

COMMENTS: It appears you are making an argument that the appropriate response to the problematic risk of forest fires is the one presented by the U.S. Forrest Service and the rest of the coalition (clear-cutting trees rather than having them burn). However, with the amount of information above, your stance is unclear. Some of the rewrite above used the aforementioned assumption as being true. In either case, it is my recommendation that you add some more to your argument, including some more information on both the position of Canon City Trust and your own position.

It is also unclear to this reader exactly who the coalition's "private companies" are—it might be better to include one or two examples. Additionally, I removed your reference to "US forest management:", because it appeared you were referencing other forest management, like commercial logging. If you were trying to make a different point, potentially that the U.S. Forest Service had mismanaged past tree populations, it is my suggestion that you also revisit that statement.

Another area of concern is the distinction between "controlled burns" and "forest fires". You reference the Forest Service and the coalition position being "cutting trees before burning them" but the rest of the piece refers only to uncontrolled forest fires. You may want to further document your point.

Finally, you provided one quote and one perspective from Canon City Trust, but no counter-quotes from the coalition (Forest Service, private citizens, etc). I would suggest including one or two, if available.