



CEL & Associates, Inc.
Real Estate Strategies, Benchmarking & Performance Solutions



SUMMARY OF ARMY HOUSING TENANT SATISFACTION RESULTS FOR FY25 PRIVATIZED FAMILY AND UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING

Prepared by: CEL & Associates, Inc.
Prepared: May 2025

Introduction

Army Headquarters engaged Archetype I LLC in conjunction with CEL & Associates, Inc. ("CEL") to conduct a Tenant Satisfaction and Opinion Survey of tenants living in privatized Family ("FH") and Unaccompanied ("UH") On-Base Housing within 48 Installations consisting of 403 Neighborhoods from March to May 2025. This Summary is a high-level overview.

Methodology, Scope and Scoring

Detailed information on the survey methodology, scope and scoring is provided in the addendums at the end of this report. Privatized Unaccompanied Housing results are reported separately in Section E, page 15.

Overview of Housing Results

The Family Housing survey results indicate an overall improvement in tenant satisfaction, with the Overall Satisfaction Index increasing from **75.8** in FY24 to **76.0** in FY25. Despite this, the Property Score declined from **72.3** to **70.7**, while the Service Score improved from **77.7** to **79.5**, moving to the high range of the "Good" category (79.9 to 75.0) and only 0.5% from a rating of "Very Good".

Business Success Factors

Scores for Business Success Factors improved within **6 of the 9 factors**, with notable improvements in Relationship Rating, which increased by **4.2 points**, indicating better management responsiveness and tenant treatment. The lowest score is for **BSF #7** Property Rating which declined **3.0** points, dropping to **70.3**. The questions for this BSF focus on areas impacting the actual home, including condition, interior, exterior, and the health and safety inside the home.

Installation and Neighborhood Ratings

Out of 48 Installations, **89.6%** (43 Installations) rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges for Overall Score (ranging from 100.0 to 70.0), whereas **10.4%** (5 Installations) fell into the Below Average range (69.9 to 65.0) or lower. In terms of Neighborhoods, **78.8%** rated similarly, with **21.2%** classified as "Below Average," highlighting areas requiring focused improvement.

Tenant Satisfaction Metrics

- **68.1%** of tenants reported satisfaction with the overall service level.
- **68.2%** expressed satisfaction with their homes.
- **60.4%** were satisfied with the condition of their homes.

Response Rate Analysis

Surveys were distributed to **78,457** homes, with **22,134** responses received, resulting in an overall response rate of **28.2%**, which is considered **Good** according to the CEL Response Rate Scale. This represents a slight decrease of 0.9% from the 29.1% response rate in FY24. Of the **48** Installations, 95.8% (46) met or exceeded the minimum response rate goal of 20%, and **29** Installations achieved a response rate greater than 30%. Six Installations, varying in size, attained a response rate exceeding 50%.

Key Questions and Observations

Key questions assessing tenant satisfaction included:

- Problems reported to management follow-up scored **74.0** (down from 74.2)
- Service level and quality overall scored **76.9** (up from 76.4)
- Maintenance work quality scored **78.7** (up from 78.5)
- Follow-up on maintenance requests decreased to **77.1** (down from 77.5)
- Overall condition of the home scored **71.5** (up from 71.4)
- Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.) scored lowest at **64.8**
- Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.) rated **65.7**
- Satisfaction with current home/unit is **74.8** (down from 75.0)

Top and Bottom Scoring Questions

The top five scoring questions range from **90.2 to 79.9** and include areas such as courtesy of maintenance and management, safety, work order completion time, and ease of the renewal process.

The bottom five scoring questions range from **70.8 to 64.8** and include areas such as overall condition at move in, awareness of the dispute process, common areas, exterior and interior features/services.

Tenant Feedback

The results of an overview of the tenant comments, categorized into positive and negative feedback, have been provided. Positive comments focus on the professionalism and responsiveness of maintenance and housing office staff, satisfaction with the living environment, and the quality of housing and amenities. Conversely, negative feedback addresses issues such as ineffective maintenance, recurring problems, outdated appliances, mold and pest issues, poor communication, and high housing costs. Overall, while the feedback provides valuable insights, it may not represent all experiences across different locations.

Conclusion

In summary, the data indicates a generally positive sentiment toward the living environment, with notable strengths in maintenance and management courtesy and responsiveness. However, areas such as interior and exterior features and common spaces reveal opportunities for improvement, as highlighted by both quantitative scores and qualitative feedback. Addressing recurring issues like outdated appliances, pest problems, and communication gaps could substantially enhance tenant satisfaction moving forward. By prioritizing these areas, efforts can be directed toward achieving a more balanced and universally positive tenant experience.

Score Ratings	
100.0 to 85.0 Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0 Below Average
84.9 to 80.0 Very Good	64.9 to 60.0 Poor
79.9 to 75.0 Good	59.9 to 55.0 Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0 Average	54.9 to 0.0 Crisis

A. Overall, Region and Installation Results

Overall Response Rates:

The minimum response rate goal was set at 20% with an overall project goal of 30%. A response rate of 28.2% falls within the “Good” range (25% to 29%), representing a slight decrease of 0.9% from the FY24 Survey.

95.8% (46 out of 48) of Installations met or exceeded the 20% minimum response rate goal. Two Installations narrowly missed this benchmark by margins of 0.1% and 0.5%.

Response Rate	
Distributed	Received
78,457	22,134
28.2%	
FY24	Difference
29.1%	(0.9%)

Satisfaction Index Results for Overall:

The Satisfaction Index Results for FY25 indicate an overall improvement in scores. The Overall Score increased slightly from 75.8 in FY24 to **76.0** in FY25. The Property Score, however, experienced a decline from 72.3 to **70.7**. In contrast, the Service Score showed a greater improvement, rising from 77.7 to **79.5**, thereby moving to the high range of the “Good” category, just a half a point shy of reaching the “Very Good” level.

Satisfaction Indexes					
Index	FY25	FY24	Var.	5 Point Score FY25	CEL Rating FY25
Overall	76.0	75.8	0.2	3.80	Good
Property	70.7	72.3	(1.6)	3.54	Average
Service	79.5	77.7	1.8	3.98	Good

Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

Business Success Factors (“BSFs”) Results:

The Business Success Factors (“BSFs”) results for FY25 highlight significant insights into functional performance, identifying areas of high satisfaction and those requiring targeted improvements. Of the nine BSFs, scores improved slightly for six, showing some progress in several key areas.

BSF #8 – Relationship Rating had the largest increase, rising 4.2 points to **80.5**, reflecting better service received and courtesy and respect with which tenants are treated.

The lowest score was **BSF #6** – Property Rating at **70.3**, or 3.52 out of 5, dropping 3.0 points. This BSF covers home condition, interior, exterior, and health and safety.

Business Success Factors						
Factor		FY25	FY24	Var.	5 Point Score FY25	CEL Rating FY25
1 - Readiness to Solve Problems	↑	78.8	78.3	0.5	3.94	Good
2 - Responsiveness & Follow Through		74.0	74.5	(0.5)	3.70	Average
3 - Property Appearance & Condition	↑	71.6	70.6	1.0	3.58	Average
4 - Quality of Management Services	↑	76.9	75.6	1.3	3.85	Good
5 - Quality of Leasing Services		79.7	82.1	(2.4)	3.99	Good
6 - Quality of Maintenance Services	↑	81.9	81.6	0.3	4.10	V. Good
7 - Property Rating		70.3	73.3	(3.0)	3.52	Average
8 - Relationship Rating	↑	80.5	76.3	4.2	4.03	V. Good
9 - Renewal Intention	↑	74.9	72.6	2.3	3.75	Average

Arrow up indicates increase.

Overall Project Status by Number of Installations:

Out of 48 Installations, **89.6%** (43 Installations) achieved an Overall Score in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average categories (ranging from 100.0 to 70.0), whereas **10.4%** (5 Installations) fell into the Below Average range (69.9 to 65.0) or lower.

Key highlights include:

- 24 Installations (50.0%) recorded improvements or had no change in the Overall Satisfaction Index.
- 19 Installations (40.0%) experienced a decline in the Overall Satisfaction Index.
- 36 Installations (75.0%) showed progress in the Service Satisfaction Index.

Metric	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score
Based on 48 Installations	Percent			Count		
Increased Scores or No Change	60.4%	31.3%	75.0%	29	15	36
Decreased Scores	39.6%	68.7%	25.0%	19	33	12
Rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0)	89.6%	58.3%	95.8%	43	28	46
Rated in Below Average range or lower (69.9 thru 0.0)	10.4%	41.7%	4.2%	5	20	2

Overall Project Status by Number of Neighborhoods:

Out of the 397 Neighborhoods with surveys returned, 313 (**78.8%**) were rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 through 70.0) for Overall Satisfaction. On the other hand, **84** Neighborhoods (21.2%) fell into the "Below Average" or lower category. A more detailed assessment at the Installation and Neighborhood levels is recommended to fully analyze tenant satisfaction.

Analyzing these results at various levels offers a clearer method to address tenant issues. For instance, lower satisfaction scores in a Neighborhood may point to specific problems like maintenance delays or pest issues that are not widespread. This detailed analysis allows for targeted improvements, ultimately enhancing overall satisfaction.

Metric	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score
Based on 397* Neighborhoods	Percent			Count		
Increased Scores or No Change*	54.0%	37.6%	64.1%	214	149	254
Decreased Scores*	46.0%	62.4%	35.9%	182	247	142
Rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0)	78.8%	55.9%	88.4%	313	222	351
Rated in Below Average range or lower (69.9 thru 0.0)	21.2%	44.1%	11.6%	84	175	46

*Note: This project had 398 Family Housing Neighborhoods. Score change calculations are based on 396 Neighborhoods because one Neighborhood had no surveys returned and one Neighborhood had no prior scores. Score range numbers are based on 397 Neighborhoods because one Neighborhood had no surveys returned.

Score Ratings

100.0 to 85.0 Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0 Below Average
84.9 to 80.0 Very Good	64.9 to 60.0 Poor
79.9 to 75.0 Good	59.9 to 55.0 Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0 Average	54.9 to 0.0 Crisis

Key Questions

The questions chosen cover satisfaction with service levels, property maintenance, home conditions, interior/exterior features, health and safety, and the likelihood of recommending the housing.

Observations:

- Problems reported to management follow-up scored **74.0** (down from 74.2)
- Service level and quality overall scored **76.9** (up from 76.4)
- Maintenance work quality scored **78.7** (up from 78.5)
- Follow-up on maintenance requests decreased to **77.1** (down from 77.5)
- Overall condition of the home scored **71.5** (up from 71.4)
- Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.) scored lowest at **64.8**
- Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.) rated **65.7**
- Satisfaction with current home/unit is **74.8** (down from 75.0)

Note: Several questions were revised between FY24 and FY25, but a comparison was made to previous scores where the intent remained unchanged.

Question as Listed on the Survey	Satisfied 5/4s	Neutral 3s	Dissatisfied 2/1s	No Opinion	CEL Score	5 Point Score
Service Related						
3c. Follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved (Re: Management)	61.6%	14.5%	21.3%	2.6%	74.0	3.70
3d. Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	81.2%	8.9%	8.7%	1.2%	85.6	4.28
3e. Frequency of contact and clarity of communications. (Re: Management)	67.1%	16.1%	15.0%	1.8%	77.9	3.89
3f. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving in housing	68.1%	12.5%	18.1%	1.2%	76.9	3.84
Maintenance						
4b. General work order or maintenance request completion time	75.7%	8.0%	14.8%	1.6%	81.4	4.07
4c. Quality of maintenance work	70.8%	9.8%	17.6%	1.8%	78.7	3.93
4d. Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	64.4%	15.1%	17.3%	3.2%	77.1	3.86
Home – Interior/Exterior and Condition						
5a. Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	52.6%	12.2%	34.6%	0.6%	65.7	3.28
5b. Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	50.6%	12.9%	35.8%	0.7%	64.8	3.24
5d. Overall current condition	60.4%	16.3%	22.4%	0.9%	71.5	3.58
Would Recommend						
7d. I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation.	65.4%	13.1%	19.7%	1.8%	75.6	3.78
Satisfaction with Home including Health and Safety						
8a. Your current home/unit	68.2%	10.1%	21.1%	0.6%	74.8	3.74
8b. The health and safety of your home	65.1%	12.5%	20.9%	1.5%	74.7	3.73

Top and Bottom Five Scoring Questions:

CEL reviewed the Top and Bottom scoring questions for the FY25 Tenant Survey.

Results at an Installation or Neighborhood level can vary significantly and therefore it should not be assumed that the Overall Results are representative of a single Installation. Reporting and associated comments should be reviewed down to a Neighborhood level to isolate top issues and areas of greatest need or focus.

Key Observations:

The top five scoring questions range from **90.2 to 79.9** and include areas such as courtesy of maintenance and management, safety, work order completion time, and ease of the renewal process.

The questions order changed but the areas of highest satisfaction are similar to the FY24 survey.

Top 5 Scoring Questions		
Question	Score	BSF
4a) Courtesy of maintenance personnel	90.2	6
3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated (by Management)	85.6	8
2a) Safety of your home/unit	81.8	Not Coded
4b) General work order or maintenance request completion time	81.4	6
6b) The lease renewal process	79.9	5

Scores are based on a 1-100 score rating. Scores are not percentages of the surveyed population.

The bottom five scoring questions range from **70.8 to 64.8** and include areas such as overall condition at move in, awareness of the dispute process, common areas, exterior and interior features/services.

More education is needed regarding awareness of the dispute process as over 5,000 tenants expressed that they were not aware of how to access it.

Bottom 5 Scoring Questions		
Question	Score	BSF
5c) Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months)	70.8	7
7f) I am aware of the formal dispute resolution process and how to access it, if needed.	69.6	Not Coded
1b) Condition of the common areas (parking, sidewalks, playgrounds, etc.)	69.0	3
5a) Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	65.7	7
5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	64.8	7

Scores are based on a 1-100 score rating. Scores are not percentages of the surveyed population.

Business Success Factor Key

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 - Readiness to Solve Problems | 6 - Quality of Maintenance |
| 2 - Responsiveness & Follow Through | 7 - Property Rating |
| 3 - Property Appearance & Condition | 8 - Relationship Rating |
| 4 - Quality of Management Services | 9 - Renewal/Referral Intention |
| 5 - Quality of Leasing/Housing Office | |

Tenant Feedback Overview

This section provides an overview of tenant comments, categorized into positive and negative feedback. It is important to note that while the data may not present the entire picture at specific Installations or Neighborhoods, it offers valuable insights at the overall portfolio level. For example, issues like "pest problems" may not be pervasive across all Installations but are significant at specific locations.

Positive Feedback

- **Professionalism and Responsiveness:** Tenants appreciate the professionalism and responsiveness of the maintenance teams. Many tenants have mentioned that the maintenance staff is polite, professional, and quick to address issues. Specific individuals were highlighted for their exceptional service and dedication.
- **Helpful Housing Office Staff:** The housing office staff is frequently praised for their politeness, helpfulness, and dedication to resolving issues. Tenants have mentioned that the staff goes out of their way to assist with changes in housing status and provide exceptional service.
- **Community and Living Environment:** Tenants express satisfaction with the overall living experience, noting that the community is clean, well-kept, and safe. The sense of community and the support from neighbors are also highly valued.
- **Housing Quality and Amenities:** Many tenants are happy with the quality of their homes, including new carpets, fresh paint, and well-maintained housing areas. The availability of amenities such as parks, playgrounds, and community centers is also appreciated.
- **Positive Experiences with Specific Companies:** Tenants have shared positive experiences with various housing companies. They have praised the professionalism, responsiveness, and helpfulness of the staff and maintenance teams.

Negative Feedback

- **Quality and responsiveness of maintenance services:** Many tenants have expressed frustration with the maintenance team's inability to resolve issues effectively and in a timely manner.
- **Recurring issues:** Tenants often have to submit multiple work orders for the same problem, indicating that initial fixes are not thorough or effective.
- **Outdated appliances:** Many homes have appliances that are old and in need of replacement, leading to frequent breakdowns and inefficiency.
- **Mold and pest problems:** Mold issues and pest infestations are significant concerns, with tenants reporting health problems and inadequate responses from maintenance teams.
- **Poor communication:** There is a lack of communication between the maintenance team and tenants, leading to delays and unresolved issues.
- **High housing costs:** Tenants feel that the quality of the homes does not justify the high cost of housing, especially given the recurring maintenance problems.

While valuable insights emerge from this feedback, it is essential to note that these comments may not fully capture the diversity of experiences across the various locations.

CEL utilized Co-pilot generative AI, which includes commercial data protection and is licensed to CEL, to populate this data. Additionally, the CEL team conducted a high-level review of the comments to ensure accuracy and relevance.

B. Scores and Rating by Installation

Response Rates by Installation:

A minimum goal of 20% was set for the project and each Installation. Falling below this does not automatically invalidate the project or Installation; further review is required for lower response rates.

Out of the 48 Installations, 95.8% met or exceeded the 20% minimum response rate goal.

Observations:

- Twenty-nine Installations, or **60.4%**, achieved a response rate greater than **30%**.
- Six Installations, varying in size, achieved a response rate exceeding **50%**.
- Picatinny recorded the highest response rate at **66.7%**.

Upon reviewing the two Installations that did not meet the 20% minimum goal, it was observed that both were reflective of the tenants' opinions, and each fell less than 1% short of the 20% goal.

Color Key: Light Blue 50.0% or higher, Green = 30% to 49.9%, Orange 25% to 29.9%. Red = Less than 20.0%.

Company	Installation	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.
BBC	Picatinny	63	42	66.7%
Centinel	Hunter Liggett	72	42	58.3%
Hunt	Redstone	343	182	53.1%
Centinel	Rock Island	80	42	52.5%
Michaels	Camp Parks	114	59	51.8%
Centinel	Buchanan	26	13	50.0%
Corvias	Aberdeen	749	356	47.5%
Centinel	Mccoy	118	52	44.1%
Michaels	Yuma	176	76	43.2%
Centinel	Natick	21	9	42.9%
BBC	Carlisle	238	94	39.5%
BBC	White Sands	345	136	39.4%
Hunt	Gregg-Adams	1,493	586	39.2%
Michaels	Belvoir	2,037	794	39.0%
Centinel	Greely	77	29	37.7%
Michaels	Leavenworth	1,404	530	37.7%
BBC	Story	232	87	37.5%
BBC	Hamilton	215	80	37.2%
Michaels	Huachuca	948	339	35.8%
Michaels	Moffett	308	110	35.7%
Michaels	Monterey	2,363	831	35.2%
Hunt	Sam Houston	890	304	34.2%
BBC	Detrick	328	111	33.8%
Corvias	Novosel	1,427	467	32.7%
Michaels	Moore/Benning	3,510	1,142	32.5%
BBC	West Point	747	234	31.3%
Centinel	Knox	2,249	691	30.7%
Corvias	Bragg	5,269	1,613	30.6%
Centinel	Wainwright	1,712	521	30.4%
Centinel	Drum	3,366	979	29.1%
BBC	Walter Reed	196	57	29.1%
Corvias	Sill	1,723	493	28.6%
Michaels	Irwin	2,315	652	28.2%
Corvias	Meade	2,408	671	27.9%
BBC	Bliss	4,040	1,088	26.9%
Corvias	Riley	3,711	1,000	26.9%
Centinel	Cavazos	4,983	1,290	25.9%
BBC	Eisenhower	738	188	25.5%
BBC	Eustis	832	208	25.0%
Liberty	Lewis-McChord	4,784	1,197	25.0%
BBC	Jackson	767	179	23.3%
Centinel	Campbell	3,989	927	23.2%
Centinel	Hawaii	7,028	1,584	22.5%
BBC	Carson	2,807	606	21.6%
BBC	Leonard Wood	1,686	354	21.0%
BBC	Hunter Aa	626	125	20.0%
BBC	Stewart	2,089	416	19.9%
Corvias	Johnson	2,815	548	19.5%

Scores and Rating by Installation:

Out of 48 Installations, 89.6% (43) rated from Outstanding to Average (100.0 thru 70.0) and 10.4% (5) rated Below Average (69.9 thru 65.0) or lower.

Line	Installation	Company	Rating Scale Overall Score	Overall	Property	Service	Dist.	% Rec.	5 Point Overall Score
1	ROCK ISLAND	Centinel	Outstanding	95.2	92.7	96.7	80	52.5%	4.76
2	NATICK	Centinel	Outstanding	94.6	92.5	97.1	21	42.9%	4.73
3	CAMP PARKS	Michaels	Outstanding	92.2	88.2	94.2	114	51.8%	4.61
4	MCCOY	Centinel	Outstanding	90.7	89.6	91.4	118	44.1%	4.54
5	REDSTONE	Hunt	Outstanding	90.7	85.3	94.0	343	53.1%	4.54
6	HUACHUCA	Michaels	Outstanding	89.0	85.4	91.3	948	35.8%	4.45
7	YUMA	Michaels	Outstanding	88.4	82.7	92.4	176	43.2%	4.42
8	GREELY	Centinel	Outstanding	88.3	86.3	88.9	77	37.7%	4.42
9	CARLISLE	BBC	Outstanding	87.1	82.0	92.0	238	39.5%	4.36
10	WHITE SANDS	BBC	Outstanding	86.1	80.2	90.3	345	39.4%	4.31
11	ABERDEEN	Corvias	Very Good	84.8	77.9	89.2	749	47.5%	4.24
12	HUNTER LIGGETT	Centinel	Very Good	83.3	78.0	87.2	72	58.3%	4.17
13	HAMILTON	BBC	Very Good	82.4	75.7	86.7	215	37.2%	4.12
14	WAINWRIGHT	Centinel	Very Good	82.4	79.4	84.2	1,712	30.4%	4.12
15	NOVOSEL	Corvias	Very Good	82.3	75.0	87.2	1,427	32.7%	4.12
16	MOFFETT	Michaels	Very Good	80.7	76.0	83.7	308	35.7%	4.04
17	DETRICK	BBC	Good	79.7	74.2	82.7	328	33.8%	3.99
18	PICATINNY	BBC	Good	79.5	68.4	88.0	63	66.7%	3.98
19	KNOX	Centinel	Good	79.0	72.6	83.4	2,249	30.7%	3.95
20	DRUM	Centinel	Good	78.6	72.8	81.9	3,366	29.1%	3.93
21	LEWIS-MCCHORD	Liberty	Good	78.5	74.8	81.5	4,784	25.0%	3.93
22	IRWIN	Michaels	Good	78.0	72.3	82.3	2,315	28.2%	3.90
23	RILEY	Corvias	Good	78.0	74.2	80.1	3,711	26.9%	3.90
24	JOHNSON	Corvias	Good	77.9	69.2	83.5	2,815	19.5%	3.90
25	SILL	Corvias	Good	77.7	73.6	79.8	1,723	28.6%	3.89
26	HAWAII	Centinel	Good	77.0	72.6	79.6	7,028	22.5%	3.85
27	BLISS	BBC	Good	75.8	70.1	79.9	4,040	26.9%	3.79
28	CAMPBELL	Centinel	Good	75.7	70.2	80.0	3,989	23.2%	3.79
29	MEADE	Corvias	Average	74.5	67.9	78.5	2,408	27.9%	3.73
30	WALTER REED	BBC	Average	74.5	72.3	75.3	196	29.1%	3.73
31	MOORE/BENNING	Michaels	Average	74.1	69.6	76.2	3,510	32.5%	3.71
32	GREGG-ADAMS	Hunt	Average	73.9	66.4	79.5	1,493	39.2%	3.70
33	WEST POINT	BBC	Average	73.6	68.8	77.8	747	31.3%	3.68
34	MONTEREY	Michaels	Average	73.2	70.6	74.8	2,363	35.2%	3.66
35	BRAGG	Corvias	Average	72.8	65.8	77.6	5,269	30.6%	3.64
36	CAVAZOS	Centinel	Average	72.8	66.6	77.0	4,983	25.9%	3.64
37	LEAVENWORTH	Michaels	Average	72.8	67.9	76.2	1,404	37.7%	3.64
38	BUCHANAN	Centinel	Average	72.6	63.1	81.1	26	50.0%	3.63
39	EUSTIS	BBC	Average	72.5	64.4	78.2	832	25.0%	3.63
40	STORY	BBC	Average	72.5	63.7	77.8	232	37.5%	3.63
41	BELVOIR	Michaels	Average	72.3	69.6	73.7	2,037	39.0%	3.62
42	JACKSON	BBC	Average	71.6	68.3	74.1	767	23.3%	3.58
43	LEONARD WOOD	BBC	Average	70.2	63.4	75.3	1,686	21.0%	3.51
44	SAM HOUSTON	Hunt	B. Average	69.7	60.1	76.5	890	34.2%	3.49
45	EISENHOWER	BBC	B. Average	67.3	62.0	71.8	738	25.5%	3.37
46	STEWART	BBC	B. Average	66.7	62.3	70.3	2,089	19.9%	3.34
47	CARSON	BBC	B. Average	66.2	62.5	68.5	2,807	21.6%	3.31
48	HUNTER AA	BBC	Poor	64.9	58.7	69.0	626	20.0%	3.25

Current and Prior Installation Scores by each Privatized Company:

The complete scoring and response data, current and prior for each Installation has been compiled by Company below. The color grids indicate the high, low and median range of the data for visual purposes.

Line	Company	Installation	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			Response Rate		
			FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.
1	BBC	BLISS	75.8	71.6	4.2	70.1	68.5	1.6	79.9	73.1	6.8	4,040	1,088	26.9%
2	BBC	CARLISLE	87.1	87.4	(0.3)	82.0	85.5	(3.5)	92.0	89.9	2.1	238	94	39.5%
3	BBC	CARSON	66.2	62.1	4.1	62.5	63.2	(0.7)	68.5	60.8	7.7	2,807	606	21.6%
4	BBC	DETRICK	79.7	77.3	2.4	74.2	75.4	(1.2)	82.7	77.4	5.3	328	111	33.8%
5	BBC	EISENHOWER	67.3	72.3	(5.0)	62.0	70.3	(8.3)	71.8	73.9	(2.1)	738	188	25.5%
6	BBC	EUSTIS	72.5	74.9	(2.4)	64.4	70.7	(6.3)	78.2	77.2	1.0	832	208	25.0%
7	BBC	HAMILTON	82.4	85.2	(2.8)	75.7	83.2	(7.5)	86.7	86.3	0.4	215	80	37.2%
8	BBC	HUNTER AA	64.9	61.8	3.1	58.7	60.9	(2.2)	69.0	62.0	7.0	626	125	20.0%
9	BBC	JACKSON	71.6	71.6	0.0	68.3	70.9	(2.6)	74.1	72.5	1.6	767	179	23.3%
10	BBC	LEONARD WOOD	70.2	65.7	4.5	63.4	64.6	(1.2)	75.3	66.0	9.3	1,686	354	21.0%
11	BBC	PICATINNY	79.5	78.9	0.6	68.4	77.7	(9.3)	88.0	81.0	7.0	63	42	66.7%
12	BBC	STEWART	66.7	61.7	5.0	62.3	63.5	(1.2)	70.3	61.0	9.3	2,089	416	19.9%
13	BBC	STORY	72.5	71.0	1.5	63.7	67.5	(3.8)	77.8	71.9	5.9	232	87	37.5%
14	BBC	WALTER REED	74.5	75.6	(1.1)	72.3	71.6	0.7	75.3	77.3	(2.0)	196	57	29.1%
15	BBC	WEST POINT	73.6	69.4	4.2	68.8	69.3	(0.5)	77.8	68.8	9.0	747	234	31.3%
16	BBC	WHITE SANDS	86.1	82.0	4.1	80.2	79.9	0.3	90.3	84.0	6.3	345	136	39.4%
17	Centinel	BUCHANAN	72.6	70.3	2.3	63.1	72.5	(9.4)	81.1	68.7	12.4	26	13	50.0%
18	Centinel	CAMPBELL	75.7	76.5	(0.8)	70.2	72.0	(1.8)	80.0	79.6	0.4	3,989	927	23.2%
19	Centinel	CAVAZOS	72.8	77.9	(5.1)	66.6	73.2	(6.6)	77.0	80.8	(3.8)	4,983	1,290	25.9%
20	Centinel	DRUM	78.6	82.9	(4.3)	72.8	78.4	(5.6)	81.9	85.7	(3.8)	3,366	979	29.1%
21	Centinel	GREELY	88.3	89.7	(1.4)	86.3	85.9	0.4	88.9	92.3	(3.4)	77	29	37.7%
22	Centinel	HAWAII	77.0	78.0	(1.0)	72.6	73.3	(0.7)	79.6	80.9	(1.3)	7,028	1,584	22.5%
23	Centinel	HUNTER LIGGETT	83.3	82.0	1.3	78.0	77.3	0.7	87.2	85.5	1.7	72	42	58.3%
24	Centinel	KNOX	79.0	83.2	(4.2)	72.6	79.2	(6.6)	83.4	85.9	(2.5)	2,249	691	30.7%
25	Centinel	MCCOY	90.7	80.0	10.7	89.6	84.4	5.2	91.4	76.4	15.0	118	52	44.1%
26	Centinel	NATICK	94.6	61.3	33.3	92.5	68.1	24.4	97.1	59.0	38.1	21	9	42.9%
27	Centinel	ROCK ISLAND	95.2	92.7	2.5	92.7	89.9	2.8	96.7	94.4	2.3	80	42	52.5%
28	Centinel	WAINWRIGHT	82.4	85.1	(2.7)	79.4	82.8	(3.4)	84.2	85.9	(1.7)	1,712	521	30.4%
29	Corvias	ABERDEEN	84.8	82.2	2.6	77.9	78.1	(0.2)	89.2	84.7	4.5	749	356	47.5%
30	Corvias	BRAGG	72.8	72.3	0.5	65.8	66.5	(0.7)	77.6	75.8	1.8	5,269	1,613	30.6%
31	Corvias	JOHNSON	77.9	76.7	1.2	69.2	69.5	(0.3)	83.5	80.9	2.6	2,815	548	19.5%
32	Corvias	MEADE	74.5	70.4	4.1	67.9	67.2	0.7	78.5	72.3	6.2	2,408	671	27.9%
33	Corvias	NOVOSEL	82.3	82.5	(0.2)	75.0	77.9	(2.9)	87.2	85.4	1.8	1,427	467	32.7%
34	Corvias	RILEY	78.0	76.1	1.9	74.2	71.3	2.9	80.1	78.6	1.5	3,711	1,000	26.9%
35	Corvias	SILL	77.7	80.1	(2.4)	73.6	76.7	(3.1)	79.8	81.9	(2.1)	1,723	493	28.6%
36	Hunt	GREGG-ADAMS	73.9	81.0	(7.1)	66.4	75.6	(9.2)	79.5	84.4	(4.9)	1,493	586	39.2%
37	Hunt	REDSTONE	90.7	88.7	2.0	85.3	85.7	(0.4)	94.0	90.8	3.2	343	182	53.1%
38	Hunt	SAM HOUSTON	69.7	71.5	(1.8)	60.1	65.7	(5.6)	76.5	75.1	1.4	890	304	34.2%
39	Liberty	LEWIS-MCCHORD	78.5	75.2	3.3	74.8	73.9	0.9	81.5	76.3	5.2	4,784	1,197	25.0%
40	Michaels	BELVOIR	72.3	69.6	2.7	69.6	67.8	1.8	73.7	69.8	3.9	2,037	794	39.0%
41	Michaels	CAMP PARKS	92.2	88.5	3.7	88.2	83.7	4.5	94.2	91.8	2.4	114	59	51.8%
42	Michaels	HUACHUCA	89.0	88.9	0.1	85.4	85.5	(0.1)	91.3	91.4	(0.1)	948	339	35.8%
43	Michaels	IRWIN	78.0	75.3	2.7	72.3	70.4	1.9	82.3	78.7	3.6	2,315	652	28.2%
44	Michaels	LEAVENWORTH	72.8	68.3	4.5	67.9	69.6	(1.7)	76.2	67.5	8.7	1,404	530	37.7%
45	Michaels	MOFFETT	80.7	81.0	(0.3)	76.0	76.8	(0.8)	83.7	83.4	0.3	308	110	35.7%
46	Michaels	MONTEREY	73.2	73.4	(0.2)	70.6	73.1	(2.5)	74.8	73.7	1.1	2,363	831	35.2%
47	Michaels	MOORE/BENNING	74.1	70.9	3.2	69.6	68.8	0.8	76.2	71.1	5.1	3,510	1,142	32.5%
48	Michaels	YUMA	88.4	91.4	(3.0)	82.7	86.9	(4.2)	92.4	94.3	(1.9)	176	76	43.2%

Key Questions:

These questions were identified as key indicators for evaluating tenant satisfaction, allowing for a deeper understanding of strengths and opportunities for improvement in housing services.

By focusing on specific questions that gauge the overall experience from the condition of homes to the responsiveness of management patterns emerge that highlight both achievements and areas requiring improvement.

The following questions were selected as an overview of areas of tenant satisfaction.

- Q8a. Your current home/unit.
- Q5d. Overall condition of your home.
- Q3f. Overall level and quality of services received.
- Q1a. Overall condition and visual appeal of housing.

For these questions, CEL used the percentage of dissatisfied and highlighted areas of 25% in red font and highlight.

By examining responses and identifying patterns in dissatisfaction, especially those marked at or above the critical 25% threshold – it becomes possible to target specific interventions.

Dissatisfied = a selection of a 2 or 1 response choice for that question. N/A excluded.

Installation	MHPI Company	Q8a. Dissatisfied Home	Q5d. Privatized Community	Q3f. Services Overall	Q1a. Condition of Home
BLISS	BBC	21.0%	24.0%	17.3%	22.0%
CARLISLE	BBC	14.9%	16.0%	6.4%	10.6%
CARSON	BBC	32.4%	32.2%	34.1%	32.9%
DETRICK	BBC	14.4%	19.3%	12.8%	18.9%
EISENHOWER	BBC	36.0%	34.8%	30.4%	36.0%
EUSTIS	BBC	31.2%	30.6%	22.5%	32.8%
HAMILTON	BBC	12.7%	16.3%	13.8%	13.9%
HUNTER AA	BBC	36.8%	37.9%	37.7%	43.2%
JACKSON	BBC	25.1%	23.2%	24.6%	19.8%
LEONARD WOOD	BBC	33.9%	32.7%	24.4%	37.2%
PICATINNY	BBC	26.8%	35.7%	15.0%	24.4%
STEWART	BBC	32.2%	35.0%	32.2%	35.8%
STORY	BBC	31.0%	31.0%	27.9%	34.5%
WALTER REED	BBC	22.2%	22.2%	25.5%	25.0%
WEST POINT	BBC	22.9%	26.5%	25.8%	25.6%
WHITE SANDS	BBC	8.1%	12.7%	5.2%	10.5%
BUCHANAN	Centinel	15.4%	7.7%	15.4%	23.1%
CAMPBELL	Centinel	23.7%	22.3%	17.9%	23.6%
CAVAZOS	Centinel	28.0%	30.1%	19.6%	30.5%
DRUM	Centinel	18.3%	20.8%	14.6%	20.4%
GREELY	Centinel	6.9%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%
HAWAII	Centinel	15.9%	17.1%	16.4%	16.3%
HUNTER LIGGETT	Centinel	9.5%	9.5%	7.3%	9.8%
KNOX	Centinel	20.8%	19.6%	13.0%	19.1%
MCCOY	Centinel	0.0%	1.9%	3.8%	3.8%
NATICK	Centinel	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ROCK ISLAND	Centinel	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
WAINWRIGHT	Centinel	12.6%	11.0%	10.7%	11.6%
ABERDEEN	Corvias	14.0%	16.8%	6.9%	16.9%
BRAGG	Corvias	24.9%	27.5%	22.4%	26.7%
JOHNSON	Corvias	21.9%	23.1%	15.6%	24.1%
MEADE	Corvias	25.7%	29.1%	18.5%	25.3%
NOVOSEL	Corvias	14.3%	16.6%	8.6%	15.1%
RILEY	Corvias	15.1%	18.2%	15.2%	14.6%
SILL	Corvias	15.2%	15.4%	15.8%	17.4%
GREGG-ADAMS	Hunt	25.7%	28.2%	18.8%	26.5%
REDSTONE	Hunt	9.4%	9.9%	3.9%	8.8%
SAM HOUSTON	Hunt	34.7%	36.2%	26.8%	33.6%
LEWIS-MCCHORD	Liberty	18.5%	18.3%	14.9%	17.0%
BELVOIR	Michaels	21.7%	22.6%	23.8%	21.9%
CAMP PARKS	Michaels	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%
HUACHUCA	Michaels	8.7%	6.8%	6.5%	8.0%
IRWIN	Michaels	21.3%	20.8%	14.2%	20.9%
LEAVENWORTH	Michaels	25.5%	29.1%	23.7%	26.3%
MOFFETT	Michaels	11.8%	19.1%	18.3%	17.4%
MONTEREY	Michaels	19.7%	20.9%	25.8%	22.3%
MOORE/BENNING	Michaels	18.5%	22.1%	19.7%	22.7%
YUMA	Michaels	10.5%	10.8%	3.9%	13.2%

C. Scores and Rating by Project:

For Army Privatized Family Housing most MHPI Projects are a single Installation. In the chart below all MHPI Projects are listed, including those that are a single Installation.

Line	Company	MHPI Project	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	Overall	Property	Service	5 Point Score (Overall)
1	BBC	BLISS/WSMR	4,385	1,224	27.9%	77.0	71.2	81.0	3.85
2	BBC	CARLISLE/PICATINNY	301	136	45.2%	84.8	77.8	90.8	4.24
3	BBC	CARSON	2,807	606	21.6%	66.2	62.5	68.5	3.31
4	BBC	DETRICK/WALTER REED NMMC	524	168	32.1%	78.0	73.6	80.2	3.90
5	BBC	EISENHOWER	738	188	25.5%	67.3	62.0	71.8	3.37
6	BBC	EUSTIS/STORY	1,064	295	27.7%	72.5	64.2	78.0	3.63
7	BBC	HAMILTON	215	80	37.2%	82.4	75.7	86.7	4.12
8	BBC	JACKSON	767	179	23.3%	71.6	68.3	74.1	3.58
9	BBC	LEONARD WOOD	1,686	354	21.0%	70.2	63.4	75.3	3.51
10	BBC	STEWART/HUNTER AA	2,715	541	19.9%	66.3	61.5	70.0	3.32
11	BBC	WEST POINT	747	234	31.3%	73.6	68.8	77.8	3.68
12	Centinel	CADENCE COMMUNITIES	317	158	49.8%	88.6	85.3	91.2	4.43
13	Centinel	CAMPBELL	3,989	927	23.2%	75.7	70.2	80.0	3.79
14	Centinel	CAVAZOS	4,983	1,290	25.9%	72.8	66.6	77.0	3.64
15	Centinel	DRUM	3,366	979	29.1%	78.6	72.8	81.9	3.93
16	Centinel	HAWAII	7,028	1,584	22.5%	77.0	72.6	79.6	3.85
17	Centinel	KNOX	2,249	691	30.7%	79.0	72.6	83.4	3.95
18	Centinel	WAINWRIGHT/GREELY	1,789	550	30.7%	82.7	79.8	84.4	4.14
19	Corvias	ABERDEEN	749	356	47.5%	84.8	77.9	89.2	4.24
20	Corvias	BRAGG	5,269	1,613	30.6%	72.8	65.8	77.6	3.64
21	Corvias	JOHNSON	2,815	548	19.5%	77.9	69.2	83.5	3.90
22	Corvias	MEADE	2,408	671	27.9%	74.5	67.9	78.5	3.73
23	Corvias	NOVOSEL	1,427	467	32.7%	82.3	75.0	87.2	4.12
24	Corvias	RILEY	3,711	1,000	26.9%	78.0	74.2	80.1	3.90
25	Corvias	SILL	1,723	493	28.6%	77.7	73.6	79.8	3.89
26	Hunt	GREGG-ADAMS	1,493	586	39.2%	73.9	66.4	79.5	3.70
27	Hunt	REDSTONE ARSENAL	343	182	53.1%	90.7	85.3	94.0	4.54
28	Hunt	SAM HOUSTON	890	304	34.2%	69.7	60.1	76.5	3.49
29	Liberty	LEWIS-MCCHORD	4,784	1,197	25.0%	78.5	74.8	81.5	3.93
30	Michaels	BELVOIR	2,037	794	39.0%	72.3	69.6	73.7	3.62
31	Michaels	HUACHUCA/YUMA PG	1,124	415	36.9%	88.9	84.9	91.5	4.45
32	Michaels	IRWIN/MOFFETT/CAMP PARKS	2,737	821	30.0%	79.4	73.9	83.3	3.97
33	Michaels	LEAVENWORTH	1,404	530	37.7%	72.8	67.9	76.2	3.64
34	Michaels	MOORE/BENNING	3,510	1,142	32.5%	74.1	69.6	76.2	3.71
35	Michaels	PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY/NPS	2,363	831	35.2%	73.2	70.6	74.8	3.66

D. Awards – Army Privatized Family

All Military Housing locations surveyed are eligible to participate in the CEL National Award Program for Service Excellence. This award recognizes those private sector and military housing Neighborhoods and/or Installations/Firms that provide an excellent level of service to tenants.

Installation Crystal Award Winners

Ten (10) Installations achieved a Crystal Service Award for FY25. Sorted below by highest scores.

Line	Company	Installation	Service Score	
			FY25	% Rec.
1	Centinel	ROCK ISLAND	96.7	52.5%
2	Michaels	YUMA	92.4	43.2%
3	BBC	CARLISLE	92.0	39.5%
4	Michaels	HUACHUCA	91.3	35.8%
5	BBC	WHITE SANDS	90.3	39.4%
6	Corvias	ABERDEEN	89.2	47.5%
7	BBC	PICATINNY	88.0	66.7%
8	Centinel	HUNTER LIGGETT	87.2	58.3%
9	Corvias	NOVOSEL	87.2	32.7%
10	BBC	HAMILTON	86.7	37.2%

Award Eligibility by Type of Award

Installation Crystal Award Eligibility:

To be award eligible, an Installation must have more than one Neighborhood, a consolidated Service Index Score of at least 85.0 and a Response Rate of at least 20%.

Neighborhood Awards Eligibility

To be award eligible a Neighborhood must meet the following criteria:

- A List Award: Service Satisfaction Index Score of at least 85.0, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.
- Platinum Award: Service Satisfaction Index Score of at least 92.7 (varies annually), and a Response Rate of at least 20%.

Honorable Mention: The Installations below qualified with Service Scores and Response Rates but are not a multi-neighborhood Installation as per the criteria. Each did achieve Neighborhood level awards.

Company	Installation
Michaels	CAMP PARKS
Centinel	GREELY
Centinel	MCCOY
Centinel	NATICK
Hunt	REDSTONE

Neighborhoods Achieving a Platinum or A List Neighborhood Award:

Neighborhood A List Awards

A List Award: Sixty-three (63) Neighborhoods

Platinum A List Award: Twenty-two (22) Neighborhoods

Note: CEL does not round up for reporting or Award purposes.

Score Ratings

100.0 to 85.0 Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0 Below Average
84.9 to 80.0 Very Good	64.9 to 60.0 Poor
79.9 to 75.0 Good	59.9 to 55.0 Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0 Average	54.9 to 0.0 Crisis

E. Overall Results - Unaccompanied Housing

Satisfaction Indexes			
Index	Current	Prior	Change
Overall Score	87.4	87.0	0.4
Property Score	85.8	85.9	(0.1)
Service Score	88.4	87.4	1.0
Response Rate	1,660	524	31.6%

The Army Privatized Unaccompanied Housing consists of five complexes within five separate Installations.

Army Privatized Unaccompanied Housing scored in the Outstanding Range (100.0 to 85.0) for Overall, Property and Service.

The Overall Response Rate of 31.6% is considered in the range of "Very Good".

Response Rate by Building:

Building	FY25	FY24	Var.
Bragg, Randolph Pointe	46.7%	44.0%	2.7%
Drum, The Timbers	33.7%	31.7%	2.0%
Irwin, Town Center	27.0%	24.2%	2.8%
Meade, Reece Crossings	25.2%	27.8%	(2.6%)
Stewart, Marne Point	24.6%	16.7%	7.9%

Response rates increased for four of the five buildings and ranged from a high of 46.7% at Bragg, Randolph Point to 24.6% for Stewart, Marne Point.

Stewart, Marne Point improved the response rate by 7.9% in FY25.

Satisfaction Index Scores by Building:

Observations:

- Three out of five buildings received awards: Randolph Pointe (Bragg) and The Timbers (Drum) earned Platinum A List Awards for Service Excellence, while Marne Point (Stewart) received an A List Award.
- Although three buildings saw a decrease in Overall and Property Scores, they remained in the "Outstanding" (100.0 to 85.0) and "Very Good" (85.5 to 80.0) ranges.

Installation	Company	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score		
		FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.
*Bragg, Randolph Pointe	Corvias	92.5	90.5	2.0	89.8	88.4	1.4	94.2	91.6	2.6
*Drum, The Timbers	Centinel	91.0	93.3	(2.3)	87.8	90.5	(2.7)	93.4	94.5	(1.1)
Irwin, Town Center	Michaels	82.7	83.8	(1.1)	80.4	82.0	(1.6)	84.5	85.7	(1.2)
Meade, Reece Crossings	Corvias	81.7	82.3	(0.6)	81.5	83.1	(1.6)	81.4	81.4	0.0
*Stewart, Marne Point	BBC	86.2	84.7	1.5	86.1	83.5	2.6	86.3	86.0	0.3

*Award Recipient. Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

Score Ratings

100.0 to 85.0 Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0 Below Average
84.9 to 80.0 Very Good	64.9 to 60.0 Poor
79.9 to 75.0 Good	59.9 to 55.0 Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0 Average	54.9 to 0.0 Crisis

F. Results by Company – Family Housing

Overall Results by Company:

The scores for each privatized company were compared against the results for the “Overall Army”. The number of Installations for each company vary greatly between one to sixteen. To identify areas for targeted improvement, it is recommended to examine results at both the Installation and Neighborhood levels.

Highlights include:

- Liberty has the highest Overall Score at 78.5, with one Installation (Lewis-McChord).
- Hunt achieved the highest response rate at 39.3%.
- Centinel has the largest number of tenants with a total of 23,271.
- Four out of the six privatized companies have Service Scores in the range of Very Good (80.0 to 84.9). The Property Scores range from a low of 67.1 (BBC) to a high of 74.8 (Liberty).

Metric	Overall Army	BBC	CENTINEL	CORVIAS	HUNT	LIBERTY	MICHAELS
Surveys Distributed	78,457	15,949	23,271	18,102	2,726	4,784	13,175
Surveys Received	22,134	4,005	6,179	5,148	1,072	1,197	4,533
Response Rate	28.2%	25.1%	26.0%	28.4%	39.3%	25.0%	34.4%
Overall Score	76.0	72.5	77.2	76.8	75.6	78.5	75.8
Property Score	70.7	67.1	72.0	70.5	67.8	74.8	71.8
Service Score	79.5	76.4	80.7	80.7	81.1	81.5	78.2
# of Installations	48	16	12	7	3	1	9

Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

Current and Prior Scores by Privatized Company:

Out of the six privatized companies, four increased in the Overall Satisfaction Index from FY25 with Liberty scoring the greatest increase of 3.3 points. Liberty has the highest Overall Score at 78.5.

Privatized Company	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			Response Rate		
	FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.
BBC	72.5	70.0	2.5	67.1	68.5	(1.4)	76.4	70.6	5.8	25.1%	25.3%	(0.2%)
CENTINEL	77.2	79.7	(2.5)	72.0	75.4	(3.4)	80.7	82.4	(1.7)	26.0%	30.0%	(4.0%)
CORVIAS	76.8	75.6	1.2	70.5	70.7	(0.2)	80.7	78.5	2.2	28.4%	30.4%	(2.0%)
HUNT	75.6	80.1	(4.5)	67.8	75.0	(7.2)	81.1	83.2	(2.1)	39.3%	31.3%	8.0%
LIBERTY	78.5	75.2	3.3	74.8	73.9	0.9	81.5	76.3	5.2	25.0%	23.9%	1.1%
MICHAELS	75.8	73.8	2.0	71.8	71.9	(0.1)	78.2	74.7	3.5	34.4%	31.6%	2.8%

Score Ratings

100.0 to 85.0 Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0 Below Average
84.9 to 80.0 Very Good	64.9 to 60.0 Poor
79.9 to 75.0 Good	59.9 to 55.0 Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0 Average	54.9 to 0.0 Crisis

Addendum A

The Survey Process: CEL worked with the Army and each privatized company to set up the survey process and obtain information on each Neighborhood to be surveyed within each Installation. CEL utilized the survey questions provided within the OSD Directive for the Army survey. All surveys were completed online.

- ♦ All military used the same question set for FY25.
- ♦ Army Representatives had access to the CEL Online Reporting.
- ♦ The survey was confidential and anonymous.

- ♦ **Distribution:** CEL distributed **78,457** surveys to tenants living in Army Privatized Family Housing. There was a total of **398** Neighborhoods within **48** Installations. In addition, CEL distributed **1,660** surveys to tenants in privatized unaccompanied housing within **5** of the 48 Installations.
- ♦ **Population:** The survey was distributed to one tenant per household living On-Base at the time of the survey launch.
- ♦ **Confidentiality:** The survey results are confidential and anonymous. Only CEL has access to the results of any individual survey. Reporting is only provided in summarized format.
- ♦ **Online Survey:** A survey invitation was sent via email to all tenants being surveyed and via text to those tenants that opted in to receive text messaging. The **text opt-in** was available during the duration of the open survey cycle. **Each email or text included a unique link to the online survey.** Up to ten email reminders, which included the survey link, were then sent out to non-respondents at seven-day intervals. CEL provided an email address for tenant assistance and for all survey methods verified residency prior to providing survey access.
- ♦ **Quality Control:** The unique survey link was associated with a specific tenant address within a Neighborhood to ensure each currently occupied home only completed one survey, thus ensuring quality control and a consistent distribution methodology.
- ♦ **Survey Process and Reporting:** The CEL reporting includes access to Response Rates, Questions Scores, and tenant Comments during the open survey cycle. Once the project is closed and reports are prepared, all reporting is uploaded to the CEL Online Reporting site for retrieval.
- ♦ **Survey Timing:** Because of the timing of the surveys, there may be discrepancies between the fiscal and calendar years. The REACT reports and accompanying materials reference the calendar year in which the survey was conducted. Please use the cross-reference table below to correlate the time periods:

Fiscal Year	Calendar Report Year
FY25	2025
FY24	2024
FY23	2022
FY22	2021
FY21	2020
FY20	2019 (2)

Addendum B

Analytics: For the purpose of assessing Tenant opinions, CEL has developed a proprietary scoring system. Tenants respond to each survey question using a five-point Likert scale. Aggregated answers are then grouped into three overall categories termed Satisfaction Indexes and into nine sub-categories termed Business Success Factors.

The three Satisfaction Indexes provide the highest-level overview and offer a snapshot of how a MHPI Company, Installation, or single Neighborhood is performing.

The Overall Satisfaction Index includes scores from all scored questions. These question scores are included in each of the Business Success Factors. Questions pertaining to Quality of Leasing Services and Renewal Intention are not categorized in the Service or Property Index but are included in the Overall Satisfaction Index.

REACT R Summarizes satisfaction by way of three Satisfaction Indices and Nine Business Success Factors



Reporting: CEL prepared consolidated reports by Overall Army, Housing Type (FH/UH), MHPI Company, Directorate, Project, and Installation, as well as for each Individual Neighborhood within an Installation. Additional reporting included pre-populated Action Plan templates at the Installation level.

Scoring: The calculated scoring ranges are as follows:

Scoring Range	Rating	Scoring Range	Rating
100.0 to 85.0	Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0	Below Average
84.9 to 80.0	Very Good	64.9 to 60.0	Poor
79.9 to 75.0	Good	59.9 to 55.0	Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0	Average	54.9 to 0.0	Crisis

Scoring is calculated scores of 1-100. Not a percentile. Example of 1-100 scoring converted to 5 point would be 80 divided by 20 = 4.0.

CEL utilized the survey and improvement process used by all its military and private sector clients called "REACT" (*Reaching Excellence through Assessment, Communication and Transformation*). This process allows for a direct comparison of all surveys conducted by CEL for purposes of comparative data and in-depth trending analysis.

Evaluating Scores

The CEL & Associates, Inc. scoring system provides a consistent methodology for evaluating survey results. Satisfaction Indexes, Business Success Factors and individual evaluation questions are all scored in the same manner, for ease of isolating high-performance areas and identifying problem areas.

Scores can be interpreted in the following ranges:

- **Scores from 100 to 85 ("Outstanding")** - Any Satisfaction Index, Business Success Factor, or question score of 85 or greater is considered to be outstanding. The management team should be commended for providing excellence in service, while Asset Management is to be applauded for providing the resources necessary to keep the property in outstanding condition and market competitive.
- **Scores from 84 to 80 ("Very Good")** - Scores in this range are approaching the very best and the management team should be recognized for their efforts. While only a few points below Outstanding, scores in this category typically mean that while most tenants are very satisfied, others feel that more could be done. Special attention should be given to any areas where ratings are below "4".
- **Scores from 79 to 75 ("Good")** - Scores in this range tend to reflect a steady, stable, and consistent level of satisfaction and performance with clear opportunities for improvement. The primary indicator of whether these scores will rise is the capacity and desire to take advantage of these opportunities. Improving these scores requires maintaining current efforts, while giving special attention to those specific REACT questions receiving the fewest ratings of "5".
- **Scores from 74 to 70 ("Average")** - Scores in this range generally reflect some satisfaction with the service or property features being evaluated, but the complete standards and expectations of the tenants are not being met. Taking action in these areas can remove obstacles to tenants feeling Very Satisfied.
- **Scores from 69 to 65 ("Below Average")** - Scores in this range generally mean that performance is just not adequate and indicate areas of necessary improvement. CEL & Associates, Inc. believes it is important to strive for clear satisfaction, not just an absence of dissatisfaction, and therefore find scores in this range are a definite area of concern.
- **Scores from 64 to 60 ("Poor")** - Scores in this range signify substandard performance and strong displeasure with the property and/or the level of service. Improvements are needed immediately. Tenant expectations are significantly different from their perceptions of the property and/or service provided. Corrective measures taken soon will prevent the scores from dropping into a category where significantly more time and expense is necessary to improve them.
- **Scores from 59 to 55 ("Very Poor")** - Scores in this range are over 25 points below the scores received by the best in the industry. Corrective measures need a strong commitment, as improvements will require significant focus, time and resources. Scores in this range are not the result of a few dissatisfied Tenants, but an expression of a majority of tenants. Remediation of each problem area is essential if the property is to improve its financial and operational performance.
- **Scores below 55 ("Crisis")** - When a significant majority of the tenants at a property fail to indicate a positive response, there is a major problem that must be addressed immediately. Corrective measures must be taken without delay. Improvements to areas receiving these low scores generally involve much more than a policy, staffing, or cosmetic change to the property. Significant, noticeable improvements must be made immediately to improve all areas with scores below 60.

To better understand the issues impacting tenant satisfaction, it is essential to review reporting and associated comments at the Neighborhood level within an Installation/Neighborhood.