The following appeared in a memorandum written by the chairperson of the West Egg Town Council.

"Two years ago, consultants predicted that West Egg's landfill, which is used for garbage disposal, would be completely filled within five years. During the past two years, however, the town's residents have been recycling twice as much material as they did in previous years. **Next month the amount of recycled material — which includes paper, plastic, and metal — should further increase, since charges for pickup of other household garbage will double**. **Furthermore, over 90 percent of the respondents to a recent survey said that they would do more recycling in the future.** Because of our town's strong commitment to recycling, the available space in our landfill should last for considerably longer than predicted."

Write a response in which you discuss what specific evidence is needed to evaluate the argument and explain how the evidence would weaken or strengthen the argument.

In the memorandum, the West Egg Town chairperson concludes that the town's available space in their landfill will last longer. However, the author comes to this contention based on a few unwarranted assumptions. If the author's claim were to take full effect, the council requires 2 crucial pieces of evidence.

First, the author presumes that the amount of recycled material should appreciate still since pickup charges have increased for household garbage. However, this may not necessarily be the case. It is possible many households will personally deliver their trash to the town landfill rather than rely on the pickup. Perhaps, some household may even consider paying the excess fee for the pickup since recycling requires comparable tedious since all of the garbage needs to be sorted according to different categories and biodegradability. If the aforementioned piece of evidence is true, the author's negligence in evaluating it significantly weakens their argument.

Secondly, the author assumes that, since over 90 percent of respondents to a recent survey said they would do more recycling, the town has a 'strong commitment to recycling'. It could be that only a select few people answered the survey, which would not be a representative sample of the town's population. For example, if there are over 10,000 residents in the town and only 50 answer the survey that is a valid representation of the entire town's commitment. Further, even if a considerable amount of people answered the survey, it is also possible that they were not truthful since most people belie their true intention when questioned in public. If either of the scenarios above is true, then the author's claim doesn't hold water.

In conclusion, the claim put forth by the chairperson of the town's council, as it stands now, is flawed. If the author where to conduct a proper scientific study that addressed each of the pieces of evidence mentioned above, the author's contention will prove more effective.

**Corrected**:

In the memorandum, the West Egg Town chairperson concludes that the town's available space in their landfill will last longer. However, the author comes to this contention based on a few unwarranted assumptions. If the author's claim were to take full effect, the council needs to evaluate 2 crucial pieces of evidence.

First, the author presumes that the amount of recycled material should appreciate still since pickup charges have increased for household garbage. However, this may not necessarily be the case. It is possible that many households will personally deliver their trash to the town landfill rather than rely on the pickup. Perhaps, some households may even consider paying the excess fee for the pickup since recycling is comparably more tedious since all of the garbage needs to be sorted according to different categories and biodegradability. If the aforementioned piece of evidence is true, the author's negligence in evaluating it significantly weakens his/her argument.

Secondly, the author assumes that the town has a 'strong commitment to recycling' based on a recent survey where 90 percent of respondents said they would do more recycling. It could be that only a select few people answered the survey, which would not be a representative sample of the town's population. For example, if there are over 10,000 residents in the town and only 50 answered the survey, then this isn't a valid representation of the entire town's commitment. Further, even if a considerable amount of people answered the survey, it is also possible that they were not truthful since most people tend to belie their true intention when questioned in public. If either of the scenarios above is true, then the author's claim doesn't hold water.

In conclusion, the claim put forth by the chairperson of the town's council, as it stands now, is flawed. If the author were to conduct a proper scientific study that addressed each of the pieces of evidence mentioned above, the author's contention would prove more effective.