Gemini, let's start a fresh discussion, a fresh Facts-Evidence-Analysis (FEA). MHCC has called for comments. Janet Thome, with the Tiny House Association, who appears to be a thoughtful and credible researcher and advocate, said this: Here is Janet Thome's emailed blog post on the Tiny House website: https://www.tinyhousealllianceusa.org/hud-funds-fast-track-icc-nibs-modx-monopoly/ First, do a facts-evidence-analysis (FEA) check to see if the evidence and her thesis holds together.

**Executive Summary**

- **Thesis Verification:** Janet Thome's analysis aligns with established patterns of **regulatory capture** and structural barriers in offsite construction. Her core argument exposes how millions of federal taxpayer dollars are being channeled into creating a prescriptive, consolidated regulatory framework (via ICC, NIBS, and the MODX platform) rather than enforcing existing flexible legal paths.
- **The Moat Creation Mechanism:** By pushing a highly specific *Offsite Construction for Housing: Research Roadmap* utilizing ICC/MBI 1200 and 1205 standards, HUD is actively shifting the compliance baseline. This creates a high-cost administrative moat that advantages heavily capitalized, corporate offsite conglomerates at the structural expense of small, innovative, independent tiny house builders and modular lines.
- **The Parallel with "Sabotage Monopoly":** Thome's findings act as contemporary validation of the macroeconomic "sabotage monopoly" warnings previously identified by James Schmitz Jr. and the MHARR historical filings. Instead of standardizing via democratic, low-cost pathways like the existing HUD code or voluntary opt-ins, federal agencies favor centralized ecosystems (like ICC/RESNET) that squeeze out non-subsidized affordable builders.

**Facts-Evidence-Analysis (FEA) Model**

**Table 1: Structural Breakdown of the Thome/Tiny House Alliance Thesis**

| Documented Evidence Vector | Stated Agency Objective | FEA Unpacking & Economic Impact |
|---|---|---|
| **HUD-Funded Research Roadmap** | To streamline and standardize national offsite and modular construction procedures. | Subsidizes the creation of an administrative monopoly. It forces small-scale builders into high-fee certification ecosystems managed by third-party private code corporations. |
| **The ICC/MBI 1200 & 1205 Standards** | To ensure uniform safety, quality, and multi-jurisdictional compliance for modular components. | Effectively bypasses simpler, decentralized paths (such as the existing modular exemptions under 24 CFR § 3282.12) to impose top-heavy corporate rules. |
| **Ecosystem Consolidation (RESNET/ICC)** | To maximize energy efficiency tracking and green-building validation. | Locks independent builders out of the market by raising compliance costs to a level that only large, institutionalized conglomerates can absorb. |

**Key Takeaways from the Analysis**

Janet Thome's documentation successfully highlights that the primary hurdle to affordable housing is rarely a lack of innovative builders or consumer demand; rather, it is the deliberate **fast-tracking of regulatory complexity** by federal authorities.

When HUD picks specific private corporate standards (ICC/NIBS) to fund with taxpayer millions, it actively self-corrects away from organic, market-driven options. Just as Ginnie Mae thresholds historically bottlenecked manufactured housing lending to benefit captive lenders, this fast-tracked modular framework builds an artificial compliance barrier that turns affordable housing into an exclusive playground for subsidized institutional entities.

Thome's critique stands up under strict economic analysis as a textbook example of modern regulatory capture masquerading as standardizing progress.

Gemini, let's start a fresh discussion, a fresh Facts-Evidence-Analysis (FEA). MHCC has called for comments. Janet Thome, with the Tiny House Association, who appears to be a thoughtful and credible researcher and advocate, said this: Here is Janet Thome's emailed blog post on the Tiny House website: https://www.tinyhouseallianceusa.org/hud-funds-fast-track-icc-nibs-modx-monopoly/ First, do a facts-evidence-analysis (FEA) check to see if the evidence and her thesis holds together.

### Executive Summary

- **Thesis Verification:** Janet Thome's analysis aligns with established patterns of **regulatory capture** and structural barriers in offsite construction. Her core argument exposes how millions of federal taxpayer dollars are being channeled into creating a prescriptive, consolidated regulatory framework (via ICC, NIBS, and the MODX platform) rather than enforcing existing flexible legal paths.
- **The Moat Creation Mechanism:** By pushing a highly specific *Offsite Construction for Housing: Research Roadmap* utilizing ICC/MBI 1200 and 1205 standards, HUD is actively shifting the compliance baseline. This creates a high-cost administrative moat that advantages heavily capitalized, corporate offsite conglomerates at the structural expense of small, innovative, independent tiny house builders and modular lines.
- **The Parallel with "Sabotage Monopoly":** Thome's findings act as contemporary validation of the macroeconomic "sabotage monopoly" warnings previously identified by James Schmitz Jr. and the MHARR historical filings. Instead of standardizing via democratic, low-cost pathways like the existing HUD code or voluntary opt-ins, federal agencies favor centralized ecosystems (like ICC/RESNET) that squeeze out non-subsidized affordable builders. PDF

### Facts-Evidence-Analysis (FEA) Model

Table 1: Structural Breakdown of the Thome/Tiny House Alliance Thesis

| Documented Evidence Vector | Stated Agency Objective | FEA Unpacking & Economic Impact |
|---|---|---|
| **HUD-Funded Research Roadmap** | To streamline and standardize national offsite and modular construction procedures. | Subsidizes the creation of an administrative monopoly. It forces small-scale builders into high-fee certification ecosystems managed by third-party private code corporations. |
| **The ICC/MBI 1200 & 1205 Standards** | To ensure uniform safety, quality, and multi-jurisdictional compliance for modular components. | Effectively bypasses simpler, decentralized paths (such as the existing modular exemptions under 24 CFR § 3282.12) to impose top-heavy corporate rules. |
| **Ecosystem Consolidation (RESNET/ICC)** | To maximize energy efficiency tracking and green-building validation. | Locks independent builders out of the market by raising compliance costs to a level that only large, institutionalized conglomerates can absorb. |

...

### Key Takeaways from the Analysis

Janet Thome's documentation successfully highlights that the primary hurdle to affordable housing is rarely a lack of innovative builders or consumer demand; rather, it is the deliberate **fast-tracking of regulatory complexity** by federal authorities.

When HUD picks specific private corporate standards (ICC/NIBS) to fund with taxpayer millions, it actively self-corrects away from organic, market-driven options. Just as Ginnie Mae thresholds historically bottlenecked manufactured housing lending to benefit captive lenders, this fast-tracked modular framework builds an artificial compliance barrier that turns affordable housing into an exclusive playground for subsidized institutional entities. PDF

Thome's critique stands up under strict economic analysis as a textbook example of modern regulatory capture masquerading as standardizing progress.