

From: Sharon Kramer

To: paul@naahq.org, jeffreylee@naahq.org

Sent: 11/19/2009 6:09:43 A.M. Pacific Standard Time

Subj: Regarding "Look Who's Talking: Managing Your Online Reputation "

Dear Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Lee,

I read your writing/blog regarding how property owners and managers could promote a positive image on line. You offer some good advice to managers that if followed, could help to create community good will which translates into more satisfied tenants, which translates into higher occupancy, which translates into higher profits.

I found these words of advice particularly worthy:

"A lot of people complain because of a lack of response they see through official channels. Be approachable and reachable, and that can reduce a lot of complaints,"

"When management takes a proactive view, or a set of actions that helps to establish their reputation outside of a confrontational stance, they tend to build a reputation that is respected," Egan says. "So when people complain, the companies' responses become much more meaningful rather than reactionary."

It is my hope that NAA will follow their own advice to property managers. NAA has a huge problem. You submitted a fraudulent amicus curie brief in a litigation in Arizona that involves two infants deaths and a \$25 million dollar insurance policy issued by Travelers. Then NAAHQ put it online that you submitted the brief.

[NAA Files Amicus Brief in Mold Case](#)

There are several science papers cited within the brief that I could reference and give the history of how they have stood up in court and in the media, but I am just going to reference to one: The US Chamber of Commerce "A Scientific View Of The Health Effects of Mold" 2003.

On page 9, NAA describes this paper as

In a report entitled, A Scientific View of the Health Effects of Mold, a panel of scientists, including toxicologists and industrial hygienists stated that years of intense study have failed to produce any causal between exposure to indoor mold and adverse health effects. U.S. Chamber of commerce, A Scientific View of the Health Effects of Mold (2003) at p. 64 and p. 65

There was no "panel of scientists" that authored this paper for the ILR. It cites false authorship of being authored by a physician. Yet, the physician has stated under oath that he had nothing to do with this paper and did not even know his name was on it. It has no scientific foundation to form the conclusion that all claims of illness from the toxins of mold are a result of "trial lawyers, media and junk science".

The paper was actually authored by two owners of a litigation defense support corporation, VeriTox. One of the authors, Bruce Kelman, is an expert for the defense in the Arizona litigation. He comes to the mold issue circa 2000 from Big Tobacco.

He has stated under oath that the ILR paper was specifically written for judges. It was paid for by the Manhattan Institute think tank who wanted something written for judges.

If you have not been tracking the online reputation of the US Chamber, the organization that NAA is holding out as the guru of science over mold, you owe it to your members to do so. They are rightfully getting nailed left and right for deceits of claiming more members than they really have and their aggressive lobbying impacting everything from global warming to tort reform to the rape of females in the military. Not a great group to have your online reputation tied to at the moment.

NAA needs to take its own advice that it provides to its members. When faced with online complaints that are legitimate and extremely serious in origin, take action to correct the wrong.

NAA should retract their amicus submitted in the Arizona litigation. Not only is it presenting a fraudulent science paper by the US Chamber written expressly to influence judges, it is serving to damage the reputation of all members of NAA on a national level.

As I understand it, the plaintiff attorney in the litigation has submitted something to the court detailing and documenting the fraud within your amicus. If the courts do not take action, then the online bloggers that help those injured by mold will.

If the NAA is truly interested in doing what is right for its members and thus their tenants; and understands the impact of justified negative information on the net, then NAA should retract a now known fraudulent document they have submitted in a legal proceeding, immediately.

The true harm of the fraudulent NAA amicus brief is that it is misleading the members of NAA that mold does not harm. This leaves your members more vulnerable to lawsuits similar to the litigation in Arizona because it leaves their tenants in potential harms way from the NAA misleading their members as to the potential serious illnesses from the matter.

Thank you in advance for your proactive response to this message, It is my hope that NAA will heed its own advice and correct errors adverse to the interest of NAA members and adverse to the health and safety of NAA members' tenants.

Sincerely,
Sharon Kramer

Disclosure: I have a degree in marketing. I have been tracking the deceit in science over the mold issue for about four years. I am currently in litigation with Bruce Kelman over this exact Chamber paper in Ca. I was the first to publicly write of the deceit of the paper online in 2005. The second time the matter was written of, was on the front page of the Wall Street Journal.

WSJ – Court of Opinion – Authors of Science Paper Often Cited by Defense Also Help in Litigation
– Corruption & Deceit in Mold Litigation – ACOEM / US Chamber

Dr. Kelman sued me for libel for the word “altered” claiming it was a false accusation of perjury.
The case has been interesting to say the least.