

Last March, the New York Times [killed its Green blog](#) and [disassembled its environment desk, distributing the staff into other units](#). Jayni noted the [possible concern that this change might result in diminished resources for environmental coverage at the Times](#); she also noted the positive spin that some Times people put on the change, that it would [“mainstream” environmental coverage into the Times overall news reporting](#).

The Times public editor has done [a follow-up on the impacts of the changes on the paper's environmental coverage](#), and the report indicates that the pessimists appear to have been more correct than the optimists: A review found that the quantity of climate change coverage in the paper declined; “the amount of deep, enterprising coverage of climate change in The Times appears to have dropped, too”; no major investigative series on the environment have been published in the Times since January 2013; and no replacement for the Green blog has been created at the paper.

These results are disturbing and distressing. Press coverage of environmental issues is a vital component of informed decisionmaking by policymakers and informed voting and activism by citizens. This is particularly true in an area as complex as the environment. I hope that the Times reconsiders its failed reorganizational efforts and reestablishes a primary center and voice for environmental coverage.