**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shakir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Fraley</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Don't talk over each other in cross.

**RFD:** I am voting con. Con provided clear examples of affordable housing in the status quo helps to improve poverty reduction. Filtering through warrant. I on the con side, thus, proved that market rate housing destroys affordable housing. Iglesias doesn't quantify or provide a time frame on how much housing demand is left for people. But even if I bought that argument, neither mitigates its impact through time frame. Stating it would take 100 years to access.

You both really were accessing the same impact and just debating the mechanism to achieving poverty reduction.