report them to our clients. So it really helps us go back and look at what's been said. But nothing that happens in this room ever leaves this room. This is the circle of trust.

Interviewer:

So none of this is going to be on YouTube or Instagram or TikTok or any of those types of things. We're safe. We are safe in here. Also I am an unbiased party when it comes to the questions that I'm asking today. I actually was honestly pulled in at last minute, so I have nothing invested in anything that we're showing you today. So you don't have to worry about hurting my feelings or anybody's feelings. So with that, I want us to all introduce ourselves. And we will be talking a little bit about political issues and sometimes those... That everybody here is here for a reason. That's because you all have different opinions.

Interviewer:

So that's fun because you actually get to talk about political things with people that will be level headed and speak their minds, and say things and we're not going to get into a weird boxing match or anything like that. And I need to tell somebody one thing real quick, and then we will get it fixed. [inaudible

00:02:51]. Perfect. Can I get to you [inaudible 00:03:09]? So because of today's viral situation, you get to hang out with Spokane people.

Interviewer:

And I'm talking normally the clients actually behind this meeting, this mirror, but they couldn't fly in today because they're all under quarantine. So with that said, I want to just go around the room... If you could introduce yourself and tell me how long you've been in Spokane. And then if you had a super power, tell me what you think you would like to have. It could be anything. And I'd like to start in the middle. I want to go with JOC.

JOC:

Okay. My name's JOC. I've lived in Spokane for about a year and a half. Oh, Gosh. My super power. That's a hard one. It's Google for the brand would be nice.

Interviewer:

Google for the brand? All right.

KW:

KW.

Interviewer:

KW. Okay.

KW:

Well, I'm KW, obviously. And I've been in Spokane for about a month now. I just came from Texas. And if I had a super power, I would love to fly.

JaC:

Hi, I'm JaC. I've lived in Spokane for 15 years before that I was in Mount Vernon. My super power would be super speed, which I've tattooed on me. That's pretty much it.

JK:

I'm JK and I've been here for three and a half years. If I had a superpower, I'd be able to heal wounds instantly.

CK:

My name's CK. I'm from North of Spokane, but I've been in the area while entire life. And my super power would be able to talk to computers.

MS:

I'm MS. I've been in Spokane my whole life, and I probably read people's minds.

GH:

I'm GH. I've been in Spokane my whole life. And my superpower would probably be to mess with time. I'd go back in time or stop it, or make a full pass.

Interviewer:

Perfect.

AA:

My name is AA, and I've been here in North Spokane about my whole life, and I really liked the idea of flying.

Interviewer:

Perfect. All right. Well, before we start talking about things too much, I want to show you a couple of video clips. And so I'll pull them up here. I'm going to show you three videos. And if you want to just take one of these sheets and pass them down. There should be one for everybody. I'll play these to you one at a time. These are some ideas [inaudible 00:06:08] for videos that you might see up [inaudible 00:06:11] Instagram. But they're really rough. So keep that in mind.

Interviewer:

What I want you to provide and evaluate in these videos is answering those five questions at the top for each one. But we don't need to worry about details like production value, or those types of things. That's for another focus group. So we're here to just feel what you think about the messages and what they're trying to tell you. And I'm going to start. So the first video is going to be video S, as in Sam. So if you want to write that one down. And I'll play them twice, so you guys can digest them.

Interviewer:

Hang on. Let me start because you need sound. [inaudible 00:06:57]. So I'm doing two things here. [inaudible 00:07:06]. This can work. [inaudible 00:08:02] to play it one more time and [inaudible 00:08:03]. I'll give you a few moments to write your thoughts on that. [inaudible 00:09:31]. If you want that pretty good penmanship, I might be in luck. And I don't think I added this. We want to keep our poker faces on while we're watching this, because we'll talk to each other about what your thoughts are. Because that way you don't sweat your neighbor's thoughts.

Interviewer:

All right. Our next video is going to be video L, as in Larry. Let me see if I can pull audio. [inaudible 00:11:56]. All right. I want to set it one more time. Try not to spoil anything. All right. Are we ready for our last of the three? This one will be P, as in Paul. [inaudible 00:17:11]. As you're going though, make sure you answer all the questions. And feel free to make sure that each of your boxes are complete and we really want to understand what your reaction is to the video and what they're trying to tell you and what you see is the main message, what new things you may have learned, how is this unique from other videos that you see on the topic? How does it motivate you to vote?

Interviewer:

And then once you feel like you've filled all the boxes and you completely feel good about what you've written down, put a star next to the video that makes you most want to go vote for candidates that support climate change action or learn more about them. You feel good.

KW:

Almost.

Interviewer:

There's no hurry.

KW:

All right.

Interviewer:

I feel like now it's show and tell time, we've been so quiet. So what I would like to know is just... Put all of our letters [inaudible 00:22:53]. S, that was the first one. Then L was the second one, and then P. Okay. Who marked S as their favorite? Who put the star on S, anybody? One. Perfect. And who had L as their favorite? Who gave L a star. All right. You three [inaudible 00:23:28], not miss anybody. JaC, GH and JOC. Okay. And then how many... That would mean the rest of you chose P, is that correct? Okay. I hope everyone has. [inaudible 00:23:40]. It can be questionable.

Interviewer:

All right. So let's start with S. So Charlotte, you were the only one that had S as your favorite. What caused you to do... What made you to put that star on that one?

GH:

I don't know. I think it's important that we watch littering and stuff. And I think we should recycle. Because that's a big help and...

Interviewer:

That's what resonated with you on that one?

GH:

Yeah.

Interviewer:

What about anybody else? Did you have any thoughts on S that stood out? Especially with all these notes we've got here? What was your initial reaction to that one other than it was the first one?

JOC:

It got strong message.

Interviewer:

Okay.

MS:

Yeah, it's thoughtful. It seemed like a more thoughtful video [inaudible 00:24:45] in your face, "We have to do this now."

Interviewer:

Okay. [inaudible 00:24:50]. All right. The three that selected L as your star, the one that prompts you to support candidates for climate change. Why was that one your star?

JaC:

Well, that one had more of an encouragement message showing that Spokane pollutes, which I didn't realize it pollutes as much to the video. Because it just shows that it's polluting so much. So I feel like it's more important to stop pollution more than anything.

Interviewer:

Okay.

JK:

My reaction was concern and inspiration, which is to me a call to action, to make better choices, conscious choices while you're grocery shopping and things you do every day.

AA:

One of the things I thought is that it didn't... It was the least of things. I thought it gave a direct like this is what's going on, this is what we need to do about it. It prompts you to do research into what's actually going on, and proposes an actual solution.

Interviewer:

Cool.

GH:

One thing I liked about that is that it had a little bit of information that I thought a lot of people didn't know.

Interviewer:

Which was?

GH:

That the government actually subsidizes industries that are harmful to the planet. I don't think everybody knows that. But that's pretty cool.

Interviewer:

And P. P was our most popular one with four of you. Although we've got an even split on most of these. So my P supporters.

KW:

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

I thought it was just really high energy, and when things are more high energy, you tend to gravitate towards them more, at least for me.

AA:

As I hear pretty high energy pretty... I feel like it had the biggest call to action.

JK:

Yeah. I thought that one was really concise. I feel like that one's the shortest, so it got to the call to action quicker. But it had the same strong unifying message as the first one, but with this more powerful call to action, like the second one.

Interviewer:

Okay.

CK:

I think addressing climate change itself was a lot bigger than the other two, which was just clean energy and pollution, which do contribute. I think addressing climate change as a subject was a bigger priority and more meaningful.

Interviewer:

Cool. What do you think are... What do you think these videos are trying to tell you?

JK:

I think they're trying to tell you to remember climate change in the environment when you're building, and making decisions.

Interviewer:

Did anyone try to tell you something different than the other?

MS:

No. I feel like all three of the videos pretty much had the same main idea, which was positive choices for the environment.

CK:

Yeah. All of them address that it doesn't matter what side are voting for, that it's a relevant topic for everyone.

GH:

Yeah, [inaudible 00:28:22].

CK:

It was more of getting against Democrat or Republican or red versus blue. Just that we all need to do it, that was topic in every video.

Interviewer:

So did any of the videos tell you anything new? Did you learn anything from any of them or not necessarily or inaudible? No? All right. How would you say for any of these videos unique from what you already see on this topic that stand out to you?

GH:

Definitely they were all positive.

Interviewer:

All positive. Is there any one that stands out more than the others or...

JK:

I think video P was a little bit unique when it showed all those images of people helping each other and working on teams. That was pretty moving.

Interviewer:

Like the coming together of [inaudible 00:29:31]. Would you say or do you feel like the messages and what the videos are trying to say... Is what they're trying to say believable to you? Do you believe what's being said in those videos? Is there anything that you want to draw in?

AA:

I think they're very vague.

Interviewer:

Okay.

AA:

Because [inaudible 00:30:11]. Yeah. Especially the first one, it's making an energy affordable. What does that mean? Unless it's the government lowering prices, it's also ramifications. It's like, what does that actually look like? Because I don't know. I'd be very hard pressed to go for something that I don't know exactly what it means they're doing.

JK:

I agree with you. And I was waiting for them to say, "Vote for [inaudible 00:30:40] or something." But I didn't really get a clear message from the first one, especially.

Interviewer:

Sure?

JK:

Yeah.

CK:

All the videos were too short to explain that much or [crosstalk 00:30:51].

JK:

They're just like remember.

CK:

They're just about 30 seconds and it's split through, "Just remember to vote. This is what you're voting for."

Interviewer:

Does any of them do a better job than others at conveying that message about voting?

GH:

Video P was more descriptive than the first two, in my opinion.

Interviewer:

How is that?

GH:

Well, I don't know if it was longer as far as seconds ago. But it described to me with the visuals that, okay, so the problem with pollution or whatever, with the people living in other areas, not speaking the same languages or whatever the case may be, having different opinions on voting and things like that. So it just shut off all that down and brought it here. Like, "Hey, everybody can do this, you just need to have one objective."

Interviewer:

MS you're quiet. Actually I'll do my part [inaudible 00:31:53].

MS:

I think the video P was more telling, just because-

Interviewer:

Like descriptive telling?

MS:

... yeah. I think that we have taught the team to change. You can't change anything by yourself.

KW:

I feel like it was more visually okay, then too I feel like more images pass through the screen. And the other two, I feel like there was more cuts and more pictures of different things. I'm pretty sure it, because video L had the video of the smoky sky and then the cars flood. And then video P had multiple different pictures, different things like the... I'm pretty sure video P had video swamp or something that didn't look right.

Interviewer:

[crosstalk 00:32:53]. Go for it.

JK:

Video P address climate change as a problem explicitly. It say Americans are good at solving problems and climate change is a problem. But the other ones didn't really explicitly say there's a big problem that we have to solve like video P did.

Interviewer:

Perfect. Do you think any of the videos do a better job at driving action to you? Just think about yourself. Did any of them do what you think the video ask you do? Which one does the best job?

JOC:

I think that L encouraged me to do research into the effects of the pollution on the specific wildfires and certain events. Because the rest of them seem like they're very general and just climate change is supported. And it doesn't really prompt any further thinking. It's just that's it. And it has a clean ending and you just get the basic message that they want you to vote on the side of climate change.

Interviewer:

Do you think there is enough education in these video clips to help drive action? Does it need to be presented in a different way for you?

JK:

I think that people are more driven to act when we see numbers, for example. I think that they should have more information. I don't think that they taught people in that there was remember climate change.

JOC:

Everyone knows about climate change.

JK:

Yeah, everyone knows. I agree.

Interviewer:

Does it help the case on helping make the videos believable if there's more numbers or more details? Is there a point when it's too much?

GH:

Well, I mean, there are short videos. I mean, I don't know how many numbers you can throw on somebody's face and then actually comprehend it. But I think that, yeah, the more numbers, the more you can comprehend what's going on. Like she said, it's just like, remember rather than, "This is what's happening, these are the real numbers. You have to do something about it."

CK:

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

I don't think it really matters unless people care about the topic. Because no matter how the video is presented, if it's something that's not really relevant to you or that doesn't really peak interests, they're not going to watch it or care about what it's saying.

Interviewer:

How would the video have information in it for you that piques your interest?

CK:

Like I said, I liked video P because it talked more about climate change rather than just clean energy and pollution. Because climate change as a whole is a lot bigger topic than those two. And it's something that I think should be addressed more thoroughly.

Interviewer:

What about any discussion about jobs or personal savings on investments in it? Do topics along that line resonate with you? Most of you hit on them climate change element of it, but what about the economic side of that?

AA:

Wasn't it video L where they said having green energy creates more jobs?

Interviewer:

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

AA:

I think that would be a pretty good [crosstalk 00:36:46].

Interviewer:

Does that topic drive more action from you versus climate change or which story sparks at least some interest from you?

JK:

I think that when they got into the economics, it was overshadowed by the clean energy messages. But when they said that switching to green energy would create more jobs, I thought that that part was pretty effective because maybe people don't think about that very much when they're thinking about the climate change discussion.

Interviewer:

Do any of these videos create urgency for you to take climate action or vote?

JK:

I think L and P, they have pretty strong direction [crosstalk 00:37:47].

Interviewer:

So an enigmatic question or you. Would articulating the direction of, say, the current political administration in an objective and factual, nonthreatening way encourage action? Did you know the current administration is doing X, or are you okay with the fact that the current administration is doing X? Do those types of messages change your urgency, change your thoughts about the message?

JaC:

I think it depends on what they're trying to be. If you bring up that question in the video, then you're essentially revealing that this is... I mean, I already assumed that it's paid for by people on the democratic side. So I feel like it's almost weird to be elusive about that, which side you're on, if you know what I mean?

Interviewer:

Weird because?

JaC:

Because they're trying to make it about unity, especially in P. But if you're coming out and saying, "You guys need to be unified, but you need to vote for a Democrat." It's like, "Are you prioritizing the climate or you're just prioritizing your party."

Interviewer:

Okay. That makes sense.

JK:

I agree with that. I think that it can change urgency, but it's really quick... The way that videos are today, that they're openly biased and it's okay to be openly biased a lot. Saying something, even if it's mostly objective, it can make me think that a video or a picture is biased. It's really easy for me to think that it's not as objective as they're trying to make it out to be, like you said.

Interviewer:

All right. Now we're really going to test my math. I want you to, in that white area, area in the upper right of your notepad. On a scale of 10 to zero, so zero's the bottom number of scale and 10 is the top. I want you to just put a number down for your response to this. How urgent do you think it is for people, companies, or governments to take action to take care of the environment and relieve human impact on the earth? I'll read that one more time. On a scale of zero to 10, where zero is not at all urgent and 10 is extremely, then how urgent do you think it is for people, companies, or governments to take action to take care of the environment and relieve human impact on the earth? [inaudible 00:41:22].

Interviewer:

All right. Let's go around the room and I'll just let you reveal your numbers, and I'll put them on my little chart. I'll start the back, JaC?

JaC:

I put a nine.

Interviewer:

JaC's a nine.

KW:

I had 10.

GH:

10. CK?

CK:

I had 10.

Interviewer:

10.

GH:

Seven.

Interviewer:

Seven.

MS:

I had eight.

Interviewer:

Eight.

AA:

Nine [inaudible 00:42:03].

Interviewer:

Nine [inaudible 00:42:03]. All right.

JOC:

Seven.

Interviewer:

Seven.

KW:

Eight.

Interviewer:

Eight. All right. [inaudible 00:42:23] about five. So my two 10s... I think I'll start with my seventh. So my seven [inaudible 00:42:50]. Why do you think this isn't... Why is it seven? It's not extremely urgent, but it's not... Why is it not urgent at all?

JOC:

I'm with you on the urgency, but not on the methods. Because you said people, companies and government. I'm right there with the people, right there with the companies, not as much there at the government though, especially with the current proposals such as like the green new deal, I find to be very unpalatable way to deal with the issue of climate change, essentially overthrowing the entire economy, in terms of saving the planet in a country where we're the second most contributor, but not doing anything.

JOC:

And not holding other countries accountable to doing the same thing, but essentially dooming our country to economic turmoil for the name of saying we can help the climate.

MS:

Yeah, I agree. We need more people than just us to change. And that's it. I don't know.

Interviewer:

So it's not more urgent because, there's other things that occur. And you answered this. So in order for it to be to help change that urgency, or what needs to change to make it for MS and JOC? At what point or what thing changes to make it 10?

JOC:

I guess if it could show me that we're all going to die in a year unless the government does something about it, then-

Interviewer:

That makes sense.

JOC:

... I don't know. I don't like the proposals that have been floated.

Interviewer:

That makes sense. My 10s, you are so enthusiastic about this. Why is it very this be extremely urgent matter? Argue your side of the coin for me.

JOC:

The last few years have had more global disasters than we've had in the last 50 years between tsunamis, hurricanes, earthquakes, big earthquakes that rattled countries, buyers. And it's been a lot pointed towards global climate change just because of how our footprint is affecting things around the world. Just in Washington, in the last couple of years it's been extremely hot and dry, we've had a lot of fires and we've had some really bad winters that don't really help make it better for those summers.

JOC:

And I think it's a relevant topic for everyone, but too many people just pushed aside because it's not... Like what you said, we're not going to die in a year. So a lot of people acknowledge it, but care enough to do anything about it. And if it keeps going like that, then it's got to be pretty fast before it is just, "Okay, we are going to die a year because no changes have been implemented because of that."

Interviewer:

Sure. A long standing inaction increases urgency. JK, you put a 10 too, right?

JK:

Yeah. Well, I think that the urgency is a 10, but I'm with JOC of that I really don't trust the government or corporations to actually make decisions that are going to really protect the planet. I think it's really urgent because people are getting really sick from toxicants in the air, the water. And I think that that's mostly because of industries that are really harmful to the planet.

JK:

And I think that over the years we already knew that the way that we industrialized was going to have effects on our planet, we already knew for decades now. And I just don't think that after what we've been shown, there's any reason to believe voting for climate change action is actually going to lead to the government putting restrictions on businesses that are hurting. I don't think that that's going to happen. But I think it's urgent that we do because people are getting sick. But I'm glad I could elaborate because I agree with JOC, I don't really think it should be in their hands after what we've been shown so far.

Interviewer:

Sure. That make sense. Do you think that the industrial pollution [inaudible 00:48:02] and those types of things, do you see that as a local issue? Do you see that as a national issue?

JK:

It's worldwide. It's totally worldwide. All of our water is polluted now. We've depleted like nutrients from our environment forever.

Interviewer:

Do we have issues like that... Those global scale issues, do you think that they're here in Spokane as well?

JK:

Absolutely.

Interviewer:

How would you articulate them?

JK:

For example, chemicals that we use to clean our water, they're really harmful. Just like bacteria we're trying to get out of our water, very harmful pharmaceuticals. They're everywhere. They're in the soil, the air, the water, here in Spokane too.

Interviewer:

MS you're new to town. Do you feel like Spokane has more climate more local issues than what you've seen in Texas?

MS:

Well, honestly, I haven't been here long enough to really observe that and give you any knowledge or answer. This is-

Interviewer:

Boring.

MS:

... yeah.

Interviewer:

I think just want to hear from everybody because, why not? What are the reasons to take action or take care of the environment and what are the... Okay. So let me read this completely. What are the reasons to take action, to take care of the environment and relieve human impact on earth? So how do these actions benefit humans? If you were to tell me the reasons why to take action, how would you phrase it? I feel like the CK can start. It's a big question.

CK:

I would say longevity. Like I said, I feel like people are aware of the topic, just don't really care enough or know enough or don't want to look into it enough to learn about it. And it would be a lot better in the long run to look at it close right now than to wait until it becomes a very big issue that we have to act very fast and abruptly on.

GH:

Makes sense. I agree with him. That's why I chose eight. Because I feel like it is a serious problem and we do have to start paying attention to it now. But it's not at a point where it's like, "Oh my gosh, this is very, very, very serious to take extreme action."

Interviewer:

AA what reasons would you put out to take action and take care of the environment?

AA:

You mean terrible to react in a awful way. I think it's more important to be proactive, especially for the environment. Because how can you take care of environment when it's on fire or you're dead? I mean you could have said, "Oh, I should probably take care of this 10 years prior."

Interviewer:

That makes sense. Proactive versus reactive?

AA:

Yeah.

GH:

I just feel like people are not doing anything until it needs to be done, and they all wait til something happens to change their...

Interviewer:

JaC?

JaC:

I think it's important to focus on it because I think it's important that our kids growing up, have a clean planet to live on. Because I think a lot of people think it's going to be like, "1000 years, 100 years from now that it's not going to be the next generation which will be affected." And if I have kids, I'd want them to be in a clean, livable earth like I did growing up. So I think it's important to take care of the planet while we can, not when it's on fire.

Interviewer:

That makes sense. All right. Which one wants to be first? KW or JK.

KW:

What was the question again?

Interviewer:

Well, what reasons do you think we should take to take action and help take care of the environment, and how do those actions benefit humans?

KW:

Well, two, the first one is a longer life and the second one is better experiences. What was the second part to that question?

Interviewer:

I think you answered it. What reasons to take action to take care of the environment, and how do these actions benefit humans?

KW:

Basically longer life and better experience.

Interviewer:

JK what are your thoughts?

JK:

I agree. It's for longer life. We already know that there's a lot of stuff, like I keep talking about, in our water, and in our soil, and in our air that causes disease. We're destroying our own oxygen sources, like the Amazon rain forest and plankton in the ocean. The only reason it matters is because it affects humans.

Interviewer:

What do you think is more concerning about the situation, is it pollution, is it climate change?

JK:

I think pollution because I think that the climate can change on its own in theory. But pollution, we know that that's hurting us. We know that it's causing disease and we know that it shows up in our children.

Interviewer:

Okay. It makes sense.

GH:

Some people don't think that climate change is real, whereas you can't really argue the fact that pollution is bad, and pollution is a real thing. And I'm pretty sure everybody can agree that it's bad and pollution is not so much a theoretical topic, and you don't have argue about that it's real or not.

JOC:

I think pollution is definitely more important, I would say. Because it's like JK was saying, climate change is not new to humanity. There's cycles of it going up and down, like the global temperature. There's times where the... Just been places and seeing this is where the level was a few thousand years ago. This entire 20 miles of inland just didn't exist, now it does. Things go up and down. I don't know. I think it creates a lot of alarmism when you freak out over islands losing an inch of land. Because this is all things that geopolitically... Not geopolitically. Geologically this has happened before. That is a very natural thing. But pollution is not.

Interviewer:

It's not natural.

JOC:

Not natural. This is something that humans have screwed up. So that's what I think.

Interviewer:

When I want to mentioned environmental concerns, does it come to your mind as just liberal ideals and objectives when we start talking about climate changes, is this a red versus blue conversation, does it have some baggage along the line for you or is it...

JK:

I think it does just because of our political state. I think the environment is definitely been politicized. And I think the idea is that liberals believe in climate change, and conservatives don't believe in climate

change. And I think as soon as somebody talks about climate change, a lot of times they do throw in stuff that isn't necessarily based on the facts. It's more about politics from what I've seen.

GH:

Excuse me. When we get to start on another person, please be excused with [inaudible 00:56:53].

Interviewer:

Please don't. You're good. Feel free. If you need to go, just go. I think we'll have a little fun. Do you care about the planet?

GH:

Yeah.

JOC:

No. Absolutely not.

Interviewer:

Okay. Are you sure?

JaC:

Not Pluto [inaudible 00:57:20].

CK:

Very broad question.

JOC:

You didn't say which planet.

Interviewer:

Yeah. [inaudible 00:57:25] planet.

JOC:

Pluto is not a planet.

AA:

I guess so.

Interviewer:

What if I called you an environmentalist? Who cares about what your political... What if I called you one, does that change the way you think about the conversation or just... I mean, you've all told me that it's a fairly urgent issue, so I could call you all environmentalist. How does that make you feel?

JOC:

When you said I'm doing something right or it makes me feel like I'm doing something right?

Interviewer:

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

JOC:

I think it's a very politically charged term nowadays.

GH:

Yeah. I think it's hard to... I don't know. It's just a label in a way.

Interviewer:

Sure.

JK:

So I think that it's meaningful. I think that's what separates an environmentalist from somebody who cares about the environment. In the abstract, is an environmentalist would like take action and change something in their life or make a sacrifice in the name of protecting the environment. Or even just going out of their way to learn about how they could protect environment.

Interviewer:

I could accuse KW of being an environmentalist. [inaudible 00:58:57]. Can I tell you something? You're great. I just [inaudible 00:59:00]. Who do you think should be responsible for taking action?

JOC:

Everybody.

AA:

Everyone.

JaC:

People.

Interviewer:

People? Why?

JOC:

Because it's our job. If we're causing the pollution, we should at least clean up after it.

CK:

I was going to say we're responsible for things like carbon footprints. So we should be the most evasive.

MS:

I feel like we all want change, we have have to put in our effort.

Interviewer:

Interesting.

JK:

I don't know. Well, I would agree Gary, but honestly, I don't know if it shall be left up to the people. Because I don't think that everybody really knows a lot about what they can and can't do.

Interviewer:

But you did just say you don't trust the government too either.

JK:

Yeah, exactly. I think that that's why it's hard to say whose responsibility should it be. Because I hear a lot of people saying it should all be up to individuals down here on the ground, the lay person. But a lot of us, we buy what's available to us. We buy what we grew up eating or purchasing or doing.

Interviewer:

We have a lot of habits.

JK:

Yeah, we have a lot of habits that are because of the way we've been industrialized. I think that corporations should be responsible because they're the ones who are responsible for polluting the environment the most. I think the average Joe... For example, when people first started buying plastic, manufacturers knew that it was basically indestructible and that it would last in our environment forever. But people who are buying these products, they didn't really know. And of course plastic manufacturers weren't rushing out to say, "Your great great, great grandchildren will have the plastic and you're..."

Interviewer:

Won't have to deal with this.

JK:

Yeah, they wouldn't say that.

KW:

I think everyone that just so happens to hear about the disadvantages and the bad things that has transpired from the initiators, which are the people, they obviously created the plants in the factories. But the locals or whatever, the people, they do basic things everyday, all day. They are the people that keep it going, a habit. I mean that's personal. So if you care, you should personally do something about it, what you can do.

Interviewer:

Sure.

KW:

Personally you should do what you can do. [crosstalk 01:01:52]. So one party initiated it and the other party continues with it. So [inaudible 01:01:57] by grandchildren and things like that, personally you should make a difference.

Interviewer:

Makes sense. What are your reactions when you hear political candidates talk about climate change actions and policies?

GH:

Don't believe them.

JaC:

Just buzzword.

Interviewer:

Do you find any conversations that they have relevant to you at all?

JK:

[inaudible 01:02:26]. I think that they're relevant. But I just feel really manipulated when people are trying to act like they care about the environment so much. I think that they know that that's the hot topic, especially for young people. So I think that they just throw it in, so they're like, "Yeah. I'm one of those too. I'm in all the planet change thing."

Interviewer:

What else? Anything else?

JaC:

Do you mean conversations that politicians enter?

Interviewer:

Yeah. Do you take any issue with the conversations that they're having about climate change? Do you appreciate that they're talking about it? Do you not appreciate that they're talking about it?

JaC:

I think a lot of it seems almost just like virtue signaling, trying to say, "I'm good because I'm talking about this." But I've heard a lot of proposals for more investment in nuclear energy and more natural gas that is maybe less harmful to environment. And seeing, especially on the democratic sides, opposition to that makes me question, "Are you just trying to do this for the buzzword or are you actually... Not even offering legitimate opposition to it or just completely ignoring it because it doesn't fit your strain of environmentalism."

Interviewer:

Okay. When a candidate now talks about when it comes to climate change, does it impact your decision to support the candidate when you're voting for them?

MS:

It can.

Interviewer:

It can?

JaC:

No.

Interviewer:

No? Because?

JaC:

I feel like words don't mean anything compared to action. Like you said with buzzwords, a lot of people in politics will just say things to get on board, and to get publicity and people under their side. And then once they get an office, they might not even act on the subject. They have their core policies that they'll act on, but they have are the things they talk about just to get publicity and more people behind them. And then those people that are behind them might get nothing out of it because they're only going for a few certain things.

KW:

I definitely agree with that. But I also know that if a candidate was... I don't like when people say that it's the climate change hoax. I can't say I agree or disagree. Whenever a candidate is like, "It's all hoax," it makes me feel like displeased.

Interviewer:

Yeah. You've got an interesting thought there. I guess, do you think that what a candidate may say regarding climate change... But again, climate change actions and policies that they may be looking for, do you think that the way you perceive those statements vary, if it's a local representative, or a state representative or, a federal representative, do you trust their statements differently or is that distrust across the board?

KW:

I find that I trust local politician a bit more. I'm not sure why exactly.

CK:

Yeah, I would second that. I think the smaller it is, the easier... [inaudible 01:06:17]. There's a lot less corruption when you go lower and a lot more community involvement. Whereas federal politicians don't have that sense of like community and just being for that certain area. We just talk about state and local, worrying about just this one state or counties. It's a lot easier for them to connect and worry about more homegrown issues.

Interviewer:

So local issues maybe have a little more resonance with you or just more believable that they can be achieved? I guess, I'm trying to understand what it is... Maybe we could say I just don't trust it. But what about it is not trustable?

GH:

I believe that the higher up you go into politics, the more, I think that they are under way more pressure from other politicians that they may have... They're all in contact with each other. They're much more influenced by other politicians, by money from corporations. I think that local politicians, they care more about local support. But the hierarchy you get in politics, the more they care about corporate support and support from other politicians who are powerful.

Interviewer:

I should ask more questions. What have I missed so far. All right. I'm going to handout some messages. So I'd like you to read these and then we're just going to talk about [inaudible 01:08:26]. You can feel free to scribble on these papers, if that helps you. [inaudible 01:08:33]. Yeah. Feel free. [inaudible 01:08:36]. When JaC's back we'll [inaudible 01:08:45]. But I have a copy for myself. Maybe while you're staring them, circle your two favorite ones.

JK:

Favorite or what would be most effective [inaudible 01:09:53].

Interviewer:

The ones that... Go and search for original ideas. The ones that motivated you to take action. We're reviewing these and then circling too, that motivate you to take action.

JaC:

Okay.

Interviewer:

All right. Now just take a quick [inaudible 01:11:23] mode. Who circled air pollution? Three of you and who circled Spokane experiencing water springs prior? One. And in 50 years? Nobody. Coal, gas and oil companies? Most of you [inaudible 01:11:45] count it. It's eight. In Washington State, the Irish solar? Two. Solar, wind power adding us jobs at a faster rate? Three. Michelle, did you do that one?

MS:

No. Just two.

Interviewer:

Okay. All right, that's cool. So what are your reactions to these statements? I don't care which ones.

JOC:

I didn't know that coal, gas and oil companies were polluting more than they were in the 2000s, which I thought they would have been less.

Interviewer:

What else? I guess what else was surprising about these things?

JOC:

How much you save with solar power?

JaC:

The air pollution one sounds like a very hefty claim to make. But I would love to see some evidence for it. But somehow I don't think in this-

KW:

That was my response too. That was my reaction too. I was like, that's interesting. I do not believe, but I would love to see.

JaC:

... I don't believe.

GH:

[crosstalk 01:12:54] research that.

AA:

That's a very broad statement. [crosstalk 01:12:56].

CK:

I think they got the numbers.

JK:

I want to know how they calculated that.

Interviewer:

What would you need to know or what would you want to understand to validate that claim?

JK:

Just how they discern that.

CK:

What studies.

JK:

What study, and how it is studied, how they can [inaudible 01:13:08], exactly.

Interviewer:

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

Right. So is there's specific things you look for in studies that help ensure that it's a quality? [inaudible 01:13:24].

JOC:

Proof that shows that it's air pollution that's killing or taking the careers off. Not anything else like, smoking tobacco or anything else.

JaC:

Well, life expectancy's been rising so I'm just wondering where that comes from.

MS:

I can see how it could. If their method was something that was reasonable. But I like to know the exact method that people... Because it could be totally...

Interviewer:

Anything else surprising in these statements? Is there anything that just seems completely unbelievable?

JaC:

I'm wondering why... Never mind. I read that wrong. I was thinking 50 years... I was thinking it was saying it has risen in the last 50 years, but it's projected. Well, I guess I wonder why they're projecting that.

Interviewer:

Is there any of these that you think is just on... I think I just asked this. But are any of these statements just like if somebody said this to you, you would think that they are just absolutely not telling you the truth? Are any of [crosstalk 01:14:52].

JOC:

Air pollution. [inaudible 01:14:54]. Actually thinking about it more, the savings of homes with solar power being 10500 a year seems a little farfetched, because energy bills do not add up to \$10500 a year general.

CK:

Exactly.

JOC:

I think we're going to be [inaudible 01:15:13] 60 bucks a month at the house I'm living in next year. That's the average. I don't understand where that's coming from.

Interviewer:

Some of these have some references to Spokane, even the state. Does that resonate with you? Is that something that can [inaudible 01:15:40]?

GH:

At sources?

Interviewer:

Well, I'm just stating that Spokane has been experiencing water springs and then [inaudible 01:15:54]. Does it matter to you if it's Spokane or it's just everywhere?

CK:

I think it's important.

MS:

Yeah. I think it's a slightly different message, but I think the ones that are local are equally as important as the ones that were on this stage.

Interviewer:

Thinking about opportunities to vote on for both, for people and for policies that may be addressing any of these messages, do any of these increase your needs or you want us to vote for, or take climate change action? Just to vote. It doesn't matter if you're going forward. Just to vote or take action.

JK:

Yeah. The one about the coal, gas and oil companies, is pretty [inaudible 01:16:50].

Interviewer:

Yeah, that one was their most popular one. What is really motivating about that one? You can even break it apart into 100 different things. What is it about that sameness?

JK:

I think one thing that made it really powerful was... I think maybe JaC said it. But I think most people would expect that there'd be more regulations on corporations, but there's actually not. There's less. So I think that it is surprising and that's what made it really effective. People think things are one way, but then...

Interviewer:

That there's been more regulation. But this implies that there's less?

JK:

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

JaC:

I'm wondering, just because I know. I don't remember what the exact year was when cap and trade was implemented. It allowed certain companies to create more pollution. But that ensured that smaller companies were making less. And overall we saw the biggest decrease in pollution that our country had ever seen after that policy was implemented. So I'm wondering if it's selective information or not. It very well could not be, it very well could be though.

Interviewer:

Going back to the question I asked earlier, if any of these statements were tied to articulating the direction of an administration, did you know that the air pollution is taking an average of three years off our lives because of decisions made with cap and trade? Does that encourage a different... Does that change the way you feel about action with that statement?

JK:

I think, yeah. The more details, the better with stuff like this. When they say this policy did this or this executive order had this effect, it makes it a little more believable than some of these which are vague. Even if they just said according to the department of agriculture, for example, then some of these would be a little bit more effective for me.

JOC:

At least it would mean the statements are true.

Interviewer:

I mean, they're statements. That's all I [crosstalk 01:19:20]. They're statements. People tell you things. And expanding on that, you as a voter, how have you determined what is true, what is not, which will spur you to vote or to take action? Does it matter to you if it's associated with a certain party? Do these kinds of statements have lights of their own?

JK:

I think that a lot of people would read these and feel like these are all liberal things to say, but I think in actuality they're pretty relevant to everyone, if they're true.

Interviewer:

If they're true?

JK:

Yeah.

Interviewer:

Well, they are true, I can tell you that. So what do you need to know in order to feel good to know that they're true?

JOC:

Sources.

GH:

Yeah. How they got the information, where they got the information from. Just more background instead of just a flat out statement. Because anybody can say any of this, but without understanding where [inaudible 01:20:50].

Interviewer:

Does that need to be given to you at the same time the statement is, or are you the type of person that would question it and then look it up?

MS:

I think that any one of these statements could potentially get legs. Like CK was saying, either you care or you don't. So based off of if you care or not, it would motivate you to research any one of these and find out more. Find out if it's true or if it's false, things of that nature.

JK:

I think that sources are the best way to give something credibility, because it gives people a place to start research. It gives them a place to start. Because I've seen people say things that aren't true and it's exposed that it's not true, but it still changes people's perception of things, even if they discovered that it's not even true.

Interviewer:

Sure.

JK:

Just hearing something can totally change how you see someone or something.

Interviewer:

That makes sense. I mean, we all rated climate change [inaudible 01:22:09]. Again, is the environment a big enough issue to get you to vote for a party that is not the party that you would in your heart say you were associated with? If you were a Democrat, would you vote for a Republican for environmental issue or vice versa, Republican vote for a Democrat for environment issue? Is this a big enough issue to cause you to do that?

KW:

I consider myself a true moderate, so it's one of the issues that I would look at when I'm picking a candidate to vote for, just one of them.

Interviewer:

There's no party for you?

KW:

Yeah.

Interviewer:

Anybody else?

AA:

Regardless of blue or red, I think if you're able to show actual evidence against air pollutions taking an average of three years off your life, I feel like you can really get to people.

MS:

Why is climate such a big topic? It seems like the only topic really concerning politics, red or blue. Why is that? Am I allowed to answer that question?

Interviewer:

You can ask the question. I don't know. Maybe my computer will have an answer about that.

MS:

I mean, there's so many other factors that goes into voting and the climate. I just want to know why is this the main focus. Because generally speaking, people won't be... I mean, unless you're a person that really, really, really cares, people won't be moved to change anything unless it affects them personally, on a personal level. And you can say 50 years from now, if you don't change from going to McDonald's every day opposed to eating at home, it's going to affect you. But if you say, "Hey, now... You know what I mean. Everything's going to be shut down. You're not going to have any water to drink you and your kids," that's enough to get somebody going. In the now moment, which matters.

JOC:

I mean, the world is ending if you don't vote for me. It can be an argument I guess, but...

Interviewer:

Is it enough to get you to cross party lines?

JOC:

Okay, if it's true.

Interviewer:

Maybe, yes, no? How about my front corner here? You guys have been quiet for a minute.

GH:

Well, I don't know. It depends. Voting for somebody based on their environmental views, depends on how you feel towards the environment. If you care for it a lot, you're going to want to your suede in your opposite party. But if you don't then [inaudible 01:24:54].

Interviewer:

If it's not personally important to you you're not necessarily going to cross the river?

GH:

Yeah. Because I mean there's so many other issues other than the environment that the candidate will attack. And some of those other issues can be more important to an individual. So I might agree with the environment issue on this side, yet all these other things are more important to me than this issue.

MS:

It just depends how much whatever it means to do. Blue should means the world to me, I'm going to...

Interviewer:

You're going to cross the line, because that's the platform for that.

JK:

I think that KW said something that was pretty important that everybody is talking about climate change, especially politicians. They are totally obsessed with it, but they really fail to like make it connect with the average Joe. There are so many ways that they could, but I don't think that they're really saying anything that's like personal enough to make people, for example, cross party lines to vote for somebody for their environmental stance. I don't think they're connecting it to people enough the way that they do health insurance or student loan debt.

JK:

They're like, "You have this problem and I can solve it." I feel like they're super vague about climate change even though they're talking about it all the time. And it's a little bit just sucks. It's suspicious.

Interviewer:

Does anybody else feel like there's not enough specificity? What kind of specifics would you like to see?

JK:

I think that if a politician really wanted to make...

Interviewer:

And I could get you to vote too. That's the bottom line.

JK:

I think that they should talk more about disease, because there is a lot of research right now into what environmental pollutants have done to us. I think that they could easily say Parkinson's has been linked to this. PCLs, stuff that people are getting in increasing amounts and then people can see we're getting in increasing amounts [inaudible 01:27:49].

Interviewer:

How else could you make the environment personal?

JK:

Saving money was pretty personal too.

JaC:

I think it's a matter of time before it becomes more mainstream, the saving money thing. Investing in clean energy is still like incredibly expensive. However, I think it's getting better. I'm involved in a lot of investing. In my school I'm in a group that does it. And I don't think there's a single clean energy company that is profitable right now. And so it just makes it very difficult to sell that to people. It's expensive to buy solar panels, I don't know the exact price. It's expensive. And those companies are even operating at a loss or barely breaking and maybe... And so I think once the technology gets there, and it's more reasonable for people to do themselves, I think that's when we'll see it take off.

JK:

I have a question for you. Can I ask a question?

Interviewer:

Yeah.

JK:

Do you think that the government should subsidize clean energy the way that they subsidize the oil industry, for example? Or do you think that they shouldn't.

JaC:

Really, they should be subsidizing anything. I don't know. I've not heard much about the subsidizing the, I guess, dirty energy. I don't know what you call it. But I don't really it. I think the clean energy is starting to grow on its own without government intervention. So why we throw the government in it now, especially when people are proposing a full government take over, almost.

Interviewer:

I don't know if anybody wrote it down or noted on it. But one of the messages in the videos talked about working together. We've talked about that a little bit, there's working together. How likely would you be to vote across party who supports a candidate that just promises to work together with both parties to address climate change? Is that simple?

JK:

I think it would be a positive point for a candidate if they made an effort to say, "I'm not one of those obsessively affiliated people." Because I think that in this day and age, a lot of people are burned out with how divisive everything is. A lot of people are still like, "Oh I'm a liberal and I hate conservatives," or, "I'm conservative and I hate liberals." Some people are. But I think a lot of people are getting sick of it and confused like all of its implications that we see all the time constantly, to be a positive.

GH:

Yeah, I agree. Because I wrote a lot about the community, so I like that aspect. I like the aspect of not putting yourself in a political box. Because you can never put yourself in a box. There's certain things that you agree with on both sides. And the idea of, it doesn't matter if I'm Democratic or Republican, let's just come together and fight this issue, is a lot more positive than clashing.

Interviewer:

It makes sense. Anybody else?

KW:

You have to come together and make changes anytime. It takes more than one person to do any change.

AA:

I think it's a good idea. I just don't think it's very possible. People are too narrow minded when it comes to politics, and are just too divided on it, that even if a politician didn't want to work together with the

other party, they wouldn't want to support that other one in any way just because of their political beliefs. But I don't think it would get much ground.

Interviewer:

Would you vote to support? Would you support that candidate if they convinced you that that was what they stood for and that's what they could do? Would it encourage you to vote?

JK:

If I was convinced, yeah.

CK:

It's a plus definitely. I think you still have to weigh that with every other aspect of them, but it does help.

Interviewer:

What did you see in the videos that changed or reinforced your interest in voting? Were you interested in voting at all before you came in here today? That's probably a good question to start.

KW:

I'd say video L, which is the video I voted for. Because it was the one out of three videos that motivated me to take action. Because it made me concerned and then inspired me.

Interviewer:

What about it raised concern with you and inspired you? Is there any specifics in that message that did that?

KW:

The weather first and foremost, and fossil fuels. I don't know much about those, but it sounded pretty convincing.

Interviewer:

Interesting. You guys is there anything that in those videos that either changed your interest in voting or really made you say, "That's why I voted." Or, "That's why I plan to vote."

CK:

I thought it seemed pretty standard political... It didn't seem different from anything I would expect to see.

AA:

So I said it wasn't really... What was unique about it is not privy anything. They just seemed like the regular you would just see in between commercials. But nothing about popped out or stood out about them.

Interviewer:

Do you have any ideas for things that maybe could make them stand out? I think we talked about maybe making the environment or climate change personnel. Would something like that do that for you?

JOC:

I think that-

JK:

Sorry. [crosstalk 01:35:21]. No, go ahead.

JOC:

... okay. I think that if your goal here is to unite the parties in addressing this issue, take examples from both sides. What do people on the right say about addressing climate change and what do people on the left say about addressing climate change, and trying to find some middle ground there to actually make progress instead of buzzwords. Because if I'm being honest, the impression I got from the videos the message I thought was underlying was support climate change.

JOC:

Especially when it's talking about things like making clean energy affordable. I know that's something that would come from the Democrat side. So the underlying message to me was trying to say, "Care about climate change, vote Democrat."

JK:

I agree with that a lot. And I think that, like we talked about, they were all pretty vague. But depending on if they were really a commercial for a candidate or for...

Interviewer:

Or for a house bill [crosstalk 01:36:40].

JK:

Yeah. If it was for something specific. Then it would be really effective if they took opinions that they know are popular from both sides. I think that would be really effective.

Interviewer:

Bridge the gap?

JK:

Yeah.

Interviewer:

All right. I want you two to sound off as we bring this to the end. So throwing the thought of, who cares about the climate and environmental issues we've been talking about. What thing is most influential to you in your decision to vote?

AA:

Follow through. And that was being said. If someone says something, especially the politic, I would hope that they would follow through before election not after election.

JOC:

Probably supporting the claims. So what they're claiming that they're going to do, explain how it could affect everybody, not just the environment, but individual impact for day to day life or whatever it could be.

Interviewer:

Making it personal?

JOC:

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

JK:

I'm more likely to vote for someone who talks about income inequality, incremental justice reform specifically.

Interviewer:

Those are the issues you're passionate about?

JK:

Yeah.

JaC:

Having an action plan. A lot of politicians just use buzzwords, or they don't actually have a plan, or convey a plan of how they're going to achieve things. And if a politician comes up with something that is relevant to people, and they actually have a plan and can tell that to an audience of how they're going to achieve it over time. It's a lot more reason to lean towards them.

GH:

I'm of the action too. Actually show that you're going to do something, less talk.

Interviewer:

Less talk, more action?

KW:

Yeah. I would say that too, more follow through. I'd like to see something go the way that they're saying before...

Interviewer:

What if they try and fail? [crosstalk 01:38:59].

MS:

It happens. It happens sometimes.

Interviewer:

Right?

MS:

Yeah. Can I ask a question?

Interviewer:

Sure.

MS:

What do politicians do that make us think that they're going through? Really? If you were a politician, how would you make people believe that you were going to pull through?

JK:

Numbers.

MS:

Numbers.

KW:

Definitely, people love numbers.

GH:

Yeah, people love numbers.

KW:

Numbers in people and numbers in finances. You know what I mean? So if a politician could get up there and be like, "This month we've had over 300 people put their toilet tissue in the garbage can instead of flushing." Things like that. Incentives, stuff like that. Community, like GH was saying. Really [inaudible 01:39:55].

GH:

Yeah. I know that community is everything, so I like to focus on..

Interviewer:

We're all in it together?

GH:

No, not so much the boxes.

MS:

I grew up, my mom is very, very conservative. And my dad is very, very liberal. So I've always seen both of them come together. And despite their differences, they can agree on all the things. And growing up I've always really liked that because they are polar opposites, and yet they come together so well. And I think that that would be important in everyday politics, so much just like community. And that's just me. I mean that's just something I've grown up with, seeing opposites come together as a community. So that's important to me.

Interviewer:

Okay, cool. All right. Does anybody have anything else they want to add? I mean, I worked [crosstalk 01:41:00].

JOC:

I didn't answer the first question. Sound economic policy is important to me, especially with things that may not be directly economic like health care, what are the impacts of those on the economy.

Interviewer:

How do you determine what sound economic policy? This is just me asking curiosity question.

JOC:

I don't know. It's honestly hard to evaluate. It depends on the exact issue. I guess the big hot button, one is universal health care right now. And the big like far left thing with Bernie and universal healthcare for all. Eliminating the healthcare industry basically [inaudible 01:41:42] in private insurance. There's a ton of economic ramifications for that. All those companies would basically be put out of business, and things like that.

JOC:

There's more specific things like interest rates and the fed, which is the... I mean, no, elected officials don't control that. But just I would say evaluating how things are going to impact the economy, tax rates and things like that.

Interviewer:

We didn't really have a long conversation about jobs. Last question. How climate policy and environmental policy affect jobs... At your point in your life, and I have feeling that's why we didn't come from. Is tying environmental policy and climate policy to jobs an important message for you?

JK:

Yeah, I think so.

Interviewer:

Why?

JK:

I think that the change... Like JOC said, making changes really affects the economy and that can last for a super long time across a bunch of different areas.

Interviewer:

So it's more about the longevity of the...

JK:

Yeah, there are a lot of things that seem like a good idea, but they totally destroy a country. We all saw what happened when the [inaudible 01:43:13] trade to Haiti, for example. There are a lot of things that seem like a good idea, but they aren't assessed for the economy as thoroughly as they should have been. And I think with climate change, a lot of people who support climate change action, they really want to see oil and coal and stuff just totally disappear. It's not exactly rational.

JK:

And a lot of people are worried about the jobs that everybody's going to lose if we change our power source. So when they say we're actually creating jobs with clean energy, I think it's pretty good. I think it could see what the minds of the people who are concerned with everybody who works in coal and oil losing their jobs.

Interviewer:

Helps talk to the other side of the table. Maybe not the cable we have here today.

JOC:

I think another important thing is where are those jobs coming from? Because if you say the government's going to add 20000 jobs, I'd take some issue with that because you're basically saying... I mean you're paying people with taxpayer money instead of having something be more free market centered and created. I'm guessing a lot of these jobs that are being added, would be free market jobs, which is great. And it's actually a net benefit to the economy instead of something that's just being put... Just another big thing to be put on the government dime that maybe doesn't need to be.

Interviewer:

Cool. All right. I'll let my friends pay you. So the fun part about coming to focus groups is, I only culture you for two hours, you get snacks and you get your thank you on your way out. So leave everything just right where it is. If you want to take a pen, I don't care. You can do that. We'll sanitize them later just because of the situation we're in. But just leave everything here. I'll take care of cleaning it up. And thank you will be from the [inaudible 01:45:33].