

from: **L. A. Tony K** <latonyk@gmail.com>
to: Rick Robinson <rrobinson@mfghome.org>
cc: "lgooch@mfghome.org" <lgooch@mfghome.org>,
Richard Jennison <rjennison@mfghome.org>,
Patricia Boerger <PBoerger@mfghome.org>,
Joe Stegmayer <joes@cavco.com>,
Tim Williams <TimWilliams@21stmortgage.com>,
"Hodges, Tom" <tom.hodges@claytonhomes.com>,
Howard Walker <howard_walker@equitylifestyle.com>

Rick,

Several notable points came up during your Deadwood presentation. As you may recall, when I raised my hand to ask about some of what you covered and the total absence of any comment by MHI on Pam Danner at HUD, you declined in front of dozens of industry professionals, saying **"Tony, I won't be taking any questions from the press."**

Isn't that odd, as you've commented for mainstream media such as the *Washington Post*, which are often less informed than trade press would be?

So, my first question is,

- **why where you not willing to engage with pro-industry trade media in a MH Industry professional setting?**

Next,

- **what is MHI's position on retaining or urging the replacement of Pam Danner from the manufactured housing program at HUD?**

Third,

- **why would MHI attempt a separate rider to a bill that purports to limit the spending of the HUD Code manufactured housing program for certain items, when the far simpler, faster, and more logical approach would be to seek the replacement by a more qualified professional to head up the HUD manufactured housing program? Isn't money fungible, so the proposed bill ultimately would fail in its claimed goal? So isn't replacing Danner easier, faster, and more logical?**

Fourth,

- the Manufactured Housing Association for Regulatory Reform has laid out over two dozen items in an article [“Actions and Abuses of The Current HUD Manufactured Housing Program Administrator That Warrant Her Reassignment and Replacement.”](#) **What would you agree with that they’ve said, what would you disagree with, and why?**

Fifth,

- **why don’t you, Lesli Gooch, or Richard A “Dick” Jennison engage in a public debate via video the questions of MHI’s performance? Is there something to hide? Why not allow the industry to see clearly if in fact MHI is doing a good job on behalf of the small to mid-sized firms that the association claims to represent? Doesn’t ducking such issues de facto reveal that MHI’s agenda and performance - by design, or de facto - favor the interests of a few major players, often to the detriment and disregard of the interests of smaller companies?**

Sixth,

- **why has MHI not made a public statement denouncing racism and steering, which Congressman Keith Ellison, other lawmakers, and non-profit groups have alleged are part of a pattern of activities by companies owned by Berkshire Hathaway, and which dominate MHI’s executive committee action and agenda?**

Seventh,

- **why has MHI repeatedly failed for years to defend the industry from errant mainstream media reports?**

Eighth,

- **wasn't it a conflict of interest for MHI to not make the deal on the MLO rule that non-profits were willing to enter into? Didn't that harm other non-BH lenders, retailers, communities, and others disproportionately?**

Finally,

You promised all attendees a copy of your power points who asked. I gave you the requested card, and now I'm asking again, please send it promptly, thank you.

There are BCC's to MHI members and others in this message. You are also invited, as usual, to respond to any articles, commentary or topics. The latest news hotlinks are below.

Thank you,

Tony