

Bruce Riordan ([00:03](#)):

Welcome to the Berkeley Climate Change Network podcast. I'm Bruce Riordan. I'm the director of the BCCN, and our special expert guest today is Sammy Roth, formerly of the LA Times, and now with his own climate newsletter, climate colored goggles. So welcome, Sammy. Welcome to the BCCN.

Sammy Roth ([00:24](#)):

Thanks for having me. I'm Bruce. Happy to be here.

Bruce Riordan ([00:27](#)):

Tell us before we get into, we're really going to focus on California and climate the beat that you've been following so well and writing about for years now. But first, tell us a little about your background, how you got to where you are today here as the climate reporter.

Sammy Roth ([00:44](#)):

Sure. Well, I studied sustainable development in college, so I had sort of a longstanding interest in climate change and climate politics. And then meanwhile, I was the editor of the student paper in school. So I had been doing journalism all throughout high school and college. So I kind of put two and two together and got a job out of college as the energy reporter at the Desert Sun, which is the paper in Palm Springs. And they had an energy reporter there because the desert in Southern California was kind of the emerging epicenter of the renewable energy industry. So this would've been back in the mid 2010s and they'd had that position there for a while. So all of the wind turbines, if you've ever driven from LA off to Palm Springs, those are some of the first big wind farms in the country in one of the windiest spots in the US out there.

([01:32](#)):

Those were built starting in the seventies and eighties. And then meanwhile, the large scale solar industry in the US was just emerging there in the early 2010s after the post economic recession stimulus bill that President Obama signed. So I kind of got to be on the ground floor of that writing about the emerging solar industry. So that's how I got into it. I did a couple of years at the Desert Sun and I went to the LA Times for a while, and now as you said, I'm doing my own thing, climate colored goggles on Substack.

Bruce Riordan ([02:01](#)):

Great. We'll talk a little bit about CCG little later.

Sammy Roth ([02:06](#)):

I'm glad that you're using the acronym. Thank you.

Bruce Riordan ([02:08](#)):

Okay, I got it right.

Sammy Roth ([02:10](#)):

Good for my branding.

Bruce Riordan ([02:12](#)):

When you started Boiling Point, which was your column and newsletter at the LA Times, it was early and you said at the time, looking back at your writing that now more than ever, even during the bad days of COVID, we must keep climate center front and center climate change front and center. And recently, I think late last year, you said the same thing about democracy now under attack, immigrants under attack, but that we need to keep climate front and center still. So talk a little about why and why you feel that way.

Sammy Roth ([02:55](#)):

Yeah, it's a good question. I mean, I think the big picture is that there's almost always going to be a reason to focus on stuff that's not climate. It's inherently something that's in the background. I mean, even when there is a climate intensified weather disaster, it's not like there's a big wildfire. It's not like climate change lit diff f. There's a big storm. It's not like climate change went up with a magic wand and caused the storm to happen. Even in those moments where climate change is most visceral and visible, it's a phenomenon that's happening in the background slowly raising the planet's temperature, I mean quickly by geologic standards, but slowly in the way that people really understand it. It's a phenomenon that's changing the background conditions and intensifying these extremes that we feel in our daily lives. And so it's just not something that's going to be intensely on most people's mind most of the time, unless those of us who are really understand it and focusing on it, bring it to the forefront and just kind of constantly remind people, Hey, this is happening.

([03:59](#)):

We got to do something about it. It's a crisis. It's an emergency. It's always going to fall to the background behind things like Trump going to war in Iran and the straight of MOUs getting restricted or frankly, anything that's happening on social media or the East wing of the White House getting destroyed or immigration raids and people getting deported. All important stories and in some cases really terrifying and horrific stories, but especially in the news environment that we live in. Now, I wrote this, as you said, during COVID, which was one of the biggest stories in modern human history. It feels like every other month. We have one of the biggest stories in history now, but man, yeah, more than ever climate's just going to kind of fall by the wayside unless we trumpeted. So yeah. So one, I think it's important to trumpeted, and two, I think that with a lot of these big stories that are happening, they're related to climate and it's really valuable for those of us who are trying to communicate about it to show those ties and those threads.

([04:58](#)):

So with Iran, for instance, and with the Strait of Hormuz, there's this obvious climate link where when the supply of global oil is getting restricted, it's a moment where you can say, Hey, this is one of the reasons why renewable energy is so important and valuable. Everyone's freaking out about gas prices as they should be because no one wants to pay this much for gas. If we weren't also dependent on global oil markets and on oil coming out of the Middle East, if we were had a greater supply of homegrown cheap clean energy, this wouldn't be as big a crisis as it was right now. And there's a reason why other countries all over the world are really flocking to. There's a lot of, especially rooftop solar installation that's happening at the moment fueled by Chinese solar panel supply. So this is a moment where it's possible to say, Hey, this is a climate story as well. And there's a lot of those with big news events.

Bruce Riordan ([05:55](#)):

Excellent. From reading your newsletter and your previous LA Times work, I didn't follow you at the Desert Sun. I will admit that I was here. Totally fine. I mean, it appears to me pretty obvious that your

love of California and in one of your columns, your love of Disneyland, I think you were talking about the ride at what's the California park that's there something?

Sammy Roth ([06:26](#)):

Yeah, it's California Adventure, and the Ride was soaring over California.

Bruce Riordan ([06:29](#)):

I was a Disneyland person in the late fifties. So the California thing wasn't there yet.

Sammy Roth ([06:35](#)):

Yes, that opened in 2001. But that's cool that you were an OG fan.

Bruce Riordan ([06:40](#)):

Oh, it was always good. I was always, growing up in California was a great highlight. So as a Californian and as someone who's now been working on climate in California, how does it feel to you to see what's happened physically, what's happened in California just in the last year or so with the big fires in la, the march that we just went through with the hottest record, smashing temperatures, record melting of the snowpack, all of this? How does that feel looking at all of that as a Californian?

Sammy Roth ([07:16](#)):

I mean, it's crazy. It's kind of weird. As a relatively young person, I'm 33 to be able to sort of just be noticing the changes and feeling them so viscerally. I mean, I grew up in la. I lived there until pretty recently just moved to Sacramento and definitely could feel it getting hotter. I mean, the fires last year were certainly unlike anything I'd ever experienced. I mean, fortunately I wasn't living in one of the areas that burned, but I was on the west side just a few miles from the Pacific Palisades, and we saw that there's big plumes of smoke in the sky. The sky changed colors, knew a lot of people who did lose their homes, never would've expected that growing up. I mean, just looking at the temperature readings the last few weeks, my God, I mean, places are breaking their March records, breaking their April records. In some places it's wild.

([08:18](#)):

I've been covering. So in addition to covering energy, which has been my main focus in my career, I've done plenty of water coverage as well. So I've been writing a lot about the Colorado River, and so just watching what's happening with snowpack readings, not just in the Sierra, but in the Rocky Mountains, which feeds a lot of Southern California's water supply. There's an argument about whether this will end up being the worst year this century or whether 2002 will still stay the worst year. It's sort of in competition right now. But I mean, it's terrifying looking at what's happening at Mead and Powell and thinking about what the runoff might look like in the next few months. So it's surreal because as a climate reporter, you're always kind of talking to scientists and reading studies and telling people, Hey, things are bad. Things are going to get worse.

([09:04](#)):

And then suddenly out of nowhere, over the period of a month or two, it's like, wow, things just got even worse by a lot really quickly. So it's a weird feeling and it's sad to see this happening in your home state. You certainly hope like, okay, maybe people will sit up and pay attention now. That's the silver

lining you're looking for. But this goes back to the conversation we had a minute ago of it still has to break through the noise of all of this other stuff that's happening, and that's just a hard nut to crack.

Bruce Riordan ([09:30](#)):

Do you see that happening? I mean, obviously these things are right in our face, and for those of us in Northern California, that whole string of fires that we had going back over the last decade, that whole string - you broke the records if you were doing slideshow like I was at the time, you had to keep changing your wildfire slides every five minutes. Practically there was something breaking. Do you see this kind of physical manifestations of climate making a difference in terms of people that you're working with and talking to? I

Sammy Roth ([10:06](#)):

Don't know. It's hard to measure. I mean, I'm in a space right now where I'm mostly in touch with people who are already pretty hyper-focused on climate. Even at the LA Times before I went out into the substack independent space, most of the people who I think were consistently reading my newsletter were pretty turned on to climate to begin with. It's hard to break through to mainstream audiences is one of the problems right now. I mean, the way that the news algorithms work, everything has become so siloed and fractionalized. People can pretty much cultivate their news diets or it's cultivated for them by the social media algorithms. So you're only kind of seeing what you want to see. This would be a lot easier of a problem to solve if there was sort of a common marketplace of news that people just were turning on the nightly news or picking up a newspaper in the morning and there was something that was curated for them that everyone could go to.

([10:58](#)):

And that's just not the world we live in and hasn't been for a long time. So the answer is no. I don't know. I mean, the thing that I really pay attention to that I look for is at what point there's really good polling showing that most people care about climate change. You ask people, is climate change important? Are you worried about it? Do you want to solve it? And the overwhelming majority of Americans say, yes, more Democrats than Republicans. But on the whole, it's large majority say yes. The problem is when you ask people what are your top priorities politically, climate change rank way down at the bottom. So that's what I'm looking for in the long term is when does that start to rise up in the political priority list? And that as far as I, I've seen hasn't happened yet. So that's not going to happen immediately after a couple of months, like the last few, but maybe we'll look back a year from now and that'll start to go up. That would make me more hopeful.

Bruce Riordan ([11:50](#)):

Well, we'll talk about the California governor's race in a few minutes with a couple of questions on this. Sticking with the impacts and adaptation and resilience and all, do you think California, the state of California and cities and counties and all are doing enough to prepare and protect, not emissions reduction, but dealing with the impacts of heat and storms and sea level rise eventually wildfire? Do you think our state is doing enough?

Sammy Roth ([12:25](#)):

No, probably not. Partly just because no one's doing enough. I mean, that's not totally a California problem, but California does more than most. There's been several propositions passed going back 10 or 15 years now where voters have allocated a lot of money to do sea level rise adaptation and heat island

effect stuff like cool pavement and more shade in cities. It's just, I think one of the biggest problems is just that a lot of this stuff moves really slowly. I hope in five or 10 years we'll start to see a lot more steel in the ground is the right word, because a lot of this is really distributed infrastructure. It's a lot of, it's not big infrastructure projects back in the day, but thus far, just in Los Angeles, there's still so many bus stops that don't have shade. Like most bus stops, you're waiting for a bus.

[\(13:18\)](#):

It's like you're just baking out in the heat. And there's still so many neighborhoods where there's very little tree cover, a lot of the sea level rise adaptation, like moving back bridges that are on highway one or moving back sections of PCH that are on eroding bluffs, that just hasn't happened yet. There's some good wildfire resilience works work that's happening, prescribed burns, for instance, forest thinning. But even there, the state is way behind the targets that it set. I don't remember offhand what the 2025 and 2030 targets are, but I know that we're nowhere near meeting those. So on the whole, no, I would say we're not doing the job we need to do, but maybe over time as more of the voter approved bond money goes out, we'll start to get there.

Bruce Riordan [\(14:11\)](#):

Let's look at the other side of the big climate coin with emissions reduction and look at, let's talk a little bit about transportation and about the electric power system and buildings. Some of the biggest reasons why in California we're continuing to contribute big amounts of greenhouse gas emissions. So first in transportation, how are we doing there? It's always been the biggest sector for California.

Sammy Roth [\(14:42\)](#):

It has been, and I should have pulled up the numbers here honestly, but California had, so the big thing we did was new sim set this target of a hundred percent zero emission vehicle sales by 2035 for new vehicles. And that was always a little bit overstated because in theory, up to 20% of those vehicles also could have been plugged in hybrids. So it was really 80% total zero emissions, and for the most part, total electric and then up to 20% plugin hybrids even before. So Trump is trying to revoke that rule. There's a lawsuit ongoing right now over whether the federal government has the authority Congress use the Congressional Review Act to revoke that, and California is suing saying, no, that's illegal. You're not allowed to do that. So they're fighting over that one right now, even regardless of that fight, California is not on track to meet that target electric vehicle.

[\(15:40\)](#):

Sales just haven't taken off to the extent that they were expected to a combination of consumer demand and the auto companies not producing as many vehicles as they plan to forward in GM and everybody's STIs. They've all been pulling models off the market or not putting out as many models as they expected to. Partly that's a response to Trump. It's a response to consumer demand. There's a whole mixing of vicious, how would you call it, a vicious cycle of forces that I would say, and it's unfortunate, but right now EV sales in California are something like 20% of the market, I think down from a peak of maybe 25. So that's dipped down a little bit, which is tough. So the state is looking, I think there was a proposal from Newsom or the legislature that's pending now to provide a smaller subsidy for electric vehicles, and I'm forgetting the number.

[\(16:38\)](#):

It's smaller than the federal tax credit that went away, Congress and Trump revoked last year. But they do want to add something back for new vehicle purchases, and maybe that will help somewhat, but it's not going to totally boost the market back to where it was before. So yeah, vehicles are the biggest slice

and we're definitely struggling there a bit. The electric sector is one of the other biggest slices of the market. I would say there's been more progress here. We started earlier on the electric sector and the economics have really helped. I mean, just solar wind has been cheap for a while. Solar has gotten really, really cheap. The big thing that's now happened is that batteries have come down and costs like 90% and continue to drop in cost, which helps you move the solar from excess solar from the middle of the day to the evening.

[\(17:25\)](#):

So on the electric side, California is something like two thirds zero carbon now. And as more batteries come online and more solar gets built, that two thirds figure is probably going to keep going up. It varies a little bit year by year, depending on the water situation and how much hydropower we have. But with Diablo Canyon is now going to stay online. That was supposed to close. The big nuclear plant was supposed to close in 2025. It looks like that's probably going to stay online. It's certainly through at least 2030 now, probably even longer. The state requirement is a hundred percent clean electricity by 2045, and I think we're on pretty good track to meet that. So the electric sector is in, I think, pretty good shape. The transportation sector, which is the biggest one more of a struggle at the moment. I mean, I think the big thing for transportation would be, and this is a question for the US as a whole, not just for California, is at what point do we start to have access to Chinese electric vehicles? In China, there's much cheaper 10, 15,000, \$20,000 EVs that by the reviews that you read and even in US newspapers that people love and they function much better at a lower price point with great ranges compared to the ones that are available here. But they're basically precluded from the US market by enormous tariffs. So if at any point US consumers in California and elsewhere got access to those types of cars, it would be a total game changer. But that hasn't happened as yet.

Bruce Riordan [\(19:03\)](#):

Yeah, it's always looked to me with the transportation sector here that we have not done. I mean, leave Trump aside. We have not done a good job of telling the story about why we need to electrify the passenger vehicle fleet and why we need people to purchase EVs and all. We kind of left that message hanging and it looked like we were just telling people it's good for you or it's something we want you to do. And that to me left it very open to the counter argument from, oh, they're just trying to tell you again, what's great for California is great for the rest of the country.

Sammy Roth [\(19:46\)](#):

Well, I think it gets missed just how good the costs look when you look at the fuel savings. Even with the high electric rates in California, you're still going to be saving money relatively quickly after a couple of years of driving the thing. There's still rebates and incentives available at the local level in a lot of places, especially if you can charge at home, you're going to be making your money back pretty fast. And then the air pollution aspect of it, it's like just, my God, that doesn't get talked about nearly enough. But especially in Southern California and the Central Valley, just the air quality alone near freeways, and in some of these communities along like the 5 and the 10 and the 101, I mean even without climate, it's just that's reason enough alone from a public health perspective. So there's all sorts of stuff going on without climate.

Bruce Riordan [\(20:41\)](#):

It has always frustrated me that we put in the incentives some pretty good incentives federally and here in California, but left the rest of it to the market. And like you said, the car companies, for the most part, I have one sitting outside here, produced pretty expensive EVs, and where was the message that we

need to be producing cheaper EVs? That can be something that not just people like me that have resources, but the average person in California would gravitate to.

Bruce Riordan ([21:23](#)):

Yeah, it just seems like one of those things, again, where we're kind of halfway, we have incentives, but we don't really want to create the economic system to make it work. Well, let's talk about the governor's race. You were co-moderator and co-leading a panel with Louise Bedworth here from uc, Berkeley, I don't know, some weeks back where you were talking with four of the candidates in a forum about climate. What did you learn from that forum or from other work you've been doing about the California Governor's race and climate?

Sammy Roth ([22:02](#)):

Yeah, it's been interesting so far. So I mean, from that forum in particular, I would say that Katie Porter and Tom Steyer stood out as being especially well-versed in sort of the intricacies of climate and energy policy. Steyer has been running this anti utility campaign, bust up the utility monopolies, give people more access to rooftop solar distributed clean energy. So he went into a lot of detail about that. He was talking about how cheap rooftop solar is and how the utilities have tried to prevent people from accessing it, which is fairly accurate. So that was his main thing. Katie Porter also talked a lot about land use planning for large scale renewable energy and micro mobility and how housing factors into clean energy. I mean, she had a really good big picture spread as well and got into the detail on this in a lot of areas. So I came away from both of them thinking, okay, they really would be in the weeds on this stuff and know what they were doing. And Swalwell either seemed like he wasn't super well briefed or perhaps just hadn't engaged on this stuff very much at all. In theory, that could change if he was governor. But he definitely seemed out of place compared to the other candidates, just in terms of not having that much to say on climate or energy.

([23:37](#)):

He talked about how California needed to install, he said, we had done a million solar roofs. We should do another million solar roofs. Well, actually, actually we already have 2 million solar roofs, stuff like that. He just didn't have that many ideas and didn't seem like he super knew what was going on. Javier Beccera was interesting. He definitely had a lot to say about all of the work he had done as California Attorney General during the first Trump administration bringing lawsuits to uphold the state's climate and energy policy. He had a lot of experience that he was able to talk about on environmental justice and defending low income communities and communities of color. He hedged quite a bit, which gave me a little bit of pause on rooftop solar net metering. I asked him about rooftop solar incentives and net metering, which the state had cut under Newsom, and his answer was, well, we should make sure the predatory rooftop solar companies aren't going after people, which was a little bit of an odd response, and he didn't really, there were a couple other issues like the Delta tunnel where he didn't really want to say how he would respond.

([24:51](#)):

Just honestly going back through my article here to remember protecting 30% of lands, 50% of lands and waters by 2050, which would be the next step from 30 by 30, which we're doing now. He just didn't really want to answer. So he just hedged a couple of times. But I thought that Porter and Steyer were the real standouts. One thing that stood out to me about all of them, which was really cool, I asked about make polluters pay this proposal to charge fossil fuel companies a fee for all of the climate damage they're doing and use that money for climate resilience and clean energy. They were all on

board with that, so that was a real positive for all of them. And with Swallow and Baer, you just got to wait and see what they say next. It's possible they'll keep studying this stuff and come out with more detail.

Bruce Riordan ([25:46](#)):

Let's talk about our current governor just for a minute. You mentioned the CPUC - the Public Utilities Commission. Yes.

Bruce Riordan ([25:56](#)):

Yeah. With throttling back the rooftop solar incentives and all, and Newsom in some other ways, is he stepping back from climate as he's clearly running for president?

Sammy Roth ([26:11](#)):

He says that he hasn't decided yet.

Bruce Riordan ([26:13](#)):

Okay. Let's just say it looks like it. And what do you think of him stepping back? Has he stepped back in this last year?

Sammy Roth ([26:22](#)):

Yeah, I mean, I think for a while now there have been ways that he, he's moderated or modulated it. I moderated a bunch on climate where he still definitely wants to portray California as a climate leader, and there are definitely areas where he's maintained that. He's done a lot of globe trotting. He went to the conference, the Global Climate Conference last fall. He is been doing a bunch of these sort of binational agreements and leading state coalitions. He's defending the state's policies in court against Trump, including the policy that would allow California to do a hundred percent zero emission vehicle sales by 2035. He hasn't actually unwound any of the really big stuff, but yeah, he's also trying to, the way he would frame it is he's trying to balance the state's climate goals with the need for affordable energy, which I would say is a false dichotomy that we should be trying to do both of those things.

([27:26](#)):

And that those two things go hand in hand, actually, because clean energy is cheap in practice. What that's meant is places where he has backtracked on stuff. So yeah, for one undoing rooftop solar incentives, the net metering program, there's a whole argument to be had about whether that net metering program did in fact raise electric rates, whatever you believe about that. In practice, he's just sort of let rooftop solar drop quite a bit and hasn't done anything to replace the incentives for those that were in place before the Energy Commission under Newsom. After the fires last year, suspended the, excuse me, it wasn't the Energy Commission. There was legislation that passed that Newsom signed that suspended the state building code for the next six to nine years so that there won't be encouragement for all electric buildings, which is quite disappointing. The state's regulations to phase out single use plastics in a lot of cases have stalled out.

([28:27](#)):

There's a lot of folks who are really, they're nominally still moving forward, but it's been really slow and they keep restarting. So there are a lot of folks who were disappointed with Newsom about that. He signed legislation to allow more oil drilling in Kern County, which the argument was, we need to supply

more oil to the refineries in the states so that more refineries don't close because otherwise gas prices are going to go up and then we're going to have a bad reaction to climate policies, which it's an interesting argument, like maybe we need more gas supplies so that gas prices don't go up so that there's not this backlash that then causes climate policies to derail. But in practice, the effect is that we're permitting more oil drilling in California, which understandably makes a lot of people pretty unhappy. So yes, in practice, there's a lot of stuff that's been going on that's been the opposite direction than you would've expected from a climate champion governor a couple of years ago.

Bruce Riordan ([29:23](#)):

Let's talk about the media. You left the LA Times to run your own newsletter. We've seen the Washington Post cut its climate coverage and its climate division way back, and CBS news similarly cutting back on climate coverage and others in this media environment. Where do you see this going and how do you think this is going to affect the climate fight that we have this much media now throttling back in various ways?

Sammy Roth ([29:56](#)):

Well, it doesn't help. There's definitely news organizations that have cut back, like you said, and laid off reporters. And then just in general, if you look at statistics of how much climate coverage there is overall, there's an organization called the Media and Climate Change Observatory. It's run out of, I think, UC Boulder, although there's a lot of academic institutions involved. And they track climate coverage from major print and broadcast networks all over the world. And if you look at their US coverage tracker, basically you saw peak in fall of 2021, which was when negotiations over the inflation reduction act were really heating up. And since then, it's just been this slide downwards going on four and a half years now. So that's really disappointing.

([30:56](#)):

In some ways, it's not like the be all end all because there's just fewer people getting news from legacy media than they're used to, which is sad. I mean, it would be better. There are more people getting news from traditional print newspapers and broadcast networks. But the extent that people are still consuming news from those sources, it's typically people who are more likely to vote. Typically people with money who are more likely to donate to political campaigns, people in sort of the literati academic class who may have more influence in the direction of public policy. So yeah, it's super unfortunate that the journalists who do have some sway here in setting the national agenda for whatever reason, choosing to, and not just the journalists. I mean, certainly the owners of these institutions as well are choosing to deprioritize climate. I mean, that's bad. That's really bad.

Bruce Riordan ([31:50](#)):

Two final questions. One about universities and their role and one about students for universities. You've been in the climate world now for quite a while by climate standards. What do you see as the best roles that universities like the one I work for here at Berkeley to play in the climate fight?

Sammy Roth ([32:15](#)):

That's a great question. I think that probably the easiest and obvious, this is obvious, but just keep doing good science at universities. I mean, especially now that the federal government for the foreseeable future is throttling back resources like whatever money universities have and can generate on their own, and whatever resources you guys can throw at just putting out science and communicating that science

as well. I mean, not just throwing science into a journal and hoping someone finds it, but communicating why it's important and what it means and what the political significance is. I mean, people need that, especially when there are fewer journalists and fewer journalists focused on climate. I mean, I think it's super, super important for researchers, and whether that's full-time professors or adjuncts or students or undergrads or graduate students or PhDs or postdocs or whoever it is to be taking the work that they're doing and doing everything they can to get it out into the public sphere through whatever communications channels are available, and helping people understand why it matters. And then to the people in charge of universities. This is maybe a somewhat naive comment because I don't know university finances well enough, but sometimes I just think, man, if ever there was a time for this is what endowments are for, it's like, isn't this what endowments are for right now? Put some money out there. So that would be my thought on that.

Bruce Riordan ([33:49](#)):

Good. Thanks. And Berkeley is good, along with a number of others. Stanford here, Harvard, MIT, Yale. You've been following the Yale communications work, I'm sure for a long time.

Sammy Roth ([34:03](#)):

They're fabulous.

Bruce Riordan ([34:05](#)):

So fabulous. So final question. This podcast goes to Berkeley faculty and staff, but it also goes to a lot of students. So talk directly to students for our final piece here. They're out there right now, they're 18, 19, 20 years old, the undergrads. What do you say to them about their future and their role in the climate world?

Sammy Roth ([34:33](#)):

The future is long, I think would be my main thing. We're at about 1.5 degrees Celsius now in a planetary scale. For a long time, there was a hope of not exceeding 1.5 degrees Celsius. That's not happening. Hopefully we can still avoid two degrees Celsius, but even if that doesn't happen, the future is still long. There's a lot of suffering that can still be avoided, a lot of good, that can still be done. And there's a lot of ways to do that, whether you're doing science or public policy or communicating or any, there's a wide variety of ways to approach climate, whether it's doing some unrelated field entirely and bringing climate into whatever type of business, or whether it's just something you think about on the side or devote some activism or volunteer hours to, or just make sure you bring it up in conversation or at the dinner table. Everyone can contribute and it's not a lost cause and it's not hopeless, even if that's a lot of the narrative that gets out there. So I would just remember that. I mean, I certainly hope to be involved with this for the rest of my life, and I'm far from hopeless.

Bruce Riordan ([35:56](#)):

Great. Thank you. Thanks for all of this. Let's finish with tell people how they can follow you. You've moved from a big newspaper now to a newsletter, CCG, climate colored goggles. How can people continue to follow you?

Sammy Roth ([36:15](#)):

Yes, just go to climate colored goggles.com. Very easy, and you can subscribe right there, climate colored goggles.com.

Bruce Riordan ([36:21](#)):

Great. And finally, how has that been to move from Legacy media, from the LA Times and all to Substack and Newsletter World? How's

Sammy Roth ([36:34](#)):

It going? It's been fun. I like the freedom. I like just being totally self-directed. Sometimes it's a little daunting. It's a lot of work. I'm doing everything by myself, but I'm enjoying it. I'm glad I made the switch.

Bruce Riordan ([36:49](#)):

Great. Well, thank you for taking some time with us. We've been talking with Sammy Roth with Climate Colored Goggles. That's the newsletter. You can find it online. I'm Bruce Riordan with the Berkeley Climate Change Network. Thanks for listening. And stay tuned for more podcasts from BCCN. Thanks.