VAILLANCOURT, TRACY

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

FLIP: 3 Jiang - Pattipati v. 7 Li - Sheng

Public Forum Debate
Tracy Vaillancourt (*14)

Finals - 15 - 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _______

Orders & 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

Judge's Signature

PCDS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

1. Housing nightmare
   - 35 AH / 100 LI renters
   - AH by 60%; MRH solves gap

2. MRH filtering luxury depr. at 15k/year
   - Value of other homes make affordable
   - Most AH is filtered down

Segregating market not just by luxury

MRH shortage means competing
  - for same housing, LI for luxury

- MRH allows landlords to set own cost +
  - need to adhere to rent control

- MRH roll back regulations on
  - existing houses + remove rent control

- New luxury construction means luxury
  - MRH most needed

- MRH dev. promotes manage.
  - uncontrolled market drives + prices 5%
  - gentrification @ prices of new los.
  - MRH + cost for construction so build

Shift construction priorities to MRH

- MRH dev. prompts AH construction to build
- running out long term impossible
- new short term / rental shortage

- The first question is asked
  - by the earlier speaker.
• bring up where does prop tax $ go a lot sooner this is a huge way to eliminate their turn + it went unaddressed until FF

• same with 1:1, 1.5:1, 1 in rent

• y'all both need to give me a clearer explanation of how the market works bc you keep contradicting each other in terms of function and never try and clarify; I can't trust either team who evidence by more of a turn

• pro needs more cards to outevidence con on how many people live in rent controlled areas since con's entire case is rent control

• con did a better job of responding to args. in rebuttal but unfortunately that allowed pro to respond to every response and further defend their own case before reading just a few cards about rent control to attack con's whole case
You need to do a better job explaining how inclusionary zoning laws still fit with market rate housing. The argument about in construction was weak, but the second one about increasing wages for construction workers was the correct way to go.

RFD vote for Pro. The Aff outweighs on long term impacts, filtering and increased tax revenue. Neg only gains access to short term impacts.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Speech</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Excerpts</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner) **Pro**

**Pro:** Define madefracture + resolve conflict between that
definition + inclusionary zoning! Analysis + weighing
the economics of this policy analysis. TS will
up as well as negative impact of the status quo prevails.

**Con:** Strongest argument was turning madefracture against
check how property taxes + rates are set - rarely do
property taxes go down.

**REDA:** Pro ballot based upon economics -
impact of TS on the problem of affordable
housing prevailed. Secondary argument on
time frame also fell for pro.

---

**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

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