This round was messy. No valid weighing from either side, so I had to weigh the arguments.

Key issue is whether building market rate housing will increase supply enough to decrease the price for poor. Pro’s argument that increase supply decrease price, which is common sense. However, rent control is not a normal market condition. Con’s Cambridge card about 50% rent spike after removing rent control was unresponded.

Con’s arguments on limitation of building from overview was also not refuted effectively. 1-1 tradeoff of affordable to luxury also limits pro’s argument that supply actually increases. Vacant land doesn’t equal to building space was also not refuted well.
While the Con team’s argument felt a bit disconnected in terms of the global impact & the repeated statistics about Ecuador, by the Pro team’s definition of a Con win, the Con team won. The Con team was able to prove that an Aff world would not have more benefits over harm as noted through the dropping of the enhanced education claim, lack of impact of filtering on low income families, and impact of building more in a world which already has a 6:1 ratio, vacant homes to homeless.

Pro - streamline your card finding process, over 6 minutes went into finding the first card Con team requested; you also went over time in - be wary of time wastage/usage.

Con - make the Ecuador/broadband claim clearer or drop it
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Nick Petsas (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Tehranchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **YES**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

I love the idea of what you guys proposed in 12th cross which is that the Aff doesn't state the probability of Sony losing big then defined as the action key taken by the Affirmative. You should have spent more time on this in rebuttal and explained it instead of trying to go for everything.

Rebuttal was a little quicker & older. I think you should have picked something to go for instead of explaining everything but you did it well. You have to be more positive & not go for everything in rebuttal summary. You almost got away with it & you guys are a good team so you usually can but it spread you too thin in this round against another good

---

**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.
### Public Forum Debate

**FLIP: 7 Sarwar - Desai v. 5 Goswick - Karanjia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Danielle Delgado (<em>18,8</em>)</th>
<th>Sat 03/16/19 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Karaniya (A1)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goswick (A2)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Desai (N1)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sarwar (N2)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was:

- **Pro**: [Signature]
- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF**: your & homeless impacts esp. cut
because it can be easy for the neg to gain those + impacts / case idea is smart

**A1**: when you don't catch a tagline, ask them to explain instead of just read off their case

**A2**: when you read your cards, cut them while you read... it will save time or summer, & c name

**N1**: don't be pressured to attempt to speak fast, just speak normally & clearly if you will get through all of your arguments in time / arguments were well-weighed

**N2**: Strongest debater in round / dig deeper in the gen. argument / call cress if I buy their FW why should I still buy the CON

**I vote PRO on FW!** while gentrification will happen in pro would the impact they provide technically outweigh the harm of there is no solution to poss. in future to solve but new people in new homes outgroups.
Ultimately, the argument presented by Team A was more compelling and the question they posed allowed them to prevail. Specifically, they were able to explain the economic impact of $20 million and offered examples to support their claims.

The differences between the two sides in the speeches were minimal, as all four teams displayed an impressive command of the material and the ability to respond thoughtfully to the arguments presented by the other team.

I was a grateful witness.
TRISTANO, MIKE

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

PF
FLIP: 15 Hays - Nair v. 5 Khan - Wong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Mike Tristano ('2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAIRO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Speaker             | Points (25-30)      |
| 1st                 | 29                  |
| WONG                |                     |
| 2nd                 | 29                  |
| KHAN                |                     |

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

While I think Bill Gates of this digital age has failed to the case of the Respor 2, The Secret laid out by once the side sum to be by once in a can world, more probable is a can world, specifically to open, middle, upper class, people success, two?

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Ethan Fiber (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2222</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sheng</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Li</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Prozzillo</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Harriss</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**RFD:** Aff delinks + responds to the neg args sufficiently and outweighs with turns and extension. Neg needed to press RC and affordable housing to have impacts + ground in this debate. Because of that I vote Aff.
PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE

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.

$1. Housing (Affordability/ Zoning/ Building) lead in increase in living. * Compare to CA. Housing.

C.1. Claim: Affordable houses in suburbs is unecessary. * Housing for Living has risen due to lack of rent control. * Affordable housing vs. market rate. * Need to reduce cost of living.

C.2. Answered questions well.

2. Affordable housing is expensive to develop. * Solution is to build more homes to decrease cost of living.

C.2. Answered questions well.

Cross 1 (Cooley) 

Pro 1: Rent control decreases quality of the community. Development. * Inclusionary zoning. (Interupting).

Con 1: Rent control does not decrease quality of the community. It leads to less housing.

C.2: Construction of houses is full of dead list demand.

C.2: Rent control only affects certain houses. Hardly all. 

C.2: Rent control leads to increase cost below median avg.

Con 1: Could not answer 2nd. Question 2.

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win? No

Pro 2: Housing (Affordability/ Zoning/ Building) lead in increase in living. * Compare to CA. Housing.

C.1. Claim: Affordable houses in suburbs is unecessary. * Housing for Living has risen due to lack of rent control. * Affordable housing vs. market rate. * Need to reduce cost of living.

C.2. Answered questions well.

2. Affordable housing is expensive to develop. * Solution is to build more homes to decrease cost of living.

C.2. Answered questions well.

Cross 1 (Cooley) 

Pro 1: Rent control decreases quality of the community. Development. * Inclusionary zoning. (Interupting).

Con 1: Rent control does not decrease quality of the community. It leads to less housing.

C.2: Construction of houses is full of dead list demand.

C.2: Rent control only affects certain houses. Hardly all. 

C.2: Rent control leads to increase cost below median avg. 

Con 1: Could not answer 2nd. Question 2.

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win? No

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.
* Not activating license renewal, but new license developed.

Con 2: * Displacement of people from their homes.
  * Housing vouchers do not meet demand
  * Placed by housing centers/home owners
  * Lack of new central home pushed to west in part