3) The cost of hydroelectricity from a hydro plant larger than 10 megawatts (is your plant this productive?) is approximately 5 cents per KW-hour, comparable to gas (≈ 4 cents), coal (≈ 5 cents), and wind (≈ 5 cents).
The environmental and social impacts of each of these fuels widely varies:

- Hydro: Damming interrupts the flow of rivers, can harm local ecosystems and displace towns and wildlife. However, it produces no direct waste and considerably lower levels of the gas carbon dioxide (CO_2), a major contributor of climate change.
- Gas: There are many consequences to the United States's use of oil/gas, such as oil spills, import costs, wars with oil-rich countries and/or those who attack oil-rich countries, and it is a non-renewable resource. It also pollutes the atmosphere.
- Coal: The largest source of energy world-wide. Coal plants are still dangerous, however, because of cave-ins and inducing lung cancer. It has major environmental impacts, including harmful waste being distributed into groundwater, the interruption of river flow and habitat, and once-beautiful mountain tops being blown off. Coal is the largest contributor to the human-made increase of CO_2 in the air. Also a non-renewable resource, but one that we don't need to import.
- Wind: Subject to lightning strikes, mechanical failure, heavy rain and ice. Can be harmful to migrating birds. Renewable. Indiana already has wind farms and thus experience with this technology.

Given this information, do you think that Indiana should continue with the production of the hydroelectric plant or should it use a different resource? Justify your answer. This should be *at least* a couple of paragraphs; I really want to hear the opinion and reasoning

You should come to a consensus on your answer;

You are welcome to choose a resource not listed, such as nuclear, geothermal, or solar. You can use arguments or reasons not listed above.

you can use the internet, books,