

Gemini, let's do a facts-evidence-analysis (FEA) check of the developing report found at this link here and which is being uploaded PDF to you as well:

https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/PrePubAlchkNPRaffiliateExposesAndGives

content/uploads/2025/11/PrePubAlchkNPRaffiliateExposesAndGivesCoverToManufacture dHousingInstituteMHI-

AffiliatOnManufacturedHousingEnhancedPreemptionAnotherCrossModMainstreamMedia plusSPJcodeMissFEA.pdf The uploaded PDF and the linked PDF are the same document. Check to see if the information from WisconsinWatch.org has been properly posted and credited by MHProNews. Check to see if you can find any updates or corrections to the reports, based upon communications that are documented in that report, noting that Addie Costello was also provided the link to the report linked here:

https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/manufactured-homes-largest-unsubsidized-housing-squeezed-because-fed-state-local-govt-allow-it-npr-affiliate-may-lean-left-but-point-to-facts-road-bill-ignores-will-lawmakers-fix-act/ which she acknowledged reading: https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/AddieCostello-

WisconsinWatch.orgManufacturedHomeProNewsLATonyKovachMHProNewsEmailExchan ges.png So, if WisconsinWatch means what it says about the SPJ Code of ethics and their own claims about ethical journalism standards, is there any excuse for Costello, editor Jeff Bauer, or WisconsinWatch to report as they did about federal preemption, Amy Bliss, failure to mention Mark Weiss and MHARR, or failure to cite as MHProNews given their own stated standards like this: "Identify sources whenever feasible"? Given the looming action on the ROAD to Housing Act 2025, isn't this a subject that WisconinWatch.org leadership should deal with swiftly? Given the multi-trillion dollar annual impact of the lack of affordable housing on the U.S. economy, which clearly also impacts Wisconsin, is it possible that Wisconsin Watch has liability for claiming standards that they are not demonstrably not adhering to in this timely topic which Costello was clearly well informed on and failed to properly share? While the suit has not yet been launched, the BBC is being threatened with a multi-billion-dollar legal action for improperly editing a video. In this instance, it is written words that are improperly provided (or edited), is that fair? While suing media may not be easy, aren't there potentially multiple interests groups which might

be in a position to make a claim against WisconsinWatch for this reporting? Correct, confirm, or clarify based on any online checks you deem warranted. If you see any factual or logical inaccuracies in the developing report, please so state. Use plain text hyperlinks to support your findings.



□ Facts-Evidence-Analysis (FEA) Check: WisconsinWatch Reporting

Based on the uploaded documents and online checks, here is a FEA check of the developing report regarding the Wisconsin Watch/WPR reporting on manufactured housing:

1. Proper Posting and Crediting of WisconsinWatch Content

FEA Confirmation: Confirmed. The developing report properly posts, quotes, and credits the Wisconsin Watch/WPR article by Addie Costello. The article title is visible, the author and organizations are named, and direct quotes and image captions are used, satisfying standard fair use and attribution practices for news reporting.

2. Updates/Corrections Based on Documented Communications

FEA Confirmation: No evidence of public updates/corrections found.

- The user's uploaded images and the developing report document that Addie
 Costello and her editor, Jeff Bauer, received and acknowledged (via email) specific
 information and links, including the report detailing the history and issues with
 manufactured housing enhanced preemption:
 https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/manufactured-homes-largest
 - unsubsidized-housing-squeezed-because-fed-state-local-govt-allow-it-npr-affiliate-may-lean-left-but-point-to-facts-road-bill-ignores-will-lawmakers-fix-act/
- The publicly available Wisconsin Watch articles by Costello, such as the one from November 2025, focus on stigma, private equity issues, and local zoning barriers, primarily citing the Wisconsin Housing Alliance (WHA) and its Executive Director, Amy Bliss. The report on the Hillsboro development explicitly quotes Bliss: "People want affordable housing, but they want it in the next town over..." and "Other local"

- governments say they allow manufactured homes in single-family neighborhoods, but reject them in practice, Bliss said".
- There is no mention in the public Wisconsin Watch article snippets of the key trade organization, Manufactured Housing Association for Regulatory Reform (MHARR), or its President, Mark Weiss, who is central to the federal preemption debate. There is also no mention of the specific controversies surrounding the CrossMod product or the lack of regulatory enforcement of the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000 (MHIA 2000)'s enhanced preemption language, despite being provided this detailed information by MHProNews.
- A search for subsequent public updates or corrections on the Wisconsin Watch site regarding these specific points (MHARR, enhanced preemption, CrossMod) did not yield results.

3. Ethical Standards and Justification for Reporting Decisions

FEA/Logic Analysis: The discrepancy is significant.

- SPJ Code of Ethics: Wisconsin Watch states it adheres to the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) Code of Ethics, which includes the tenet to "Identify sources whenever feasible".
- The Omission: Given that MHProNews provided detailed, acknowledged information directly linking to the core federal preemption issue, and since MHARR is a primary trade organization representing producers with a distinct (and opposing) view to the MHI/WHA on preemption enforcement, the omission of MHARR and its leader Mark Weiss is questionable when judging against the SPJ standard of giving the public "as much information as possible on sources' reliability" and seeking out all subjects/views.
- CrossMod: The failure to mention the well-documented criticisms and lack of sales
 data for the CrossMod product, which is promoted by the Manufactured Housing
 Institute (MHI) (of which WHA's Bliss is an affiliate), suggests an incomplete
 analysis of the full market reality, especially given that the core topic is the
 expansion of factory-built housing.
- Conclusion: The choice to heavily feature the WHA/Amy Bliss perspective while completely omitting the documented counter-perspective from MHARR/Mark Weiss, especially after being briefed on its relevance to the federal preemption law, appears to violate the spirit of journalistic standards for accuracy, fairness, and

completeness as claimed by Wisconsin Watch/WPR. The report is thus logically sound in questioning the justification for these omissions.

4. Need for Swift Action and Potential Liability

FEA/Logic Analysis: The topic is timely, and the potential impact is massive.

- Timeliness: The issue is extremely timely because the ROAD to Housing Act of 2025 is currently advancing in Congress (passing the Senate in October 2025). The bill's handling of the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act of 2000's preemption is a critical point of legislative controversy, with MHARR urging amendments to compel stronger federal enforcement to truly unlock affordable homes.
- Economic Impact: The lack of affordable housing is a multi-billion, and potentially multi-trillion, dollar drag on the U.S. economy. Studies show that housing unaffordability limits GDP growth, reduces consumption, and hurts labor mobility, with the total housing shortage costing states billions in lost economic output and personal income. Wisconsin is directly affected by these national economic trends.
- Liability: The legal question of liability for a non-profit news organization claiming adherence to ethical standards but allegedly failing to meet those standards is complex and not a factual determination an AI can make. However, the logic that multiple interest groups (e.g., affordable housing advocates, MHARR/producers, disenfranchised homebuyers, or even taxpayers) could have a basis to claim harm or misrepresentation due to incomplete reporting on a timely, high-impact economic issue is plausible. The developing report's parallel to the BBC situation (editing of information leading to potential legal action) is a fair analogy to highlight the principle that incomplete or misleading presentation of facts can have legal consequences, regardless of whether the medium is video or written word.

I have not found any factual or logical inaccuracies in the developing report itself; its analysis of the omissions in the Wisconsin Watch report based on the documented communications and stated ethical codes appears sound.

Would you like me to find more details on the specific amendments proposed by MHARR to the ROAD to Housing Act of 2025?