The passage and the lecture argue over the decline in frog populations. The reading asserts three solutions to prevent this decline. On the other hand, the lecturer casts doubt on the solutions that are given in the reading passage.

First of all, the author of the reading argues that law should be established to prohibit the farmers from using harmful pesticides near sensitive frog populations, for those pesticides can attack the nervous system of frogs if they enter a frog's body. However, the professor asserts that this is not an economically pragmatic or fair measure. Because, farmers whose farm are near the endangered frog populations have to follow stricter regulations regarding pesticides use. Thus, there would be severe disadvantage for these farmers compared to those in other areas.

Second, the reading passage holds the view that the frogs which are infected with fungus can receive antifungal medication. In the contrast, the woman in the lecture explains that it is really hard to capture each individual frog and apply these treatments on the large scale. Also, the fungus cannot be stopped from passing onto the next generation, so the treatment would have to be applied again to each new generation of frogs. Therefore, the whole project will be incredibly expensive.

Finally, the writer explains the third solution which is about protecting key water habitat from excessive water use and development by human being. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that the real threat to frog habitats is global warming which has contributed to the disappearance of many water and wetland habitats. Hence, forbidding humans from using water or building near frog habitats is not good solution to reverse the ongoing habitat changes caused by global warming.