Steaming Ahead: Will AI Amplify Electric Inequalities?

by Jonathan Bean

DOI: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3671007 / PDF

COLUMN | CONSUMING TECH

Jonathan Bean,
University of Arizona

Steaming Ahead: Will AI Amplify Electric Inequities?

Herbert Simon famously wrote about design as being the act of devising "courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones" [1]. In the world of technology, and in particular AI, it feels more like what's underway is the wholesale creation of a nearly infinite set of possible futures without regard to the consequences—human, environmental, social, or political. It's as though we are cooking pot after pot of AI spaghetti with the single-minded goal of throwing it against the wall to see what sticks. So quickly have we become busy cooking up one batch of spaghetti after another, indeed building vast machines, themselves powered by AI, to cook and throw the spaghetti for us, that we haven't noticed we're not throwing it against a wall, but instead onto other human beings and into a precarious natural world. The boiling water and steaming mess is only partly a metaphor; the data centers currently powering the AI revolution are famously rapacious users of energy, but they are also prodigious producers of heat. Some data center cooling centers dump the excess heat into the air; others move the heat in water, dumping the equivalent of millions of pots of boiling water into waterways or evaporating it into the atmosphere. Need I mention climate change?

At this point, I don't know where I'm going to land on AI, and I don't think anyone else can be sure of our AI future. One recurring idea is that AI will release the masses from the drudgery of work, unleashing higher human creativity and potential. That sounds nice, and I hope it works out that way. But how do we get there, and what is the price? We ignore history at our own peril.

We know—or seem to know—that data centers are spiking energy demand. That is hardly news, but what has surprised some is the apparent severity and speed of the spike in the U.S., where a perfect storm of demand has already arrived. Large incentives in the Inflation Reduction Act and Bipartisan Infrastructure Law have spurred companies to build energy-intensive manufacturing plants in the U.S. Those same policy mechanisms, combined with shifting consumer preferences, are reflected in a shift to energy-hungry electric cars. Utilities are struggling not only to keep up with the growth in demand but also simply to predict it. A recent news article sheds light on the severity of the problem. Amazon, the article reports, is building a server farm powered by a small nuclear plant, in part because it can't find enough power on the grid to buy. In Georgia, the most recent projection of electricity use over the next 10 years is 17 times higher than previous expectations:

"When you look at the numbers, it is staggering," said Jason Shaw,

It's as though we are cooking pot after pot of AI spaghetti with the single-minded goal of throwing it against the wall to see what sticks.

IMAGE BY ANGELA OLIVERIO // SHUTTERSTOCK.COM

Related

- Will Future AI Demands Derail Sustainable Energy Initiatives?

Questions for reflections *(feel free to write shared comments here below)*

- How do AI and data centers impact energy and water consumption? What are the results of these usages in terms of heat produced and predictability of energy on the grid?

  - (20244442 Jongik Jeon) AI and data centers are becoming a major consumer of energy and water. According to the article, Georgia's most recent prediction of electricity use over the next decade is even 17 times higher than previous anticipations. Some data center cooling facilities discharge too much heat into the air, or use water to dump heat equivalent to millions of pots of boiling water into waterways.
  - (20253833 Jeonghoon Han) AI systems and data centers have rapidly increased global energy and water consumption. The author describes them as vast machines that not only absorb enormous power but also release excessive heat into the environment. Cooling systems often expel this heat into the air or nearby waterways, making them both heavy consumers and producers of thermal waste. Beyond the environmental

impact, this rapid growth has made energy demand harder to predict, forcing utilities to confront an unstable and overheated power landscape.
- (20210193 Hyerin Na) AI and data centers became the greedy consumers of energy and water. The heat from data centers moves into the air and water, so it causes climate change. Also, because of the striking change, utilities are struggling to predict the energy demand, and that causes some problems such as the need for additional energy source construction. Furthermore, data centers' regular and large energy consumption is very attractive to the utilities, which chase the profit, so focusing on that precious 'gold' could cause them to drain all their investment and overlook people's basic daily energy requirements.
- AI training/inference and the data centers that host them are highly electricity- and water-intensive, venting waste heat into air and waterways, which raises local temperatures and makes grid demand less predictable with steep, synchronized loads (20254257 Hyungseok Moon).
- AI and data centers drastically increase energy and water consumption, producing vast amounts of heat that must be dissipated and making overall electricity demand both higher and harder for utilities to predict. (20180892 Bonwoo Koo)
-AI and data centers use a huge amount of energy and also increase water consumption due to water being used for cooling. The heat produced might be released in to the air or into waterways, which burden the environment. It has become difficult to predict the energy demand and to answer it due to the growing need for energy. (20256331 Emilia Ojala)
-Data centers that power AI consume not only vast amounts of electricity but also large quantities of water for cooling, and as a byproduct, they cause thermal pollution. The expansion of such facilities makes it difficult to predict energy demand, weakening the stability of the power grid. (20210397 Sohyeon Yu)
- Data centers consume a lot of energy and water. They make heat and if more data centers are built, the energy consumption might get crazy (Vaeinoe Ristimaeki 20256332)
- AI technology and the data centers that support it consume massive amounts of energy. These facilities not only release excess heat into the atmosphere, but also discharge boiling water into waterways, causing environmental harm. Meanwhile, power utilities who are eager to welcome such “large customers” want to overestimate electricity demand in order to justify expanding infrastructure. (20254477 Eunchae Lee)
-AI and data centers consume massive amounts of energy and water for powering and cooling servers, producing excessive heat that worsens climate impact. These sudden, high demands make the power grid unstable and hard to predict. As a result, the burden of AI-driven luxury energy use may shift onto people already struggling to afford basic electricity. (20220656 SubinCho)
- (20230377 Eunji Shin) AI pushes a step-change in electricity demand, with data centers acting as large, near-24/7 loads; they’re attractive to utilities because the load profile is steady, yet the scale and speed of new demand have outpaced forecasts (e.g., Georgia’s 10-year load projection jumping dramatically; firms pursuing on-site generation like small nuclear) and stressed planning. Cooling turns much of that electrical input into

waste heat: some sites vent it to air, others move it with water—effectively “boiling-pot” equivalents dumped into waterways or lost to evaporation—raising local thermal and water-use impacts. Net effect: high, continuous consumption that is predictable at the site level but increasingly unpredictable in aggregate, forcing grid operators into “whack-a-mole” expansions.
- AI and data centers consume vast amounts of electricity and water. The heat generated during the cooling process of servers is released into the air or nearby waterways, causing environmental pollution. The unpredictable increase in electricity demand reduces the grid’s stability and predictability. (20254509 TaehyunLee)
- They consume massive, steady power and water, releasing huge amounts of heat. Sometimes the equivalent of “millions of pots of boiling water” into air or waterways. Their local energy use is predictable but the rapid overall surge makes grid demand harder to forecast.(20254236 Haeri Kim)
- (20190607 Jaeyong Jung) Data centers are severely spiking energy demand, with Georgia's projection increasing 17 times higher than expected. These facilities are also prodigious producers of heat, dumping the equivalent of millions of pots of boiling water into the environment, which complicates utility efforts to predict demand, despite their large, predictable usage patterns making them highly attractive customers.
- AI and data centers use lots of electricity to run servers and lots of water (or extra power) to cool them, which can strain local power and water supplies.
Nearly all that energy turns into heat, so cooling systems push warm air out or release warm water, raising local temperatures or discharge.
Their load is usually steady and predictable (24/7), but big AI training or traffic spikes can cause sudden surges that make grid planning harder. (20252529 Sunghyun Chang)
- AI models and data centers consume an enormous amount of electricity to run the system and water to cool. From the energy grid point of view, it's a big strain to the already vulnerable system, where excess energy is distributed across the grid with very low predictability. Excess heat is just carelessly released into the environment, affecting the local ecosystem and contributing to global warming. The entire process is not even efficient because most of the work is just like randomly cooking and throwing spaghetti until it sticks well to the wall. (20255031 Kyunghwan Kim)
- AI and data centers consume huge amounts of electricity and water to operate and cool servers. Much of that energy turns into waste heat, which is released into the air or nearby waterways, causing local environmental impacts. Although each data center’s power use is steady and predictable, the overall growth in AI demand makes the total grid load harder to forecast, creating instability and stress on both energy and water systems. (20230835 Hyunji Huh)
- AI and data centers use enormous amounts of electricity and water, mainly for cooling their systems. The heat produced by AI operations is often released into the air or nearby rivers, causing serious thermal pollution. This large and unpredictable energy demand makes it difficult for utilities to manage and forecast power needs.
As a result, AI infrastructure increases both overall energy consumption and instability in the power grid. (20254499 Jieun Lee)

- AI data centers use a lot of electricity and water for cooling, dumping excess heat into the air or waterways. The grid is seeing a sudden demand spike that utilities struggle to predict even though data-center consumption patterns are steady. (20254459 suyoun Lee)
- AI and data centers use a huge amount of electricity and water, especially for cooling their servers. Most of that energy ends up as heat released into the air or nearby rivers, which can harm the environment. Even though each center runs on a steady load, the fast growth of AI makes overall energy demand unpredictable and puts more strain on power and water systems. (Guhn Lee 20254430)
- AI systems consume huge electricity to power and cool computers. This leads to water consumption and releases hot air or water into the environment. This makes harder to predict how much energy will be needed, since AI related demand is growing very quickly and unevenly across places. (20256333 Jana Nguyen)
- AI data centers consume huge amounts of electricity and water and generate massive waste heat; each center's load is predictable, but the *overall* growth of the sector makes grid forecasting unstable.(20210533 Hyeonseok Lee)
- AI and data centers consume massive amounts of electricity and water to keep servers running and cooled. The heat generated in this process is released into the air or nearby waterways, placing stress on local environments and sometimes causing thermal pollution. As the number of data centers rapidly increases, it becomes more difficult to predict overall power demand, which in turn weakens the stability and planning capacity of the electrical grid. (20256470 Misong Kim)

- Should electric consumption be associated with or dependent on its final usage? "How can we tease apart the provision of electric energy for basic needs from AI-powered applications that are not entirely necessary?" And "How much electricity is it reasonable and responsible to devote to AI?"

  - (20244442 Jongik Jeon) I think it is not inadequate to separate electricity provision into basic needs and non-necessary AI usage, since there remains a fundamental problem of judging the value within the user's prompt or question. Therefore, in my opinion, the final usage cannot be taken into account, but usage patterns may be used as a criteria for the electricity assignment. By allocating more resources to users whose question topics are consistent or whose multiple questions ultimately point toward a single goal, we can distinguish them from users who ask one-time questions or dumb questions.
  - (20253833 Jeonghoon Han) The author argues that electricity for essential needs(like light, heating, and health) should be clearly distinguished from AI-driven conveniences that are not strictly necessary. While digital tools enhance comfort, they also raise ethical questions about fairness when many people still struggle to afford or access power. Thus, deciding how much electricity should be devoted to AI is less a technical issue than a moral one, requiring society to weigh comfort against equity and responsibility.
  - (20210193 Hyerin Na) It's understandable that utility companies are excited about finding new, large energy consumers and aiming to profit from them. However, utilities

should stop overestimating future energy consumption and excessively exploiting energy sources, especially fossil fuels. They must also take into account the current disparity in electricity access and the resulting hardships of the public, and actively work toward solving that problem.
- We should explicitly separate guaranteed energy for basic needs from discretionary AI workloads and allocate only a transparently justified share to AI—guided by social value, equity, and carbon intensity through caps and pricing (20254257 Hyungseok Moon).
- Electric consumption should indeed be tied to its purpose, because energy for essential needs like light, health, and heating must be prioritized over non-essential AI uses. This raises the ethical question of how much power is “reasonable and responsible” to devote to AI. Electricity usage regarding AI should not undermine access to essential energy needs or worsen environmental and social inequities. (20180892 Bonwoo Koo)
-For fulfilling basic needs energy consumption should be tied to its purpose, since this would allow prioritizing between what is truly essential in times where electricity is scarce. However measuring how electricity is used is quite difficult and would require users to report how they use electricity, which could easily lead to being untruthful about the use to gain more access to electricity. (20256331 Emilia Ojala)
-Electric consumption should be distinguished based on its purpose: essential electricity for sustaining human life—such as lighting, heating and cooling, and healthcare—must take priority over AI and other nonessential applications. In a world where many households already struggle to pay their electricity bills, it is unjust for the AI industry to expand power grids for its massive energy demands while passing the costs onto society as a whole. Therefore, responsibility for energy use should be proportional to the social value it creates. AI that contributes to human welfare or environmental improvement can justify a certain level of energy consumption, but wasteful use of power for mere convenience or entertainment is ethically and socially indefensible. Ultimately, the question of “how much and for what” energy is used is not a matter of technological progress but one of fair and sustainable energy distribution.(20210397 Sohyeon Yu)
- In theory yes, in the ideal world, the more important a thing is, the more resources it should be able to have allocated to it and other way around. It just is very difficult in practice to control that. (Vaeinoe Ristimaeki 20256332)
- AI technology can help boost productivity and in some cases provide essential support to specific individuals. However, in certain situations, its necessity doesn’t seem as urgent as that of people who need electricity just to maintain their daily lives. Furthermore, if we allow the unlimited use of electricity for AI technologies without adequately addressing the environmental damage caused by data centers, the future of humanity itself could be at risk. One possible approach might be to prioritize electricity allocation for AI technologies that serve socially beneficial purposes or demonstrate high utility. (20254477 Eunchae Lee)
- For the first question, electric consumption should be judged by how essential its purpose is. Power used for lighting, heating, or healthcare is a basic necessity, while AI-powered or luxury applications are optional. Differentiating them ensures fairness and sustainable energy use. For the second question, we can separate them by prioritizing essential services in energy policy and setting consumption limits for nonessential AI

operations. And for the last question, it is reasonable and responsible to devote to AI only as much electricity as brings clear social or environmental benefits. AI power use should be balanced against public needs. Otherwise, excessive consumption risks diverting resources from essential sectors and widening inequality. (20220656 SubinCho)
- (20230377 Eunji Shin) A fair approach is end-use–aware governance: guarantee "lifeline" electricity for basics (lighting, heating/cooling, health) at protected rates, while subjecting discretionary, compute-intensive uses to (i) transparent metering of energy, heat, carbon, and water, (ii) procurement rules favoring additional, firm-low-carbon supply, and (iii) progressive tariffs that internalize local grid/thermal impacts. This matters because energy poverty is real (e.g., ~20% of U.S. households struggle to pay on time; hundreds of millions lack access globally). As for "how much for AI," the text frames it as a societal choice: set explicit AI energy budgets and accountability so essential needs aren't crowded out by "nice-to-have" workloads.
- It would be reasonable to distinguish electricity consumption based on its purpose, with priority given to power essential for basic human needs. However, it is difficult to clearly separate the use of electricity for AI. Since the necessity and value of AI applications are hard to define precisely, it may be more practical to regulate AI systems through broader policies. (20254509 TaehyunLee)
- The article asks how to distinguish electricity for basic needs like light and heat from AI conveniences that are not entirely necessary. It warns that the grid expansion for AI should not burden households already struggling with bills. I agree that separating needs from wants is necessary so that essential services stay protected and industries that create new demand help fund the infrastructure they strain. (20254236 Haeri Kim)
- (20190607Jaeyong Jung) The material argues that methods must be considered to tease apart the provision of electric energy for basic needs from the supply for AI-powered services that are not entirely necessary . The costs of upgrading the power grid to power AI should not be borne by those who are already struggling to cover basic expenses. Furthermore, the technology industry must engage in discussions regarding how much electricity is reasonable and responsible to devote to AI and accept the responsibility to pay for new generation and distribution upgrades
- Electric consumption should be associated with its final usage, because society must protect basic needs (lighting, heating/cooling, healthcare) first and make non-essential AI pay the full costs it creates (grid upgrades, carbon, water).
We can tease them apart by using lifeline rates for essentials, location/time-based pricing and interconnection fees for AI workloads, public reporting of efficiency (PUE/WUE), and rules that shift or curtail AI use during peak hours.
A reasonable and responsible amount of electricity for AI is the share that fits local climate targets and reliability limits, grow AI only when it is efficient, powered by clean PPAs/storage, and net-beneficial to communities. (20254529 Sunghyun Chang)
- The first question might sound a bit controversial, but the main idea is that not all electricity consumption is ethically equal in the value each will generate. I agree with the concept since powering essentials and necessities is indeed more important. However, I am hesitant about really bringing it into reality. Theoretically, no logic can decide whether

each energy consumption is crucial or not, and even technology-wise, how should we detect such behavior? Wouldn't that be another burden to the grid? If shutting down electricity due to that reason results in fatalities in any way, who is even responsible? Isn't the progressive rate system (누진제) already enough? I mean, even for the second question, revising the progressive rate system alone might alleviate the entire issue in terms of making AI companies endlessly boil spaghetti and be more responsible of each execution they make. (20255031 Kyunghwan Kim)
- Electricity consumption should be prioritized based on its purpose. Power for essential needs—like lighting, heating, and healthcare—must come before large-scale AI applications that are not strictly necessary. While AI can bring innovation, expanding energy infrastructure mainly for its benefit is unfair when many people still struggle to afford electricity. Therefore, it is reasonable to set ethical and environmental limits on how much electricity AI should consume. (20230835 HyunjiHuh)
- Electricity can be divided into essential energy for survival—such as heating, cooling, and lighting / and luxury uses powered by AI, like chatbots or virtual assistants. The author criticizes providing equal energy support for nonessential features, such as “asking Alexa to fart.” He argues that society must distinguish between basic human needs and the AI industry’s excessive energy use. Therefore, the cost of expanding the power grid should be borne by the AI industry, not ordinary consumers.(20254499 Jieun Lee)
- We should separate power for basics such as light, heading, cooling, and health from extra AI uses that are not strictly necessary. Because many people already struggle to pay electric bills, AI should not crowd out or raise the cost of essential energy. (20254459 Suyoun lee)
- Electricity should be prioritized for basic human needs such as lighting, heating, and healthcare before being allocated to nonessential AI uses. The costs of expanding and upgrading the grid to support AI should not fall on households already struggling to afford electricity. A responsible share of electricity for AI is one that serves clear social or environmental benefits and does not deepen existing inequalities in energy access. (Guhn Lee 20254430)
- The paper suggested that we should separate essential energy use from optional or luxury uses. This distinction is important because using large amounts of energy for luxury or experimental AI tools can take resources away from essential uses and make electricity more expensive for people who already struggle to afford it. It is reasonable and responsible to devote only a limited and carefully managed amount of electricity to AI, ensuring that innovation does not come at the cost of fairness or access to basic energy needs. (20256333 Jana N.)
- Electricity is a basic public good tied to survival, so essential household electricity should be protected, and luxury/optional AI workloads should not be treated the same.(20210533 Hyeonseok Lee)

- If the industry is driving demand for all this new power, how should the burden of upgrading the power grid to support AI not fall on consumers?

  - (20244442 Jongik Jeon) To address this issue, I agree with the author's claim. By modifying the governance structure in an efficient and delicate way, we can reflect different stakeholders' opinions when taking the next step of AI development. For example, when new AI development is necessary but requires substantial resource consumption or a significant rise in prices, a thorough verification should be conducted by integrating the perspectives of diverse users (not only developers) to determine if the development is truly essential and beneficial to all.
  - (20253833 Jeonghoon Han) According to the author, consumers should not bear the cost of AI's growing energy appetite. Instead, the technology industry must share responsibility for infrastructure expansion, since it directly drives the surge in demand. He suggests reforming grid governance so that decisions about new energy-intensive AI projects include broader social input, not just corporate interests. In this way, power systems can evolve fairly while preventing energy inequities from deepening further.
  - (20210193 Hyerin Na) It would be best if the tech industry could restrain themselves from greed. However, I'm quite skeptical about that possibility, because capitalist society doesn't function in that way. The utilities have no reason to have mercy on us currently, because their main consumer is not us. So in my opinion, rather than trusting capitalism, the government has to focus on that problem and construct the regulation as soon as possible.
  - Since industry is driving demand, grid-upgrade costs should be borne by AI developers and data-center operators via interconnection requirements, capacity contributions, and targeted tariffs under reformed, participatory grid governance—not by household consumers (20254257 Hyungseok Moon).
  - The technology sector should bear responsibility for upgrading the grid rather than passing costs to consumers, ensuring equitable access to affordable electricity. (20180892 Bonwoo Koo)
  -The responsibility for upgrading the power grid should fall on the AI and data center industry instead of consumers. New governance structures should be put in place to reduce incentives for arbitrage, to have the industry take responsibility of the energy usage and to ensure access to affordable power is retained for consumers. (20256331 Emilia Ojala)
  -If the industry is driving demand for new power, it should bear the cost of upgrading the grid—not consumers. This requires three actions: the industry taking financial responsibility, reforming governance to ensure fair cost distribution, and adopting proactive, ethical measures to support sustainable energy use. (20210397 Sohyeon Yu)
  - Upgrading the grids should be a responsibility of the AI industry. They are the ones making money of the AI and via that the energy, so they should be the ones to invest their money in this (Vaeinoe Ristimaeki 20256332)
  - Given the enormous amount of energy they consume, I believe AI technology companies should share the cost of expanding the electricity infrastructure. Beyond simply building more power plants or transmission lines, a more responsible and

sustainable approach would involve contributing to the scaling of environmentally friendly energy technologies. (20254477 Eunchae Lee)
- If the industry is driving the surge in electricity demand, it should also share the responsibility and cost of upgrading the power grid. Large tech and AI companies benefit directly from this expanded capacity, so they must contribute through infrastructure investment, carbon fees, or special energy tariffs. Otherwise, ordinary consumers who may already struggle to afford basic utilities would unfairly bear the cost. (20220656 SubinCho)
- (20230377 Eunji Shin) Apply cost-causation and additionality: require large AI/data-center interconnections to fund a commensurate share of transmission/distribution upgrades, align siting with real grid capacity (location-based signals), and pair growth with firm, clean supply they bring online. Regulators can shift investor-owned utilities from volume-driven returns to performance-based incentives, reduce arbitrage opportunities, and mandate heat-recovery/community-benefit agreements so externalities aren't socialized. The article explicitly raises whether tech should pay for new generation and grid build-outs since it's driving demand—answer: yes, via structured tariffs, interconnection charges, and accountability mechanisms.
- Since the AI industry is largely responsible for the rapid increase in electricity demand, the cost of expanding and upgrading the power grid should not be passed on to consumers. Instead, AI companies that drive this demand should share the financial responsibility for improving the power system. (20254509 TaehyunLee)
- The industries fueling AI growth should help finance the grid upgrades their expansion requires. If the costs fall on consumers, it deepens inequality, so a fair approach is for major data and tech companies to contribute through targeted fees or infrastructure partnerships that strengthen the power system for everyone. (20254236 Haeri Kim)
- (20190607 Jaeyong Jung) The expense of boosting the grid for AI should not fall on those already struggling with basic bills. Since the technology industry is driving this massive new demand for power, they must actively discuss their responsibility to pay for new generation and distribution upgrades. Additionally, we should adjust grid governance structures, perhaps by implementing measures like progressive tariffs that internalize local impacts, ensuring these rising costs are not unfairly shifted to consumers.
- The burden should not fall on consumers because many households already struggle to pay bills; instead, we must protect basic needs first and keep essential power affordable.
Since the tech industry is driving the new demand, it should take responsibility for paying for new generation and grid upgrades, rather than shifting costs to the public. Regulators and policymakers should adjust grid governance so non-essential AI growth doesn't raise prices for everyday users and communities. (20254529 Sunghyun Chang)
- Again, the idea is compelling, but it sounds like a huge lawsuit or even a more serious dystopia. If electrical grid providers (in countries where the service is not owned by the government) try to charge the cost of infrastructure upgrade to AI companies, it's as if AI companies are holding the stake of grid companies in a way. Then they would influence more on decision-making about the power grid, further blurring the motivation behind

this. The fact that this AI boom will not last forever is also a concern. What would the AI companies do with the stake when the boom suddenly pops? I think the most realistic way would be to let AI companies have their own power farm if they need, and strengthen the progressive rate system (누진제) if required. From the cooling point of view, like current datacenters, utilizing vacant land along the seashore near the powerplant or using the excessive heat to warm the swimming pool (https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-64939558) might be an option. (20255031 Kyunghwan Kim)

- Since the AI industry is driving most of the new electricity demand, it should also take primary responsibility for upgrading the power grid. Companies that profit from large-scale AI operations must contribute financially through taxes, tariffs, or direct investment, rather than shifting the burden to consumers. Transparent governance and regulation are necessary to ensure that energy expansion remains fair, sustainable, and socially responsible. (20230835 Hyunji Huh)
- Since AI companies are the main cause of this growing power demand, they should pay for the grid expansion and system upgrades needed to support it.he current system risks shifting those costs to consumers through higher electricity rates, worsening inequality.Instead, governments and regulators should make sure that the companies using the most energy also help maintain a stable and reliable power grid.(20254499 Jieun Lee)

The burden shouldn't fall on consumers because the industries creating the new demand are the ones directly benefiting from grid expansion. They should fund infrastructure upgrades through higher connection fees, taxes, or mandated investments in clean and reliable generation. Companies should also locate data centers in places that are not inhabited by people to prevent a loss in their quality of life (access to water, electricity, and living costs). And lastly, nuclear energy when maintained with robust measures will provide the consistent and efficient energy source that data centers need. Otherwise the world will burn. (Guhn Lee 20254430)

If AI companies are driving up power demand, those who are not ordinary consumers should pay for the grid upgrades required to support their increased energy use. Since the technology industry is responsible for creating this new demand, it is fair that they contribute to the costs of expanding and maintaining the power infrastructure. Otherwise, regular households could face higher electricity bills for benefits they do not directly receive. The author emphasizes that the electric system should be managed in a way that prevents AI's growing energy needs from making electricity less affordable and accessible for everyone else. (20256333 Jana N.)

- The cost of upgrading the power grid should be borne by the industries that create the demand (AI/tech), not shifted onto regular consumers. (20210533 Hyeonseok Lee)