Copilot, pivoting to a fresh facts-evidence-analysis (FEA). Don't conflate prior Q&As with this one unless it clearly is related. https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/07/PrePubAIchkDOE_SecretaryChrisWrightMHARR_LetterAndPR.WhyItMattersWeaponizationLawfareEvolvingManufacturedHousingIndustryLandscapePlusSundayWeeklyMHVilleHeadlinesRecapFEA-1.pdf The upload to you and the link are the same PDF. Keep in mind our protocols: https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/GeminiProtocolsFactsEvidenceAnalysisFEA6.13.2026 MHProNews.jpg and https://www.manufacturedhomepronews.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CopilotProtocolsForMHProNews.jpg You can use 3 tables to do your FEA.

Table 1 – DOE manufactured housing energy rule vs. Trump EO 14394 and ROAD Act

Item	Key facts	Alignment / conflict
DOE May 31, 2022 MH energy standards (10 CFR Part 460)	Final rule published May 31, 2022; standards explicitly "adapted from…2021 IECC" and apply to HUD Code manufactured homes once enforcement procedures are finalized.	Directly tied to IECC framework that DOE has now repudiated for site-built homes, which MHARR argues is a logical basis to repudiate the MH rule as well.
DOE repudiation of 2024 IECC	DOE has announced rejection of 2024 IECC as unduly burdensome for affordable housing; MHARR's July 9, 2026 release treats this as "a further independent, valid and sufficient basis for a parallel DOE	Strong policy signal that IECC-based mandates are inconsistent with Trump's affordability agenda; supports MHARR's call to

Item	Key facts	Alignment / conflict
	repudiation of the manufactured housing standards."	withdraw MH standards built on 2021 IECC.
Executive Order 14394 (Removing Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Home Construction)	EO 14394 directs HUD and DOE to "reform and where appropriate, eliminate unduly burdensome or costly energy-efficiency...requirements regarding housing... includ[ing]...revising the Energy Conservation Program's Energy Conservation Standards for Manufactured Housing."	MHARR's letter correctly anchors its repeal demand in explicit EO language; the EO is a clear legal/policy hook for DOE to withdraw the MH rule without waiting for Congress.
ROAD Act (21st Century ROAD to Housing)	As described in the draft, ROAD does **not** repeal the 2007 EISA mandate for MH energy standards and "would specifically allow the DOE standards to go into effect if they were approved and adopted by HUD (a virtual certainty under a Post-Trump administration)."	MHARR's warning is well-founded: ROAD is structurally compatible with future HUD adoption of DOE's rule; without DOE repeal now, a later administration could weaponize the dormant standards.
Houchin bill vs. compromised ROAD language	The draft notes that "A previous bill filed by Rep. Erin Houchin (R-IN) would have done that, but was 'compromised' into irrelevance and ineffectiveness for reasons that have never been fully – or even partially – explained."	FEA: this is a credible concern—legislative dilution left the EISA mandate intact, so the safest path for MH producers is administrative repeal at DOE plus vigilant opposition to any HUD energy rule derived from IECC/EISA authority.

"MHARR asserts that DOE's June 26, 2026 repudiation of the 2024 International Energy Conservation Code (IECC)...is a further independent, valid and sufficient basis for a parallel DOE repudiation of the manufactured housing standards." "Such action, moreover, is essential, because the pending housing bill – the 21st Century ROAD to Housing Act – would not automatically or necessarily eliminate the May 31, 2022 DOE 'final' standards."

Table 2 – MHARR vs. MHI: actions, omissions, and lawfare/weaponization implications

Dimension	**MHARR posture (per draft)**	**MHI posture / behavior (per draft & prior FEA)**	**FEA takeaway**
DOE MH energy rule	MHARR "has reiterated and reinforced its long-standing call" for full repeal; directly writes to Secretary Wright, tying EO 14394, DOE IECC repudiation, and appliance-rule rollback together as grounds to scrap the MH rule.	Draft notes "a manual check of the MHI website…does not reveal anything similar to MHARR's report…GAIO cross-check…confirmed that there is no similar report by MHI on this date akin to what follows from MHARR."	Clear asymmetry: MHARR is proactively litigating the policy battlefield; MHI is publicly silent on a rule that could add "thousands of dollars to the purchase price of a new manufactured home" and shrink the market. That silence is consistent with a consolidation-friendly posture.
Use of Trump EO 14394	MHARR explicitly cites section 2(c) directing revision of MH energy standards; frames repeal as aligned with Trump's affordability agenda.	No evidence in the draft or MHI's site (per GAIO check) that MHI is invoking EO 14394 to demand relief for HUD Code producers or buyers.	MHARR is leveraging the best available legal tool; MHI's non-use of the same tool is a material omission that supports the "Machiavellian Housing Institute" critique.
Litigation / lawfare strategy	MHARR signals willingness to "continue to pursue the full repeal…through all available means" and to "aggressively	Draft points out that "MHI has not attempted in the 21st century to litigate that non-enforcement of the 2000 Reform Law" and has similarly avoided litigation to enforce preemption or	Pattern: MHARR uses law to de-weaponize regulation; MHI's inaction allows law and regulation to be weaponized against independents and

Dimension	MHARR posture (per draft)	MHI posture / behavior (per draft & prior FEA)	FEA takeaway
	oppose any HUD…energy standards…based upon… the pending DOE standards.”	to block DOE energy mandates.	consumers, while benefiting well-capitalized consolidators who can absorb higher costs and tighter supply.
Transparency and public-facing advocacy	MHARR publishes detailed releases, letters, and calls to action; explicitly warns of ROAD Act loopholes and HUD MHCC energy agenda.	Draft documents repeated MHProNews outreach to MHI with “routinely failed to respond” and notes the absence of comparable public-facing analysis or warnings from MHI.	FEA: the contrast supports the thesis that MHARR is acting as a regulatory reform watchdog, while MHI functions more as a quiet facilitator of the status quo that advantages large consolidators.
Weaponization / lawfare framing	MHARR’s actions implicitly resist weaponized regulation by seeking repeal and exposing procedural shortcuts (e.g., “absolutely minimal notice” for MHCC energy meeting).	The draft’s “MACHIAVELLIAN HOUSING INSTITUTE” framing and antitrust/RICO discussion around community closures and constrained new development suggest MHI-aligned actors may be using law and zoning as tools of market control.	The lawfare narrative is coherent: when one trade group fights weaponized rules and another tolerates or quietly leverages them, the net effect is regulatory capture and structural suppression of affordable MH output.

“In Washington, D.C., MHARR President and CEO Mark Weiss stated: ‘…HUD is showing its utter contempt for both the HUD Code industry and hard-pressed lower and moderate-income consumers…by pursuing unneeded and unnecessary high-cost ‘energy’ mandates.’” “If such facts are merely ‘market forces’ then there is no antitrust violation…But if this is part of a scheme to deliberately limit the supply of land-lease manufactured home communities, that could be an antitrust violation. In that case, it may also be reasonable to think that RICO violations are also at play."

Table 3 – Industry impact: risks, opportunities, and strategic moves for HUD Code stakeholders

Category	Risk / opportunity	Evidence base	Strategic implication (FEA)
Cost and demand impact of DOE MH energy rule	**Risk:** "needlessly add thousands of dollars to the purchase price of a new manufactured home," pricing out lower-income buyers and shrinking shipments.	MHARR letter explicitly states the added-cost risk; DOE's own EIS acknowledges incremental purchase price increases tied to IECC-based envelope requirements.	Immediate priority for independents and consumer advocates is to support MHARR's repeal push and to oppose any HUD MHCC energy standard that mirrors DOE's framework.
ROAD Act loophole	**Risk:** If DOE rule remains on the books, ROAD's structure allows a future HUD to adopt it, turning a currently deferred rule into a powerful post-Trump weapon against MH affordability.	Draft: "would specifically allow the DOE standards to go into effect if they were approved and adopted by HUD (a virtual certainty under a Post-Trump administration)."	FEA: repeal now is safer than relying on future congressional fixes; industry should treat ROAD as incomplete and press for explicit EISA-mandate repeal or carve-outs for HUD Code MH.
Preemption and siting (MHIA 2000 vs. zoning barriers)	**Opportunity:** Enforced federal preemption could replicate California's ADU surge nationally, unlocking hundreds of thousands of	Infographic and draft note CA ADUs adding "+60,000 Units/Year…after stripping local vetoes," contrasted with MH's "1.12%" market yield and Jennison's "Feasible	Strategic move: pair MHARR's anti-DOE campaign with a pro-preemption litigation/advocacy push—using EO 14394 and MHIA 2000—to attack exclusionary

Category	Risk / opportunity	Evidence base	Strategic implication (FEA)
	HUD Code placements and billions in revenue.	500K Units Annually" model.	zoning and weaponized local vetoes.
Community supply, closures, and antitrust exposure	**Risk:** Net loss of land-lease communities plus near-zero new development creates a choke-point that supports higher rents and consolidation, with potential antitrust/RICO exposure.	Draft's Datacomp table shows only 310 new communities 2002–2016; Lincoln Institute/FEMA estimates ~50,000 communities now vs. ~55,000 circa 2000, with more closures than openings.	FEA: regulators and litigators could frame this as coordinated supply restriction; independents and residents have grounds to push for investigations while advocating for pro-preemption, pro-development reforms.
Trade association credibility and representation	**Risk:** MHI's silence on DOE repeal and MHIA enforcement undermines its claim to represent "all segments" and strengthens the "serving consolidators" critique.	Draft: "MACHIAVELLIAN HOUSING INSTITUTE – THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION SERVING CONSOLIDATORS OF THE MANUFACTURED HOUSING INDUSTRY" and detailed KPI charts showing long-term underperformance vs. historic norms.	Strategic implication: independents, retailers, and consumer advocates should recalibrate expectations of MHI, lean more heavily on MHARR and independent media for FEA, and consider alternative or reformed representation structures.

"As MHARR has demonstrated… the DOE standards…would needlessly add thousands of dollars to the purchase price of a new manufactured home…" "If federal preemption under the 2000 Reform Law were enforced by HUD routinely manufactured housing production could soar nationally. That would ease affordable housing crisis. Enforcement could save tax dollars over time."

If you want, next step we can tighten this into a sidebar graphic: “Three pressure points: DOE rule, ROAD loophole, MHIA preemption” with one killer stat per box.

All links

ReferencesRelated results

eCFR

eCFR :: 10 CFR Part 460 -- Energy Conservation Standards for Manufactured Homes

https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-10/chapter-II/subchapter-D/part-460

GovInfo

Federal Register, Volume 87 Issue 104 (Tuesday, May 31, 2022)

https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2022-05-31/html/2022-10931.htm

GovInfo

Executive Order 14394—Removing Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Home Construction March 13, 2026

https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/DCPD-202600174/pdf/DCPD-202600174.pdf

public-inspection.federalregister.gov

affordable for many Americans. EXECUTIVE ORDER 14394 - - - - - - -

https://public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2026-05388.pdf

The White House

https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/eo-14394.pdf

https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/eo-14394.pdf