<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5212</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sengupta</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Corben</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Desai</td>
<td>26</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. Brought displacement on Aff
2. Terminal defense from Aff on public resides. Not solving wasn't contested.
3. NHT development & filtering not contested.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Type</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>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Sutton - Thomas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Shelly - Pertsovsky</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

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:** 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:**
1. **Pro** Thomas 30/28: 29
   - Equal access more people
   - Increase more affordable
   - More housing to middle class

2. **Con**
   - Housing
   - Displacement
   - Housing prices
   - Improving economy
   - Help low income people
   - Promote economic growth
   - More housing from market
   - Filter
   - Need to build new homes
   - More taxes on
   - Not talking about 3rd world 
   - Economic growth
   - Creates more jobs
housing shortage
dispersal housing in rural
2.5% decrease of homelessness
prevent
OECD - need 1800 develop markets - 400 homes
most have developed
broadband access
for affordable housing
decreasing homelessness

Can

Doesn't say
filtrations does
make sense
Economy
US is greatest
market hours
≠
Save 2.2 million lives
**Public Forum Debate**

**Autumn Frey ('17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2209</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro 2nd</td>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>McCormich</td>
<td>29 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>30 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con 1st</td>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Goetzinger</td>
<td>27 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>28 Points</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:**
- Excellent case. Maybe work on reading less. You read well but maybe I believe you know your case. Your speech was confident - nice job.
- Speaker 2: Be careful not to go so fast that you slur your speech.
- Excellent job giving your speech vs. reading your speech. Shows me you know it! You got them on the guillotine out of context.
- Cross: You made your point on con clipping evidence. Completely owned the cross. Wow!
- Summary: Great job showing short and long-term affects.

**Con:**
- Speaker 1: Well spoken, good pace and logical case. Great first question on cross. But don't let your opponent grandstand. Excellent cross.
- Speaker 2: Nexus effect - good topic and well done on the rebuttal. Be careful not to just read. But arguments were solid. Calm down a little.
- Cross: Be careful with open-ended questions. You let your opponent restate their case multiple times.
- Summary: Try not to sway when speaking. SS1 & the 113% argument was used over and over, without giving new reply based on Aff comments.

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Suresh Pattipati (*'3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro [Circle Winner]

Is this a low point win? _NO_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Good points, good flow*

*Good job!*

---

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:**

Pro proposed a counter plan, but not refuted by con, which is a compromise of market price housing and rent control/subsidized housing. This kind of counter plan should be caught by con, but it wasn't.

Under the counter plan, con's second contention does not have impact anymore.

On gentrification, con's card on every neighborhood gentrified left 10 households poor and 12 poverty does not seem to be a big factor without knowing how many households were affected. Pro's argument that people don't get displaced and benefit from a better neighborhood then stands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2211</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>DINNAN</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>SASTRIAWAN</strong></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**  **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **GOOD JOB ON DELIVERY**
- **CON DID GOOD AT CANCELING PRO POINTS & HAD CARDS TO BACK IT UP**
- **PRO YOU KNOW YOUR OWN MATERIAL WORN YOU NEED TO BE BETTER READY TO COMBAT OPONENT POINTS**
- **ALSO DROP THE CLOWN FROM THEIR POINTS.**
PF
FLIP: 18 Panayotova - Castañeda v. 10 Rosenberg - Sarfati

Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Greg Pratt ('19)</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>L. Castañeda</td>
<td>E. Sarfati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>v. Panayotova</td>
<td>L. Rosenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro** - Thank you for evidence on A homelessness. Thx you for adjusting to my speed/spend request. I would have liked a definition of market rate. In Panayotova you responded to con & said Pro does not use S+L however in CX you correctly said market regulates this is S+L

**Con** - I'd have liked evidence that homelessness is increasing — you need a link to cost — See Pro comment. Also, I would caution arguing RFE is not subject to market — Supply and demand is a challenge to low income families. Rosenberg - Focus: a question don't argue NYC not close to (e) imp. Simmons 30 million

**RFD** - Interesting debate - Pro/Con both argued Displacement. I would have benefited from a definition of "market rate" from Pro. Decision rested on ST v LT. Con argued ST impacts through LT benefits & Pro argued opposite. In the absence of a criteria Pro's decision based upon LT impacts.
**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2222</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Desai</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sarwar</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**RFD:** I voted for **Neg blc** the demolition and displacement turns + argument is never sufficiently answered by the **Aff** and neither is the whole prioritized debacle, -- a word up I remind you is not in the resolution. Blc of that Neg wins on scope + magnitude

**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.
HOFFER, AUBREY

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

PF

FLIP: 2 Ori - Tehranchi v. 15 Justice - McHenry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Aubrey Hoffer (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>McHenry</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tehranchi</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ori</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro (Circle Winner)  Con

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro -
- Dropped Nexus effect which makes the card about wages increasing null.
- Dropped filtering
- Monopolization had no warrant.

Con -
- Renovation point is unclear - needs to be cleaned up.
- Response to the finite amount of poor ppl argument unclear.
- Great Job in cross.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Mike Tristano (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>RIUZ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>FRAZENY</strong></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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</th>
<th>Speaker 1 Summary</th>
<th>Speaker 2 Summary</th>
<th>Grand Crossfire (all)</th>
<th>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Jason Knorr (*'19)</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Moffatt</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Pattipati</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro: Moffatt
Con: Pattipati

(Is Circle Winner) NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

R60: I vote Con on magnitude and time frame of the resolution as it means new market rate housing which according to McAdoo will take 50 years to filter. On magnitude, I am weighing a 5% increase in rents means 2000 displaced to 10,000 new units = 1% decrease in rents and I can weigh that for the Con.

Neg: very pleased with the impact weighing in this round.

Aff: Watch out and respond better to their turns, if you say you have answers in cross say the evidence in a speech.
## WADWEKAR, SAUDAMINI vs. AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

### Round 4

#### Public Forum Debate
- **Speaker**
  - 1st: Elizabeth Hollmann (Pro)
  - 2nd: Nishat Ahmed (Pro)
- **Points**
  - Pro: 28 (25-30)
  - Con: 25.5 (25-30)

#### Saudamini Wadwekar (*2)
- **Speaker**
  - 1st: Riley Oldani (Con)
  - 2nd: Joey Schilling (Con)

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Affirmation: 3, Disagreement: 3

**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.*
6) Affirmation: the supply makes more houses available, & prices, making more houses affordable (Agree)

7) Rent control helps poor (Agree)

7) Affordable housing heavily subsidized which affirmation will abolish the world will be chaotic (Agree)
<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>Karanja</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Korek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goswick</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bendok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? √ yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro won the link is for filter down
If Neg extended cards about how prices stay high Pro wouldn't access case.

I bought Neg analysis on pro general evidence. No real link to poverty.

SSI is marginal in the debate.
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2216</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</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>Kalya</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**PRO side** -
- Nice expiation of issues, good understanding of topic. Kalya did well in cross - refuted con side. Heritage Foundation - NOT a great source. Many think they have extreme bias. Wang: good speaker, good at making audience pay attention. Wang: good cross, making con side rephrase ill-worded question. Kalya: great pushback on 18.6 million vacant homes - LOCATION doesn't matter if they are vacant if they are not in the right location.

**Con side** -
- Villagomez: need to know your topic a little better, give eye contact and engage audience. Both of you stumbled a little bit. Please don't call people with less money "lower class individuals", I couldn't always follow your arguments. Nice back and forth on cross. Keep at it!

**PRO side** displayed greater knowledge + understanding, outlined issues, + refuted con 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

---

**Judge's Signature**

Sunnylope
Exchange of evidence, right away, is exactly what annoys me. No constructive use here, so far as I can tell. 2nd speakers must have been looking at stuff.

Panda: too fast in your delivery, way too hard to follow you when you got going full steam.

Lupica: You need more constraining warrants when addressing Neg’s rebuttal on your C2

Jakrebet: You should be rock solid on constructive delivery, noticed a couple of stumble on the pre-written speech.

FYI Affordable housing is not synonymous with subsidized housing. It can also be considered market rate. Not clear to me on either side what camp this existing affordable housing falls into.

I voted my because they showed less negative impacts via displacements, which was the clearest ary in the round for me.
Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**
- Never a good idea to not have questions ready during Cx. Not a good look.
- Try not to have to bolster your own case in your rebuttal. I've heard it all before. Focus on attacking their arguments.
- Your summary was tough to follow and did not cover enough ground.

**Ney**
- Hard to have a clear and easy-to-listen to case on a tough topic.
- I ended up without many specific comments because the round became extremely confusing. Ultimately, the con was easier to follow, and had more offense to end the round. Not strong offense, but offense nonetheless. God bless you all for debating this topic.
DELGADO, DANIELLE

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

Public Forum Debate

Round 4

Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30)
1st | Singh | 28
2nd | Shi | 26

Speaker | Con | Points (25-30)
1st | Gustin | 27
2nd | Braun | 27

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gustin:
- either reword claim or shorten cards because case is repetitive

Braun:
- when neg upholds the sq carefull when saying that the neg would will finally solve

Shi:
- when neg upholds the sq carefull when saying that the neg would will finally solve
- just because your opp speak faster doesn't mean you need to /mis interp a couple of their cards (it's ok you got the idea thru)

AFF: lower income people are moving out of Seattle

I vote **CON** on time frame of impacts or less of how poss. to charge.
"How long will the O.I.S. the Neg brings up will take?

"So your saying gen. happens when there is not enough houses?"
**FLIP: 3 Jiang - Pattipati v. 2 Harriss - Prozzillo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Nick Petsas ('15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 2207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Speaker</th>
<th>2nd Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>Prozzillo</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Pattipati - the summary needs some help
- Put the clip on your shirt
- Answer question asked to you from cross
- Memory is good
- Ex. 10 difficult to understand
- 1st speaker simply past in summary would be helpful

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.

**AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament**

RFD: The Pro won the debate today by showing why in the New World changes in the way the object proper is mitigated & outweighed by the massive benefits of inclusionary zoning & the gentrification turn.
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2225</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kay Bakshi</td>
<td>Vishrut Chauvagain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jenna Cooley</td>
<td>Alexander Nistor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Alek Kemeny (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5212</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sengupta</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Venkatachalam</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Corben</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Desai</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:

1. Brought displacement on aff
2. Terminal defense from aff on public subsidies not solving wasn't contested.
3. MNT in development & filtering not contested.
The winner of this debate was Pro

2 - 1

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.
Housing shortages
disparity housing in rural
26% decrease in homelessness
prevent
SPEA - 160 develop homes - 400 homes
now have developed
looser broadband access
for affordable housing
decreasing homelessness

Can

Doesn't say
flattening doesn't make sense

Economy
US is greatest

Market hours

Save 2.2 million lives
Frey, Autumn

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

FLP: 2 Singer - Goetzinger v. 5 McCormick - Gill

Public Forum Debate

Round 4

Speaker | Pro 2nd | Points (25-30)
---------|---------|------------------
1st      | McCormick | 29               
2nd      | Gill     | 30               

Room 2209

Speaker | Con 1st | Points (25-30)
---------|---------|------------------
1st      | Goetzinger | 27               
2nd      | Singer   | 28               

The winner of this debate was:

Pro

Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Speaker 1: Excellent case. Maybe work on reading less. You read well but make me believe you know your case with your speech. Cross was confident - nice job.

Speaker 2: Be careful not to go so fast that you slur your speech. Excellent job giving your speech vs. reading your speech. Shows me you know it! You got them on the facts used out of context.

Cross: You made your point on cross clipping evidence. Completely owned the cross. Wow!!

Summary: Great job showing short and long term affects.

Final Focus: Great job not only giving your case but refuting neg as well.

Speaker 2: Nexus effect good topic well done on the rebuttal. Be careful not to just read. But arguments were solid, calm down a little!!!

Cross: Be careful with opened ended questions. Gag at your opponent restate their case multiple times.

Summary: Try not to sway when speaking. CSI & the 113% argument was used over and over, without giving new refutes based on aff comments.

Final Focus: You guys let yourself get run over. Don’t get defeated. Fight & Tried at the end.

Final Focus: You restated your case but not in light of what pro argued.
## Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2218</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*good points, good flow

*good job!*

---

### 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 proposed a counter plan, but not refuted by con, which is a compromise of market price housing and rent control/subsidized housing. This kind of counter plan should be caught by con, but it wasn’t.

Under the counter plan, con’s second contention does not have impact anymore.

On gentrification, con’s card on every neighborhood gentrified left 10 households poor and 12 poverty does not seem to be a big factor without knowing how many households were affected. Pro’s argument that people don’t get displaced and benefit from a better neighborhood then stands.
Public Forum Debate

Round 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Dinnan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sastriawan</td>
<td>27</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>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro 

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? N

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Good job on delivery**
- **Con did good & combat Pro points & need cards to back it**
- **Pro you knew your own material when you need to be better ready to combat opponent points**
- Also dropped flow at half their points.