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**Conclusion:**

* Presently, the public continues to be exposed to enormous financial burdens and known risks to the health, safety and lives of all who live within the blast radius of infrastructure in the Northwest industrial district.

**Premises:**

* + P1: On March 25, … and as much as $37 billion in building damages.
  + P2: This study followed the agency’s 2012 … critical oil and gas storage tanks and electrical infrastructure in Northwest Portland’s industrial area.
  + P3: Shockingly, current building code … fuel infrastructure.
  + P4: Despite the glaring oversights … improvements.
  + P5: In Oregon, building codes … seismic upgrades.
  + P6: In finding the city’s code … earthquake liquefaction zone.
  + P7: That cost would be … resilience measurement.
  + P8: This approach, … dangerous activities.
  + P8: At the time when we’re taking … ecological damage.

**Strength of Argument:**

I believe this is a really strong argument with a minor flaw that can be fixed for further improvement. First of all, the authors used quite an amount of statistic to back up their points of views. For instance, the authors briefly restated a research from Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, a governmental managed agent dealing with geology in general, to introduce the issue by letting the readers know ahead what the consequences would be. That would greatly attract the audience to keep reading the post to find out more. Next, by pointing out an old report in the past, in which discusses the same terrible results as in the more recent article, the authors create a connection between the present and the past. Thus, by doing so, the authors were also successfully proved that because we haven’t done anything to solve the problem, the risks still exist until the recent day. Such conclusion becomes the premise for his next point of view as in complex argument. However, since the authors didn’t explain carefully many scientific terms, such as Cascadia Subduction Zone, the premise can be difficult to understand, especially to the audience who doesn’t know much about such thing. Secondly, by pointing out that the government hasn’t actually worked towards the solution, the authors are able to urge the readers to act fast before the consequences come about. Finally, by clearly discuss about the possible solutions and their outcomes throughout the rest of his argument, the authors establish and greatly enhance the reason why the readers should accept and follow the argument.