FLIP: 15 Hays - Nair v. 3 Jiang - Pattipati

Public Forum Debate

Danielle Delgado (*18.8)

Round 3

Room 2217

Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM

<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>26</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>Hays</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Pattipati: Don't take a minute to get ready before you speak. Otherwise next time I'll count it as prep.
- First speakers: Your cases are so dramatic. Nair, you too and I appreciate that. But I feel like you would be a better 1st speaker (your are good at rebuttal tho, just your pacing is better off in case/sum).
- Neg: that was the most iconic case to get more prep.

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.

Great round (had a great laugh)

I vote Con due to the fact that the AFF is impacts take too long and are too small retheta in the Neg. Would win biopartition support the harms here ability to be mitigated but the current ameliorates will continue.
Both sides AMAZING! This is really hard.

**CON Side**: Korer - great job setting up your arguments. Very good speaker. Bendok - you have a lot of passion - try to regulate better - no yelling when you yell, it is hard to follow you. You did a good job addressing all the PRO side points. Very thorough. *

**PRO Side**: Your arguments were very organized and easy to follow. Very good data + good job explaining it. Both of you are exceptional speakers, you sound very polished + prepared. Good deflection during cross. Great job keeping audience following you.

*Korer - fantastic summary of problem.

**PRO Side wins** - displayed exceptional knowledge, great delivery, remained composed in cross, addressed all con points.

**Thank You!**
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2212</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Yango</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Gould</strong></td>
<td>29</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.

---

Scarcity concedes need for affordability.

Aff drops filtering in the AF.

No solvency means Neg wins.
**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.

---

**RFD:** I am voting on the Nexus study and the federal reserve can, market rate housing increases need for housing, which the aff did not answer for.

**AFF:** Make sure in summary flow through your own argument and if you're going to give me a key voter, talk about it. Your framework was abusive because it did not allow the neg to access any argumentation or provide counter-argument.

I just feel when I look at my flow, there is too much defenses in summary and if and little offers which gave me no reason to vote aff.

**NEG:** The issue here is that there is too much time spent attacking was weak, and little weighing being done. Also, Marimond is not something I would bring to that.

**EVERYONE:** Weigh please impact level debate not more, level of at least weight is round to me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2224</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Anika Desai</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sazma Sarwar</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kay Bakshi</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jenna Cooley</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

Comments & Reason for Decision: I was swayed towards affirmation because of the points listed below:

1. Used competition by building more houses to drive prices and hence will increase affordability.
2. Strong point with Mr. Trump slashing budget by 6.2 billion & need for more housing.

Negotiate side made good arguments about gentrification, zoning laws but failed to convince me to negate. They also need to allow their speed while giving speeches.

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 easier speaker.
CHAKABARTY, MEERA

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

PF

FLIP: 10 Rosenberg - Sarfati v. 2 Korzay - Moran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 5212</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</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>Sarfati 27</td>
<td>1st Halley Moran 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rosenberg 30</td>
<td>2nd Sarah Korzay 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Both the teams had strong arguments. But I vote for Con because they defend the points very well.

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 Crosfire (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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Aashney Shah (*5)</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Hossain</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Zawilak</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(circle winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: The Pro got too bogged down in link-level debate and so I had to weigh on impacts, which the NCF could cleanly flow through their C2 which wasn’t responded to. So I vote NCF on magnitude/time frame.

---

**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.
AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

Public Forum Debate

Round 3  
Room 2211  
Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM

Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30) | Con | Points (25-30)
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1st | CASTANEDA | 27 | ROBBINS | 28
2nd | PANAYOTOVA | 27 | VILANCENT | 28

The winner of this debate was

Pro | Con
--- | ---
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very good delivery and conclusions (Good skeletal)
AFC seems to conclude point that construction leads to crime housing
How do maker refer success across poor and minority
AFC was not addressing the demand of low income public housing

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.
FREY, AUTUMN

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

FLIP: 19 Jakrebet - Lupica v. 15 Kalra - Shah

PF

Public Forum Debate

Autumn Frey (*'17)

Round 3

Room 2208

Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM

Speaker: Pro

1st AARIW SHAH
2nd ESMAI KALRA

Points (25-30)
30

Speaker: Con

1st Witthi Jakrebet
2nd Mia Lupica

Points (25-30)
21

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Speaker 1: Passionate, smooth, well paced, logical. Nice job!
Cross: Completely owned the cross. You controlled the cross.

Speaker 2: Fabulous job, running totally off script. You know your case so well.
Cross: Good points on the funding.

Summary: Good job on use of pulling cards to see their examples may not totally be related to market rate housing, and showing which of your 5 points they did not address.

Girandercross: Good job pointing out that they are not quite arguing the resolution.

FF: Great way to wrap up the case.
Gentlemen - a true pleasure to watch you excel in this round!

Speaker 1: Well spoken. Good pace - nice, logical flow.
Cross: You attempted a good answer but gave pro the chance to grandstand.

Speaker 2: San Francisco example was great! Well spoken & logical.
Cross: You held your own but not sure you helped by using evidence specific to urban areas?

Summary: You are making great points- be passionate & be confident!
Girandercross: You're beating a dead horse with some questions that have already been asked.

FF: Speaker 2, you did a good job trying to wrap up your case, but it's not the judge's job to call for evidence - that's your job - call them out and ask for the cards! disprove it yourself.
While both teams did very well, the Pro team was better able to rebuttal all five elements of the Pro case on a more national scale. The Pro case struggled to provide evidence beyond Seattle and struggled with providing a time frame. Additionally, they failed to address the impact of loss of zoning & destruction of low income/affordable housing. Con team, be wary of the "wealthy own 9 houses claim"— broad generalizations were made in your math & was not clearly supported by your case.
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Aubrey Hoffer ('7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Moffatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points (25-30)

| 1st     | 25                 |
| 2nd     | 26                 |

The winner of this debate was

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

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 🎰

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro -**

1. You didn’t address I arguments against filtering even once.
2. You must be able to provide accurate cards. “All cards are opinions” is a flabby argument. You say that rich ppl are going to move into luxury apts and that there’s a housing gap for rich ppl - Prove it.

**Con -**

Great job. Try not to introduce new cards in cx - wastes time, save it for the case. Purely opinion tho so keep doing ya if that works.

---

**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: 10 Pertovsky - Thomas v. 19 Anderson - Villagomez**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2214</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Con Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sutton Thomas 28</td>
<td>Michael Villagomez 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shellie Petrovsky 28.5</td>
<td>Alexander Anderson 27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There was no clash. No one told me how to weigh arguments. I gave the room to Pro on clear extensions.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 ...................... 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 ...................... 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2) .................. 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 ...................... 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 ...................... 4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4) .................. 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary ........ 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary ........ 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all) .......... 3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus .......... 2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus .......... 2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
# AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

**Public Forum Debate**

**Nick Petsas (*'15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2225</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Voller Brown</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sanyal</td>
<td>29</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:**

Great job guys.

2nd speaker on *Neg* declared you speaker points by 2 by being disrespectful, arrogant & your opponents.

- Don't talk down your partner ooc ex: me.
- Don't say stop snappy & violent.
- Don't ask a "Do you have a point or not?" Have been paying attention to your partner in prep time.
- Sit down during your opponents time to speak.
- Stop styling on random.
- If I could give you less than the minimum speaker points I would.

1st Speaker - you did a wonderful job.
# Public Forum Debate

## Round 3

<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>McCormick</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hollman</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>29</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:**

**AFF**

Good rebuttal & being all + for containing need to bring in cards to support.

**NCS**

Good contentions. Need to bring in cards to support during rebuttal.

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Time Limit</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.*

---

Pro won as they would allow both gentrification & economy will be better in pro world.
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2213</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Goetzinger</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **MAKE SURE TO KEEP FLOW**
- **PRO WON WITH ARGUMENTS YOU CAN USE OTHER CAMS AND DERIVED LOGIC.**

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</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>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
GUINEY, ERIN

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

PF you can come off slightly patronizing in cross, be aware of your tones.

FLIP: 14 Stone - Parker v. 7 Li - Sheng

Public Forum Debate

Erin Guiney (*2,18)

Round 3

Room 2215

Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>1st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**PRO - 30**

1. MRH leads to gentrification
2. having market profit
3. MRH revenue = fund to help construct new buildings
4. Speculative means (doubling impact)
5. Aff. dev benefits + con: lack of ATI makes it hard to retain employees
6. Low demand = poor transport
7. Oil prices, supports low income households
8. Build too little housing market + prices of homes
9. Filtering = land running out
10. Healthy place high bids on existing RC + houses
11. Prevents filtering
12. MRH depreciated
13. Creates more houses takes 35 years
14. Allowing companies to retain employees
15. Houses, price more fair + accessible

Correcting market failure:

Rent controls banned

Rent controls removed rent control.

Rent control lifts 4 million Americans from poverty.

Rent control prevents poverty race to build homes.

Rent control harmonic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Ethan Fiber (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kalya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wang</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: Neg completely drops their entire case and AFF's comprehensive rebuttal was never addressed and neither were the turns. With nothing left I automatically vote AFF. I'm also not sure exactly if you want to kick out of rent control as Neg b/c idk what you're left w/ in your case.

Good round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Suresh Pattipati (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sachi Sengupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Harshini Venkatachalam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Good supporting points and good flow
2. Liked how built your case
3. Good job

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>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
The neg won as they held their contention although Speaker 1 for the aff was excellent. Set good plan but neg kept to their flaw. Some assertions that neg made on why they should win didn't hold.

Speaker 1 for aff was very good. Exposed flow, good cites and didn't get thrown by her opponent's attacks in cross.

Speaker 2 for aff had some noises that carried over. Kept on point but didn't do a swell in cross.

Speaker 1 for neg was thorough and pertinent. Absolutely rude in cross. Interrupted 3 times on questions and didn't let opp finish.

Speaker 2 for neg was solid in all facets. Kept to flow and cause and did well to refute aff but some ideas and assertions felt weak.