# Public Forum Debate

**FLIP: 7 Panda - Shakir v. 18 Panayotova - Castañeda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Alex Wakefield (*5,2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Neha Shakir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pirnak Panda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Aff:**
  - Just be more resolved would prioritize market rate housing does not mean that it is the answer.
  - Stop making arguments about rent control being good. If a city can't play well with the judges.
  - Interestingly, Chente's drop rent control, but I get why you did it.
  - If you're going to drop rent control like that, you HAVE to: (1) Bring your theme (2) Not bring rent control up in the prep. Get it.
  - You don't have to tell me out loud you're dropping something, just do it.

- **Neg:**
  - You should have a question ready to start CX: session 2.
  - You should spend your rebuttal attacking their flow not re-reading their rest of your case or extending.
  - You seemed to completely drop their opening argument.
  - You need to respond to the majority of the San Francisco costest.

---

**Summary Structure:**

- Warrants → Response → Warrants → Why you win → Weigh.
Con team seemed to have a more realistic understanding of the impact of free market. As indicated in their initial argument, the majority of housing being built is luxury, driving up housing costs and causing price ripple effects. Even if more middle class housing were built, the rate of filtering is insufficient. Market price housing is on par with trickled down economics which is considered, by many economists, to be problematic.
AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Jason Knorr (*'19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 2212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Thomas, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pertovsky, 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Corben: you shouldn't refute when reading the case of ther it shouldn't be a huge pause of fluency issues when you are reading where you sources (mention them before the case) you only mention issues Thomas rather than asking who is your impact/ cont. ask them to explain/be more assertive in CX Pertovsky: housing is living in a bone Desai: don't waste your time reading the entire card... cut it down & summarize be careful when saying something flows through when they didn't address something... they did attack it may be not the best but they only you brought up the collision point too late in CCX

I vote AFF as they had a better understanding of the topic or proved the econ profit will solve the neg effects of the SQ & benefit their CU.
AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

PF

FLIP: 7 Sanyal - Voller-Brown v. 15 Hays - Nair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2220</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker Con Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>HAYS</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>NAIR</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>VOLLER-BROWN</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>SANYAL</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

RFD: The only impact left at the end of the round was OPIC broadband saving 2.5m lives at providing 400k people w/ housing vs i vote on that.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>McCormick</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jakrebet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lupica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:
- **Pro**: Great job on refining cards and combatting points on defense.
- **Con**: Put your better cards on later.
- Both sides delivered well.
Con Side - very very good choice of cites. Supported your side well. Your argument was well constructed and easy to follow. Sheng - nice, solid delivery, a joy to listen to you. Li - very good pushing back during cross. Try not to be so combative. You are debating, not battling.

Pro Side - your argument was about affordability but you tried to swerve health issues in and it didn’t work. Also the “filtration” idea is not well supported. Both of you need a little more preparation and knowledge of the subject. Hollman - as first speaker, you need to make a little more eye contact. Good first effort.

Age does not make luxury housing affordable. The most expensive areas can be the oldest. Old parts of Phx (Arcadia, N. central) are still very expensive 60+ years later. What about gentrification???
**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2208</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Venkatachalam 26 25</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sengupta 20 25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro**
- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**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.
30.

Market Rate

App. 

- Lack of supply
- Lost affordable supply
- Study - persistence of poverty w/ gentrification.
- Affected disabled especially

Impacts:
- Study lack of elasticity
  - Argued rich move away
    leaving poverty, & declining rents/values

Failed to say why
the poor must live
in urban neighborhood.

Gentrification leads to
affordable housing by a
t factor of 12.

- Societal Good vs.
- Affordability.

1:44

0 Aff. 

argued income insufficient

Failed to make the pt.
of supply & demand

Made point of supply & demand BUT lacked data points.

Did not point out
that the rich moving
away drives down
value.

Gave stats on
 displacement.

& Missed inequity/inefficiency
of gov. involvement.
**Public Forum Debate**

**Stephanie Okonoski (*6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2216</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>@ Sreya Pattipati</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>@ Ryan Jiang</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was 

Pro (Circle Winner)

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

**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: 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:**

Should the US government promote the development of market-rate housing in urban areas?

**Con - Morgan 27**

1. Gender
2. Price rates out for what can handle
3. 2017 increase
   - During rent increases, demand for housing
   - Show that this is disability with priced out on market
     - Homelessness
     - Victimization especially women
     - Landlord won't move
     - Negative cycle - market-rate has
     - Quality of lives
     - Builders are out of money? - Argument clear

**Pro - build new quality housing for people of moving life demand for jobs filter**

- Marketing
- Ballooning rent increases but 55% I renovate stop
- Rehab for communities at higher price point

**Judge's Signature**

Sunrise Mountain HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation
Promote problem with market-rate housing kept 35 low housing rent decreased by 2%

Feeling:
2/3 of affordable housing no bidding war monopoly jacking up prices prevents competition

5. income promote market - doubled housing

0. better education

Ryan 20

And Norwegian - melon

2. not building enough houses

20% gender disability SSI - funding impact fees shortage for prices

NYU - R. Chan

post are communists
Public Forum Debate

Round 2

Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (25-30)
-------|-----|--------------|--------|-----|--------------
1st | Moffatt | 26 | 1st | Cheek | 26 |
2nd | Pattipati | 29 | 2nd | Mukherjee | 28 |

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:
Friendly talk before debate between teams - talking over the judge a bit. Keep it professional once inside the room. Took a long time for con to pro-focal. Not a great first impression of either side, to be honest.

Speaker 1: Nice job on constructive. Spoke well & passionately. Clear points. Define "nightmare" in your one contention.
Cross: Nice job controlling the pace of response. Excellent.

Speaker 2: Good case but a bit rough in the delivery when you spoke off script, you did better.
Cross: You did an awesome job controlling the cross. Wow - master class! Nicely done.

Summary: Nice job restating & clarifying case points - well spoken.
Grand Cross: Isn't Trump going to be out of office in a year?* huh?

Final Focus: Great job clarifying questions in the grand cross, housing bracket shift is 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2224</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sarfati</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Karanjia</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goswick</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

1. Not enough offense on either as a result of a lack of frontlining + extending thru int.
**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>Bakshi</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td>29</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>Yango</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Great job tactically in this debate. You all have improved so much as a team!

- 1st Speaker points for being extraordinarily late... 30 mins late

- Case was too fast

- Contention 2 is not a contention... it is a warranty of the impacts of the first contention

- Never anytime in Grand Crossfire is a good look.

**RED:** The Aff wins by showing it is a supply issue, not a "price" issue. They also show that gentrification does not actually lead to displacement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Scott Nielson (*'10)</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2215</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>Gortzinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
<td>Sillirer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _No_

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

---

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</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>Oldani</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Schillinger</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Shih</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 doesn't adequately address my response or impacts so I have to vote my on affordability and displacement. Need cleaner extension from both teams. Good debuting.
Pattipati, Suresh
Kapadia, Binal

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2219</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Michael Villagomez</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Alex Anderson</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff doesn’t show affordability solution.
Aff concedes the Internal link.
About supply not being the problem.
Ney has WAY better strength of link for their terminus impacts.

Cool.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>4 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</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

**FLIP: 5 Khan - Wong v. 6 Vlantentine - Robbins**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Meera Chakabarty (7)</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Robbins</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vlantentine</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Robbins spoke well.

Vlantentine spoke well but was not able to defend points well.

Wong spoke well. Strong arguments. Wong was the best speaker.

Khan was able to dismantle the other team argument.
GUINEY, ERIN

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

PF

FLIP: 5 Braun - Gustin v. 15 Kalra - Shah

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Erin Guiney (*2,18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shah 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kalra 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gustin 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Braun 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Housing nightmare
  -35 aft homes/100 ppl (poor)
  -7010-16 aft. homes v.
  -Lower rates
  -Strife stops filtering
  -Homes become 15 as time goes on. Can take 50 years + become affordable.

- Segregated market
  -Always a profit to build.
  -Lack of luxury = get AH, so need luxury so poor
  -AH.gov.

- End manipulative monopoly with price of homelessness (lack of AH bigtest
market highly concentrated on reason: 1) is not building enough homes
+ monopolies + prices prevent competition

- MRH removes monopolies + 1 cost, MRH 1 living costs

- Homes built shortage of skilled workers + materials costs

- Companies build more AH when city land

- Companies built in better neighborhoods

- Allot more housing poverty +

- 1 chance of gent.
agree

solve long + short term
more ATP must happen for every
luxury in SQ
taxes go to subsidies for ATP
(when poor tax?)

pro

can

fair housing for all (esp low income)
low income must get out of poverty

1. Housing market - short term displace
   - new dev. should be 50% ATP, in only
   - 70% MRH only makes worse
   - 70% MRH = luxury, lead in rent only
   - water shortage, expensive land, materials, drop zones

2. gent. disp.
The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Pro didn’t address Con’s case in rebuttal at all. Pro also failed to make clear links on how market housing helps poor, especially disabled people. Cheap supply and demand would automatically lower the price, doesn’t sit well with gentrification from Neg. Neg was able to extend gentrification and impact on disabled people without much blocks.
PF

FLIP: 3 Sastriawan - Dinnan v. 7 Sarwar - Desai

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

Public Forum Debate

Greg Pratt (*'19)

Round 2

Room 5212

Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM

Speaker

Pro

Points

Con

(25-30)

1st

Anika Desai

28

1st

Emma Dinnan

25

2nd

Sazana Sarwar

27

2nd

Yoga Sastriawan

24

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Con

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

It would be helpful in your case to make clear distinction between houses or apartments - you seemed to use these terms interchangeably. I was surprised by your assertion that market housing would coexist with affordable housing policies. Over time wouldn't market controls/ zoning be lifted?

Sazana - careful of 2 that ends - what do you mean? This is an invitation for opponents to debate their case. 2 outstanding young debaters - thank you for adjusting to my speed limitation, great debate!

Con

I'd like a definition of affordable housing & see pro comment on house/apt. Emma - very confusing response to 1st question - you too have potential that will be realized with experience - once you take your economics course your facility with these arguments will improve. I would have attached how to ask how their case would fit Q?

Decision: This round would benefit from definition clarity - I was never certain if the debaters were referring to single family houses or apartments and the application of zoning control idea was very unclear.

RFD - Pro case prevailed, although the housing supply assertion by con was undressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Scott Franz (*15)</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 2225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Prozzille</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro    Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

Aff wins by forfeit as a member of the negative was unable to compete this round.

Con may be able to compete r 4.