In an attempt to improve highway safety, Prunty County last year lowered its speed limit from 55 to 45 miles per hour on all county highways. But this effort has failed: the number of accidents has not decreased, and, based on reports by the highway patrol, many drivers are exceeding the speed limit. Prunty County should instead undertake the same kind of road improvement project that Butler County completed five years ago: increasing lane widths, resurfacing rough highways, and improving visibility at dangerous intersections. Today, major Butler County roads still have a 55 mph speed limit, yet there were 25 percent fewer reported accidents in Butler County this past year than there were five years ago.

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.

At the very first glance, it seems plausible for the author to draw the conclusion that the limitation on speed has no effect on reducing the accident on the highway. He also suggests to intimate the B city’s successful case to tackle with the problem. However, this problem could hardly be assigned such a hasty conclusion and suggestion based on the offered information which do not suffice to render a desirable improvement. According, more evidences are supposed to be collected to corroborate the variation and feasibility of this issue.

To begin with, the author mentions the number of accidents does not decrease after lowing the speed limits, which indicates the new limitation does not effective. However, more evidences should be provided about whether the overall traffic status has changed after applying the new law. For example, if whole traffic has become much busier due to some seasonal reason, then, although the number of accidents does not decline, it could not necessarily manifest the traffic situation has not been improved. In this case, without the evidence of the overall traffic fluctuation during the new rule implemented period, we could justify whether the accident has been controlled.

Secondly, regarding the report that the author highlights, it has been used to state most of the drivers do not obey the new regulation. Here we need to cast doubt whether those report could reflect the real and comprehensive picture of all the drivers. Many essential evidences are lacking, such as the location of the patrol station where the reports come from, is the location need the entrance of the highway so people might be dismiss the signal but then slow down after noticing the now rule? Or who have provides the information? If it is the shop keepers, then how could he fathom the speed of very pass-by cars accurately?

To settle all these questions, we need to seek more information from reliable source.

Finally, the author employs the successful case of B city to advocate undertaking the same kind of road improvement as B did five years ago. However, more evidences are expected to be provided here to prove that if P emulate B’s action, it would give rise to a same result. Lacking the detailed comparison of the two places, any consequence of implementing B’s action to P might only rely on conjecture. For example, if the percentage of citizen in B who are frequent driver was only 15% by five years ago, while the figure of P is 45% now, surely B could benefited from the new road then, whereas the same action would do little favor to P.

All in all, as discussed above, the conclusion of the lower limitation has no effects could be weaken, as well as the solution of the road improvement could end up with being less effective without adequate information.