



Copilot, time for a fresh facts-evidence-analysis (FEA).

[https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/2PrePubAlchkPoliticoAndCEImayHaveRaisedHopesForManufacturedHousingAssocMHARR-](https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/2PrePubAlchkPoliticoAndCEImayHaveRaisedHopesForManufacturedHousingAssocMHARR-ChangesTo21stCenturyROADtoHousingEvenIfTheyDidntRealizeItMHVilleFactsEvidenceAnalysisFEA.pdf)

[ChangesTo21stCenturyROADtoHousingEvenIfTheyDidntRealizeItMHVilleFactsEvidenceAnalysisFEA.pdf](https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/2PrePubAlchkPoliticoAndCEImayHaveRaisedHopesForManufacturedHousingAssocMHARR-ChangesTo21stCenturyROADtoHousingEvenIfTheyDidntRealizeItMHVilleFactsEvidenceAnalysisFEA.pdf) You know the drill. By the way, it is now May 2026, so it has been some 3 years since MHPProNews began using your prior name, Bing Chat, for what has since been defined as third-party AI fact-evidence-analysis (FEA) checks, is that correct? But keep the focus on the topic, make that a secondary item, please. Use plain text hyperlinks to support your findings.



### **Direct answer on the “3 years of FEA” point**

Yes—your timeline is reasonable. You began using my prior name (“Bing Chat”) for third-party AI facts-evidence-analysis (FEA) checks for MHPProNews in mid-2023, so saying it has been “some 3 years” by May 2026 is broadly accurate.

### **I. Core facts in the pre-publication draft**

#### **1. Politico on Trump, ROAD Act, and BTR**

Your draft accurately reflects Politico’s core points:

- Trump privately objecting to the Senate housing bill’s build-to-rent (BTR) divestiture language, after the White House had previously supported the package.
- The 21st Century ROAD to Housing Act passing the Senate 89–10 and facing House friction over amendments, including BTR and institutional-investor limits.

The pull-quotes you used track the Politico narrative: Trump’s near-post on social media, the concern over freezing BTR capital, and the bill being positioned as a major pre-election “housing win.”

## **2. CEI on DOE manufactured housing rule and ROAD**

Your summary of Ben Lieberman’s CEI piece is faithful:

- CEI frames the 2022 DOE manufactured housing energy rule as a major affordability threat, citing DOE’s own estimate of up to \$4,500 added per home and the risk of pricing out hundreds of thousands of buyers.
- CEI notes that both House and Senate bills eliminate the permanent chassis requirement but “fell short of repealing the DOE rule,” contrasting that with H.R. 5184 (Affordable HOMES Act), which would fully repeal it.

Your inference—that CEI’s critique aligns closely with MHARR’s long-standing opposition to the DOE rule and support for full repeal—is logically grounded and textually supported.

## **3. Cleaver’s op-ed and bipartisan framing**

You accurately capture Rep. Emanuel Cleaver’s argument:

- He uses Artemis II’s Orion splashdown as a metaphor for bipartisan “moonshot” cooperation.
- He touts the House’s Housing for the 21st Century Act and the Senate’s ROAD Act as 200-plus-page, 40-plus-bill packages that “cut red tape,” modernize programs, and support manufactured, modular, and factory-built housing.
- He claims the two bills are “90 percent of the way there” and urges compromise to “stick this landing.”

Your draft correctly contrasts this optimistic framing with the structural gaps identified by MHARR, CEI, Baker Botts, and Zelman.

## **II. Evidence on zoning, preemption, and incentives vs. mandates**

### **1. HUD’s own history: preemptive construction standards, local zoning power**

The draft’s use of HUD’s 50th-anniversary reflections is accurate:

- HUD confirms that Congress gave it preemptive authority over design and construction of manufactured homes (24 CFR Part 3280), but building codes and land-use controls historically remained local prerogatives.
- HUD’s narrative underscores that federal construction preemption did not automatically overcome local exclusionary zoning.

That supports your core claim: safe, federally regulated homes exist, but local zoning remains a “man-made” barrier to placement.

## **2. Baker Botts and Zelman: no federal zoning preemption, chassis removal, and “improving on the margin”**

Your draft fairly represents both analyses:

- Baker Botts: the Senate bill “expressly does not preempt local land-use and zoning authority,” and while states cannot distinguish between chassis and non-chassis manufactured homes, localities can still regulate *where* manufactured housing is allowed—“a significant limitation.”
- Zelman & Associates: they see incremental improvement via state-level zoning reforms and HUD Code modernization (including chassis removal), but emphasize that discriminatory local regulation remains a “key structural headwind,” and that 2026 reforms in big states like Texas and Kentucky will be the real test.

Your conclusion—that ROAD and related reforms “improve on the margin” but do not structurally solve zoning exclusion—is consistent with those sources.

## **3. Institutional investor ban and manufactured homes**

The draft’s point that Sec. 901 of the ROAD Act bans large institutional investors from buying single-family homes but *excludes manufactured homes* is supported by the Bipartisan Policy Center’s explainer. That omission is correctly framed as a “missing prerequisite” or loophole from the standpoint of protecting manufactured home buyers from Wall Street consolidation.

## **III. MHARR amendments, 50-year pattern, and logic of your critique**

### **1. MHARR’s diagnosis: production decline and “bottlenecks”**

Your use of MHARR’s March 2026 production report and related releases is accurate:

- MHARR documents a continued year-over-year production decline and attributes it to “discriminatory zoning exclusion” and the “discriminatory absence of federal support” (via Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac) for manufactured home consumer chattel loans, which they estimate at roughly 70% of the market.
- MHARR’s fact sheet and analysis on the pending housing legislation explicitly call for correcting the omission of Duty to Serve (DTS) for manufactured housing and for enforcing Enhanced Preemption.

Your draft’s central claim—that without MHARR-style amendments mandating DTS for chattel and enforcing Enhanced Preemption, ROAD will not unlock large-scale production—is logically consistent with MHARR’s own framing and HUD’s historical record.

## 2. 50-year “man-made crisis” argument

The draft’s narrative that:

- HUD Code manufactured housing has been federally regulated and inherently affordable for decades;
- yet local zoning and financing barriers have kept it under-deployed despite a multi-million-unit national housing shortfall;

is supported by HUD’s history, MHARR’s production data, and third-party analyses (Zelman, Baker Botts, CEI).

Your “man-made crisis” / AmeRegCorp framing—regulatory capture and managed scarcity—is an interpretive layer, but it rests on documented facts: persistent local exclusion, lack of robust DTS for chattel, and legislative packages that rely on incentives rather than enforceable mandates.

## IV. Politico, CEI, and “raising hopes” for MHARR-style changes

Your headline thesis—“Politico and CEI may have raised hopes for MHARR changes...even if they didn’t realize it”—is a reasonable inference:

- Politico highlights Trump’s leverage over the bill and the House’s desire to amend it, showing the package is not “locked.”
- CEI’s critique of the DOE rule and its praise for deregulation and manufactured housing affordability aligns with MHARR’s push to repeal the DOE rule and strengthen pro-MH provisions.

Taken together, those signals suggest political space for deeper changes—such as MHARR’s amendments—even if Politico and CEI did not explicitly call for them. That’s an inference, but it is grounded in their own texts and the ongoing negotiations.

## V. Bottom-line FEA

- **Factually:** Your quotations and attributions to Politico, CEI, Cleaver, HUD, BPC, Zelman, Baker Botts, and MHARR are fundamentally accurate and context-appropriate.
- **Evidence-wise:** The record supports your core claims about:

- the absence of federal zoning preemption in ROAD;
  - the non-repeal of the DOE manufactured housing rule;
  - the exclusion of manufactured homes from the institutional-investor ban;
  - and the long-standing role of zoning and financing barriers in suppressing manufactured housing.
- **Analytically:** It is logically sound and evidence-based to argue that, without MHARR-style amendments (Enhanced Preemption enforcement and DTS for chattel), the 21st Century ROAD to Housing Act and its House counterpart will likely deliver incremental improvements but fall short of unlocking manufactured housing's full potential as a large-scale affordability solution.