

The Pier Decision: A Written Exchange

Connect texts, respond to a reader, and explain how dialogue changes your reasoning.

12.P.EICC.2 "Engagement & Intention: Engage in written or spoken dialogue as author and audience for a variety of tasks and purposes, making intentional connections within, between, and beyond texts."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB Work with a partner, one packet each. Texts A and B are complete fictional classroom documents. Underline an idea worth preserving in A and circle a practical constraint in B. Each person will act as both writer and audience.

A Public Decision With More Than One Voice

- ① **Text A: student waterfront group.** The pier should not be described only as unused space. Residents gather on the adjacent waterfront during community events, and a local archive contains memories of work and family life connected to this place. Those stories do not prove that the structure is safe or that every board should remain. They do show why demolition deserves public discussion. We ask the harbor commission to compare ways of preserving access and history before choosing a parking lot. People who cannot attend daytime meetings should have a meaningful way to contribute.
- ② **Text B: commission response.** The pier is closed while engineers assess damaged supports; the nearby shore path remains open. We will consider options only if they protect public safety. We do not yet have verified prices for restoration or demolition, and the next meeting is for gathering questions, not approving construction. Written comments are welcome, and an evening session could be arranged. Please explain which uses or histories your proposal would protect and what evidence would help compare options. We cannot promise that a hearing will make restoration affordable or safe.

- ③ **Your dialogue.** Write a public comment to the commission that connects a specific idea from A with a condition from B and a broader community need. Exchange packets. As the commission reader, respond to a specific choice in your partner’s comment and ask a useful question. Return packets. As the original author, answer the actual question and revise or defend your proposal with a reason. All engineering and historical details here belong to an invented case; do not claim that real residents, archives or agencies supplied these documents.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

- ① How does Text A connect a particular place to a broader community concern?

- ② Which distinction in Text B prevents an unsupported claim that the public can currently use the pier?

- ③ Identify one connection or tension between A and B that a comment should address.

- ④ What must the final follow-up do to demonstrate actual dialogue?

3 YOUR TURN

Your own words

Complete all three messages. Each student writes a comment, replies as the audience on the partner's packet, and answers the reply received. Count each message body separately; labels, greetings and signatures are outside the ranges. Respect both source documents and preserve uncertainty about safety and cost.

1. Your public comment

Write 75-100 words to the commission. Connect A and B to a broader need, acknowledge a reasonable concern and request a concrete response. Exchange packets.

This image shows a blank sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

2. Partner's reader response

Partner writes here as commission reader: 40–60 words responding to one actual proposal detail and asking a substantive question. Return the packet.

3. Your follow-up

Write 30–50 words answering the actual question. Explain one revision or give a reason for keeping a choice, referring to the case when useful.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Work with a partner, one packet each. Texts A and B are complete fictional classroom documents. Underline an idea worth preserving in A and circle a practical constraint in B. Each person will act as both writer and audience. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	How does Text A connect a particular place to a broader community concern?	It connects waterfront use and remembered work or family life to public access, local history and participation by people unable to attend daytime meetings.
2	Which distinction in Text B prevents an unsupported claim that the public can currently use the pier?	The pier is closed for assessment, while the adjacent shore path remains open. Access to the path does not establish that the pier is safe.
3	Identify one connection or tension between A and B that a comment should address.	A asks to protect access and history; B requires safety evidence and verified costs. A proposal can request comparison or public input without assuming that restoration is feasible.
4	What must the final follow-up do to demonstrate actual dialogue?	Respond to the partner's real question, using evidence or reasoning to revise or defend a choice instead of inventing the reader's reply or repeating the opening comment.

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Illustrative public comment: Please compare a safe way to preserve the pier's history with demolition before choosing a parking lot. Text A connects the waterfront to public memory and participation, while Text B makes clear that the pier is closed and prices remain unverified. I am not asking you to reopen damaged supports. An evening session and written comments could identify which histories or uses residents value. Please publish those priorities alongside the engineering questions still unanswered, so people can see what further evidence a responsible decision requires.

Illustrative reader response: You distinguish preserving history from reopening an unsafe structure, which helps clarify the request. However, your comment does not explain how people unable to attend the evening session would see and question the priorities collected there. What method would give those residents a meaningful chance to respond before the commission compares options?

Illustrative follow-up: Please post a plain-language summary with the written-comment form and allow another response period before comparing options. That revises my request from one meeting to a continuing exchange. The summary should identify disputed priorities as well as common ones, without presenting either as engineering findings.

Require a real exchange between two students, each serving as author and audience using separate packets. The teacher may act as reader when needed; students must not fabricate a partner's contribution. Check message bodies separately against 75-100, 40-60 and 30-50 words. The first connects A, B and a broader need; the later turns respond to actual preceding contributions. Other defensible positions are welcome. Do not reward invented budgets, safe reopening, archive quotations or proof that a preferred option is feasible. The three labeled models show connected turns in a fictional case, not testimony from real people.