

Both the lecturer and the author talk about coal ash and whether establishing harsher rules for power plants to handle coal ash is beneficial or not. As opposed to the reading, the speaker reckons that creating stricter rules would be advantageous and she denies all three downsides which have been mentioned in the reading.

To begin with, the professor indicates that although power companies ought to use liner in new lands and ponds, we should force them to do so in old lands and ponds as well. ~~Due to the fact that~~ permeating into the ground, coal ash contaminates underground water supplies. On the other hand, the author states that ~~existed-existing~~ regulations are sufficient and there is no need to create severe ones. For instance, power companies are coerced to use liner in order for both new lands and ponds to stay clean.

Secondly, the lecturer claims that setting more rigid rules would not discourage people from buying ash-recycled products and they would purchase recycled products without any concerns like they have bought mercury recycled products which have been recycled from toxic materials. In contrast, the reading illustrates that by establishing harsher regulations, we make people anxious about utilizing ash-recycled materials, because they would think that those materials are as dangerous as coal ash.

Last but not least, the speaker makes it clear that making new rules would increase power companies' expenses about by 15%. Having said that, this ~~up-risingrise~~ would add only about 1% to the general public's electricity bills which is not considered a ~~great-significant~~ increase. However, the author cites that by making new rules, we increase power companies' expenses /costs which would lead to electricity price growth. In other words, this could adversely affect people's welfare and consent.