



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



SUMMARY OF
FY25 TENANT SATISFACTION RESULTS
FOR
HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING

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

Introduction

Army Headquarters engaged Archetype I LLC in conjunction with CEL & Associates, Inc. ("CEL") to conduct a Tenant Satisfaction and Opinion Survey to assess the living conditions and service quality in Army Unaccompanied Housing within 46 Installations consisting of 785 Buildings/Groupings with 93,725 tenants 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.

Overview of Results

The Satisfaction Index for the UH Army project shows that UH Housing's first-year survey results were in the Below Average range (69.9 to 65.0) for the Overall Score **68.1** and the Property Score **65.1**, while the Service score of **70.6** was in the Average range (74.9 to 70.0).

Business Success Factors

The BSFs for ARMY Unaccompanied Housing ranged from a high of **71.8**, or 3.59, to a low of **63.7**, or 3.19.

The highest rated BSFs were **BSF #5** – Quality of Leasing/Check in Services and **BSF #6** – Quality of Maintenance Services, both scoring **71.8**, or 3.59. Questions for BSF #5 included the check in and assignment process while BSF #6 included areas within maintenance services, such as courtesy and respect, timeliness, work quality and follow-up.

The lowest scoring BSF for FY25 is in **BSF #9** – Renewal Intention at **63.7**, or 3.19. The questions in this BSF include referral and recommendation of the Installation to others.

Installation and Building Ratings

Out of 46 Installations, **45.7%** (21) of Installations rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0) for the Overall Score, **15.2%** (7) Installations rated Below Average (69.9 thru 65.0), and **39.1%** (18) rated Poor or below. In terms of the 715 Buildings that had surveys returned, **42.5%** (304) rated similarly, with **57.5%** (411) classified as Below Average or below.

Tenant Satisfaction Metrics

- **48.0%** of tenants reported satisfaction with the overall service levels.
- **47.3%** expressed satisfaction with their homes.
- **47.3%** were satisfied with the condition of their homes.

Response Rate Analysis

Surveys were distributed to **93,725** tenants, with **10,360** responses received, resulting in an overall response rate of **11.1%**, which is considered Needs Improvement on the CEL Response rate scale. However, first-year surveys for similar populations and demographics in other MilDeps ranged from **10% to 14%**.

Key Questions and Observations

Key questions assessing tenant satisfaction included:

- Service level and quality scored **68.7**
- Problems reported to management follow-up scored **66.8**
- Satisfaction with current home/unit is **66.2**
- Overall condition of the home scored **66.0**

Top and Bottom Scoring Questions

The top five scoring questions range from **77.0 to 72.5** and include areas such as courtesy of maintenance and management, security of the home, and ease of the check in process.

The bottom five scoring questions range from **64.1 to 62.5** and cover topics such as the condition and appeal of the building, referrals to others, renewal if extended, move-in condition, and interior features.

Tenant Feedback

The results of an overview of the tenant comments, categorized into positive and negative feedback, have been provided. Despite the numerous complaints, some soldiers have shared positive experiences with certain housing offices and maintenance staff, appreciating their responsiveness and efforts to address issues when they arise. The overall sentiment reflects a desire for a more supportive and health-conscious living environment for soldiers.

It is important to note that while the data may not present the entire picture at specific Installations or Buildings it offers valuable insights at the overall portfolio level. For example, issues like "water quality" may not be pervasive across all Installations but are significant at specific locations. To better understand the issues impacting tenant satisfaction, it is essential to review reporting and associated comments at the Building level within an Installation/Building.

Conclusion

From the findings, it is apparent that while there are areas where tenant satisfaction is strong, particularly in aspects such as maintenance responsiveness and courteous management, significant opportunities for improvement remain. Addressing concerns such as building conditions, water quality, and overall unit appeal at the granular level of specific Installations can greatly enhance tenant experiences. Prioritizing health-conscious and supportive environments for soldiers will not only improve satisfaction scores but also foster a stronger sense of community and well-being within the housing portfolio. By leveraging these insights, actionable strategies can be developed to tackle recurring issues and ensure a higher standard of living for tenants across military Installations.

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%. The actual response rate of 11.1% falls within the Needs Improvement range. However first-year surveys for similar populations and demographics in other MilDeps have ranged from 10% to 14%.

Response rates by Installation varied from a high of 59.1% (White Sands) to a low of 1.3% (Fort Drum).

Twenty-nine Installations have response rates in the 10% or higher range. Sixteen Installations met or exceeded the minimum 20% goal. Fort Bliss with 6,061 tenants and a 21.2% response rate was the largest Installation to achieve a response rate of 20% or higher.

Response Rate	
Distributed	Received
93,725	10,360
11.1%	
46 Installations	785 Buildings

Satisfaction Index Results for Overall:

The Satisfaction Index for the UH Army project indicates that UH Housing's first-year survey results were within the Below Average range (69.9 to 65.0) for the Overall Score (**68.1**) and the Property Score (**65.1**), while the Service score was **70.6**, placing it in the Average range of 74.9 to 70.0. All surveys submitted contribute to the Army overall results, including those Installations that did not achieve a response rate sufficient to be valid at the Installation level.

Due to the low response rate for Army UH overall of **11.1%**, CEL created a subset of the reporting by rolling up the **29** Installations achieving a response rate of 10% or higher. The combined overall response rate for these Installations was **20.0%**. CEL then compared these results to those of the Army UH overall project. The variance in all Satisfaction Scores was less than a point for all Satisfaction Indexes, suggesting that the scores are relevant for targeted improvement purposes at the Army overall UH project level. CEL further reviewed this group down to the question scores and without exception, the difference between the two groups was less than one point.

Satisfaction Indexes FY25							
A. ARMY – All 46 Installations				B. ARMY – Subset of 29 Installations 10% or Higher Response Rate			
Response Rate 11.1%				Response Rate 20%			
Index Scores	CEL Scores	5 Point Score	CEL Rating	CEL Scores	5 Point Score	CEL Rating	Variance "Group A" minus "Group B"
Overall	68.1	3.41	B. Average	68.7	3.44	B. Average	-0.6
Property	65.1	3.26	B. Average	65.7	3.29	B. Average	-0.6
Service	70.6	3.53	Average	71.1	3.56	Average	-0.5

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

Business Success Factors (“BSFs”) Results:

The Nine Business Success Factors provide specific insight into which functions have a high level of satisfaction, and which need a focused effort for improvement.

The BSFs for ARMY Unaccompanied Housing ranged from a high of **71.8**, or 3.59 to a low of low of **63.7**, or 3.19.

The highest rated BSFs were **BSF #5** – Quality of Leasing/Check in Services and **BSF #6** – Quality of Maintenance Services, both scoring **71.8**, or 3.59. Questions for BSF #5 included the check-in and assignment process while BSF #6 included areas within maintenance services, such as courtesy and respect, timeliness, work quality and follow-up.

The lowest scoring BSF for FY25 is in **BSF #9** – Renewal Intention at **63.7**, or 3.19. The questions in this BSF include referral and recommendation of the Installation to others.

Business Success Factors			
Factor	FY25	5 Point Score	CEL Rating FY25
1 - Readiness to Solve Problems	69.6	3.48	B. Average
2 - Responsiveness & Follow Through	66.8	3.34	B. Average
3 - Property Appearance & Condition	64.2	3.21	Poor
4 - Quality of Management Services	70.2	3.51	Average
5 - Quality of Leasing/Ck in Services	71.8	3.59	Average
6 - Quality of Maintenance Services	71.8	3.59	Average
7 - Property Rating	65.4	3.27	B. Average
8 - Relationship Rating	71.4	3.57	Average
9 - Renewal Intention	63.7	3.19	Poor

Overall Comparison by Directorate:

The Satisfaction Indexes by Directorate range from a high Overall Score of **70.1** for Readiness to a low of **63.1** for Europe. The Readiness Directorate is also the largest with 59,577 tenants. The highest response rate was achieved by the Training Directorate at 16.6%.

Line	Directorate	Surveys			Satisfaction Scores			# of Installations	Overall CEL Score Rating
		Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	Overall	Property	Service		
1	EUROPE	9,358	841	9.0%	63.1	59.0	67.1	7	Poor
2	PACIFIC	17,200	2,550	14.8%	65.9	62.5	68.4	8	B. Average
3	READINESS	59,577	5,809	9.8%	70.1	67.5	72.4	14	Average
4	SUSTAINMENT	1,414	136	9.6%	65.0	61.0	69.0	5	B. Average
5	TRAINING	6,176	1,024	16.6%	66.5	63.6	69.0	12	B. Average

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

Overall Project Status by Number of Installations:

Out of 46 Installations, **45.7%** (21) of Installations rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0) for the Overall Score, **15.2%** (7) Installations rated Below Average (69.9 thru 65.0), and **39.1%** (18) rated Poor or below.

Metric	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score
Based on 46 Installations	Percent			Count		
Rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0)	45.7%	32.6%	52.2%	21	15	24
Rated in Below Average range (69.9 thru 65.0)	15.2%	19.6%	30.4%	7	9	14
Rated in the Poor to Crisis Range (64.9 to 0.0)	39.1%	47.8%	17.4%	18	22	8

Overall Project Status by Number of Buildings:

Out of 715 Unaccompanied Housing Buildings that had surveys returned, **42.5%** (304) of Buildings rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0) for Overall Satisfaction, **57.5%** (411) of Buildings rated in the Below Average range or below.

Analyzing these results at various levels offers a clearer method to address tenant issues. For instance, lower satisfaction scores in a Building 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 715* Buildings	Percent			Count		
Rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0)	42.5%	32.7%	51.9%	304	234	371
Rated in Below Average range or lower (69.9 thru 0.0)	57.5%	67.3%	48.1%	411	481	344

*Note: 785 Buildings were surveyed. 70 Buildings had no surveys returned. Scores are based on 715 Buildings with 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 selected questions delved into aspects such as satisfaction with service provided, maintenance, property upkeep, housing conditions, interior and exterior elements, health and safety measures, and the propensity to recommend the housing. Results at an Installation or Building level can vary significantly and therefore it should not be assumed that the Overall Results are representative of a single Installation.

Observations:

- Courtesy and respect with which you are treated scored highest at **75.7**
- Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.) scored lowest at **62.5**
- Service level and quality overall scored **68.7**
- Maintenance work quality scored **72.5**
- Follow-up on maintenance scored **68.5**, while management follow-up scored **66.8**
- Overall condition of the home scored **66.0**

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)	44.2%	25.9%	22.3%	7.6%	66.8	3.34
3d. Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	58.6%	23.3%	11.2%	6.8%	75.7	3.78
3e. Frequency and clarity of communications. (Re: Management)	47.4%	28.0%	17.1%	7.4%	69.7	3.49
3f. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving in housing	48.0%	25.0%	20.2%	6.8%	68.7	3.43
Maintenance						
4b. General work order or maintenance request completion time	51.8%	21.4%	22.6%	4.2%	69.2	3.46
4c. Quality of maintenance work	55.4%	23.5%	16.6%	4.6%	72.5	3.63
4d. Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	45.9%	27.5%	20.1%	6.5%	68.5	3.43
Home – Interior/Exterior and Condition						
1a. Overall condition and visual appeal of your housing	47.3%	19.6%	31.1%	1.9%	64.1	3.21
5a. Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	48.4%	25.0%	24.1%	2.5%	67.0	3.35
5b. Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	42.7%	22.2%	32.8%	2.2%	62.5	3.12
5d. Overall current condition	47.3%	24.1%	26.1%	2.5%	66.0	3.30
Would Recommend						
7d. I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this Installation.	33.9%	24.5%	22.1%	19.5%	63.8	3.19
Satisfaction with Home including Health and Safety						
8a. Your current home/unit	47.3%	22.3%	25.7%	4.6%	66.2	3.31
8b. The health and safety of your Home	47.5%	24.5%	22.2%	5.8%	67.8	3.39

Top and Bottom Five Scoring Questions:

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

Results at an Installation or Building 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 Building level to isolate top issues and areas of greatest need or focus.

The top five scoring questions range from **77.0 to 72.5** and include areas such as courtesy of maintenance and management, safety and security of the home, and the assignment/check in process.

Top 5 Scoring Questions		
Question	Score	BSF
4a) Courtesy of maintenance personnel	77.0	6
3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated (by Management)	75.7	8
7e) Housing is a significant factor in my decision to stay in or leave military service.	75.4	Not Coded
2a) Safety of your home/unit	74.8	Not Coded
6a) The assignment and sign in/signing process	72.5	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 **64.1 to 62.5** and include areas such as condition and appeal of the building, referral, renewal, move in condition, and interior features.

Bottom 5 Scoring Questions		
Question	Score	BSF
1a) Overall condition and visual appeal of the housing.	64.1	3
7d) I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation.	63.8	9
7c) If extended at this installation, I would seek/want to live in this housing community again.	63.6	9
5c) Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months).	63.1	7
5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.).	62.5	7

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

Note: Non-coded questions are assessed separately and do not impact the Business Success Factors. These questions are usually designed to gather feedback on specific topics without affecting overall satisfaction levels.

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 Buildings, it offers valuable insights at the overall portfolio level. For example, issues like "water quality" may not be pervasive across all Installations but are significant at specific locations.

Positive Feedback

- **Helpful Housing Community:** Some soldiers have expressed satisfaction with the helpfulness of the housing community, noting that the housing office strives to care for the needs of the community despite constraints.
- **Responsive Maintenance Staff:** There are positive comments about the responsiveness and professionalism of maintenance staff when they do address issues.
- **Security and Safety:** Some soldiers feel safe in their housing and appreciate the urgency of the housing office to resolve issues.

Negative Feedback

- **Mold and Pest Issues:** Persistent mold problems and pest infestations are a major concern for many soldiers, affecting their health and living conditions.
- **Maintenance Delays:** Maintenance requests often take weeks or months to address, leading to frustration among soldiers.
- **Inadequate Facilities:** Complaints about outdated and poorly maintained barracks, including issues with laundry facilities, kitchens, and overall cleanliness.
- **Security and Privacy Concerns:** Unauthorized personnel accessing living quarters, leading to instances of theft and privacy invasions.
- **Cramped Living Spaces:** Many soldiers feel that the barracks rooms are too cramped for two individuals, leading to a lack of privacy and uncomfortable living conditions.

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:

The response rates ranged from a high of 59.1% to a low of 1.3%. The overall response rate for Army UH was 11.1%.

Key Observations:

- Out of the 46 Installations, 63.0%, or 29 Installations, had a response 10% or above.
- White Sands had the highest response rate at 59.1%.
- Fort Irwin with 1,075 tenants is the largest Installation to achieve a response rate over 30%.
- Riley with 4,616 tenants was less than 1% from achieving a 30% response rate.
- Bliss with 6,061 tenants and a response rate of 21.2% is the largest Installation to achieve a response above 20%.

	Directorate	Installation Name	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.
1	READINESS	WHITE SANDS	22	13	59.1%
2	TRAINING	CARLISLE	9	4	44.4%
3	SUSTAINMENT	ABERDEEN	45	18	40.0%
4	READINESS	IRWIN	1,075	340	31.6%
5	READINESS	SOTO CANO	395	119	30.1%
6	READINESS	RILEY	4,616	1,378	29.9%
7	TRAINING	GREGG-ADAMS	136	39	28.7%
8	PACIFIC	HAWAII	4,362	1,230	28.2%
9	TRAINING	MOORE	1,302	346	26.6%
10	TRAINING	JACKSON	155	41	26.5%
11	PACIFIC	WAINWRIGHT	1,820	459	25.2%
12	SUSTAINMENT	DETRICK	116	28	24.1%
13	TRAINING	NOVOSEL	197	44	22.3%
14	EUROPE	BENELUX	136	29	21.3%
15	READINESS	BLISS	6,061	1,284	21.2%
16	PACIFIC	GREELY	10	2	20.0%
17	TRAINING	KNOX	251	50	19.9%
18	PACIFIC	CAMP ZAMA	457	90	19.7%
19	TRAINING	LEONARD WOOD	552	98	17.8%
20	SUSTAINMENT	MEADE	343	59	17.2%
21	EUROPE	WIESBADEN	973	154	15.8%
22	TRAINING	MONTEREY	890	136	15.3%
23	TRAINING	EISENHOWER	1,131	168	14.9%
24	READINESS	MIAMI	29	4	13.8%
25	EUROPE	ANSBACH	510	65	12.7%
26	EUROPE	STUTTGART	444	56	12.6%
27	TRAINING	LEAVENWORTH	256	31	12.1%
28	READINESS	CAVAZOS	8,808	1,057	12.0%
29	PACIFIC	DAEGU	1,219	129	10.6%
30	READINESS	JOHNSON	2,078	198	9.5%
31	PACIFIC	OKINAWA TORII	248	23	9.3%
32	TRAINING	HUACHUCA	136	12	8.8%
33	PACIFIC	HUMPHREYS	5,836	491	8.4%
34	EUROPE	BAVARIA	3,524	284	8.1%
35	EUROPE	RHEINLAND-PFALZ	2,305	182	7.9%
36	READINESS	STEWART	5,000	369	7.4%
37	READINESS	LEWIS-MCCHORD	4,706	330	7.0%
38	SUSTAINMENT	BELVOIR	426	23	5.4%
39	EUROPE	ITALY	1,466	71	4.8%
40	TRAINING	SILL	1,161	55	4.7%
41	READINESS	CAMPBELL	6,186	252	4.1%
42	PACIFIC	CASEY	3,248	126	3.9%
43	READINESS	CARSON	6,527	217	3.3%
44	READINESS	BRAGG	9,635	192	2.0%
45	SUSTAINMENT	MYER-HH	484	8	1.7%
46	READINESS	DRUM	4,439	56	1.3%

Scores and Rating by Installation:

The Installations are presented in order of highest Overall Scores, with a five-point scale added for comparison to CEL scores. Out of 46 Installations, **45.7%** (21) of Installations rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0) for the Overall Score, **15.2%** (7) Installations rated Below Average (69.9 thru 65.0), and **39.1%** (18) rated Poor or below.

Line	Region	Installation	Overall	Property	Service	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	Overall 5 Point Scale
1	TRAINING	CARLISLE	99.8	100.0	99.5	9	4	44.4%	4.99
2	READINESS	MIAMI	91.3	91.9	89.2	29	4	13.8%	4.57
3	READINESS	SOTO CANO	88.7	86.6	90.7	395	119	30.1%	4.44
4	READINESS	WHITE SANDS	87.5	84.8	89.7	22	13	59.1%	4.38
5	SUSTAINMENT	BELVOIR	85.4	81.3	89.7	426	23	5.4%	4.27
6	PACIFIC	GREELY	82.7	84.0	83.8	10	2	20.0%	4.14
7	TRAINING	KNOX	81.2	78.9	82.1	251	50	19.9%	4.06
8	SUSTAINMENT	ABERDEEN PG	81.1	82.4	79.9	45	18	40.0%	4.06
9	TRAINING	LEONARD WOOD	80.3	80.5	79.9	552	98	17.8%	4.02
10	PACIFIC	CAMP ZAMA	80.1	73.2	85.4	457	90	19.7%	4.01
11	TRAINING	HUACHUCA	79.7	73.3	85.6	136	12	8.8%	3.99
12	READINESS	RILEY	75.4	74.1	76.6	4,616	1,378	29.9%	3.77
13	PACIFIC	HUMPHREYS	74.6	72.5	76.6	5,836	491	8.4%	3.73
14	EUROPE	STUTTGART	72.3	70.7	74.1	444	56	12.6%	3.62
15	TRAINING	NOVOSEL	71.9	67.3	75.8	197	44	22.3%	3.60
16	PACIFIC	DAEGU	71.8	66.5	76.7	1,219	129	10.6%	3.59
17	READINESS	BLISS	71.2	68.2	74.0	6,061	1,284	21.2%	3.56
18	SUSTAINMENT	DETRICK	71.2	66.9	76.0	116	28	24.1%	3.56
19	EUROPE	BENELUX	70.6	68.5	73.7	136	29	21.3%	3.53
20	PACIFIC	CASEY	70.4	65.6	74.3	3,248	126	3.9%	3.52
21	READINESS	LEWIS-MCCHORD	70.0	67.6	72.3	4,706	330	7.0%	3.50
22	READINESS	JOHNSON	68.5	65.6	70.9	2,078	198	9.5%	3.43
23	TRAINING	MONTEREY	68.4	70.9	65.9	890	136	15.3%	3.42
24	READINESS	CAVAZOS	68.3	65.0	70.7	8,808	1,057	12.0%	3.42
25	READINESS	STEWART	67.0	64.3	69.6	5,000	369	7.4%	3.35
26	READINESS	IRWIN	66.5	62.1	69.6	1,075	340	31.6%	3.33
27	EUROPE	ITALY	66.1	62.1	69.6	1,466	71	4.8%	3.31
28	TRAINING	LEAVENWORTH	66.0	63.7	67.5	256	31	12.1%	3.30
29	PACIFIC	WAINWRIGHT	64.6	62.2	66.8	1,820	459	25.2%	3.23
30	READINESS	DRUM	64.2	61.5	67.6	4,439	56	1.3%	3.21
31	TRAINING	GREGG-ADAMS	64.2	54.8	73.4	136	39	28.7%	3.21
32	EUROPE	ANSBACH	64.0	61.1	66.5	510	65	12.7%	3.20
33	READINESS	CAMPBELL	63.9	62.1	64.8	6,186	252	4.1%	3.20
34	TRAINING	MOORE	63.8	61.2	65.5	1,302	346	26.6%	3.19
35	READINESS	CARSON	63.3	60.7	65.8	6,527	217	3.3%	3.17
36	TRAINING	JACKSON	63.0	61.1	65.6	155	41	26.5%	3.15
37	EUROPE	BAVARIA	62.7	59.7	65.8	3,524	284	8.1%	3.14
38	EUROPE	RHEINLAND-PFALZ	62.6	56.6	68.2	2,305	182	7.9%	3.13
39	PACIFIC	HAWAII	60.9	57.3	63.2	4,362	1,230	28.2%	3.05
40	TRAINING	SILL	60.7	58.0	63.0	1,161	55	4.7%	3.04
41	EUROPE	WIESBADEN	58.0	52.5	63.3	973	154	15.8%	2.90
42	TRAINING	EISENHOWER	57.8	50.2	66.6	1,131	168	14.9%	2.89
43	PACIFIC	OKINAWA TORII	53.5	46.1	61.1	248	23	9.3%	2.68
44	SUSTAINMENT	MEADE	52.6	47.4	57.5	343	59	17.2%	2.63
45	READINESS	BRAGG	52.4	49.2	55.3	9,635	192	2.0%	2.62
46	SUSTAINMENT	MYER-HH	39.8	33.4	47.2	484	8	1.7%	1.99

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.

Directorate	Installation	8a	5d	3f	1a
EUROPE	ANSBACH	33.3%	31.3%	23.0%	41.3%
EUROPE	BAVARIA	39.0%	34.2%	29.8%	39.3%
EUROPE	BENELUX	32.1%	24.1%	19.2%	27.6%
EUROPE	ITALY	31.3%	34.8%	24.2%	26.1%
EUROPE	RHEINLAND-PFALZ	44.2%	41.4%	29.9%	48.3%
EUROPE	STUTTGART	23.6%	15.1%	23.6%	19.6%
EUROPE	WIESBADEN	48.4%	48.7%	34.2%	51.6%
PACIFIC	CAMP ZAMA	22.1%	20.7%	8.0%	22.5%
PACIFIC	CASEY	27.6%	26.7%	23.5%	32.5%
PACIFIC	DAEGU	37.8%	32.0%	20.0%	35.7%
PACIFIC	GREELY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
PACIFIC	HAWAII	33.9%	38.1%	30.1%	45.0%
PACIFIC	HUMPHREYS	19.4%	21.4%	15.5%	23.4%
PACIFIC	OKINAWA TORII	63.6%	60.9%	28.6%	82.6%
PACIFIC	WAINWRIGHT	28.7%	26.7%	24.0%	38.1%
READINESS	BLISS	17.7%	18.0%	14.1%	23.2%
READINESS	BRAGG	58.9%	55.3%	52.5%	57.4%
READINESS	CAMPBELL	34.2%	32.7%	31.0%	38.5%
READINESS	CARSON	31.6%	31.7%	31.5%	34.9%
READINESS	CAVAZOS	30.9%	29.6%	23.0%	36.5%
READINESS	DRUM	41.8%	30.9%	36.4%	37.5%
READINESS	IRWIN	29.6%	27.8%	18.3%	36.9%
READINESS	JOHNSON	30.0%	24.7%	20.4%	27.6%
READINESS	LEWIS-MCCHORD	24.6%	23.5%	20.1%	26.9%
READINESS	MIAMI	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
READINESS	RILEY	10.5%	10.5%	8.5%	12.0%
READINESS	SOTO CANO	3.4%	5.9%	0.9%	4.2%
READINESS	STEWART	29.5%	30.1%	23.8%	33.6%
READINESS	WHITE SANDS	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	8.3%
SUSTAINMENT	ABERDEEN	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	11.1%
SUSTAINMENT	BELVOIR	22.7%	9.1%	4.8%	18.2%
SUSTAINMENT	DETRICK	23.1%	29.6%	7.1%	23.1%
SUSTAINMENT	MEADE	57.4%	54.4%	49.1%	65.5%
SUSTAINMENT	MYER-HH	85.7%	75.0%	62.5%	87.5%
TRAINING	CARLISLE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TRAINING	EISENHOWER	55.3%	51.2%	39.9%	57.8%
TRAINING	GREGG-ADAMS	52.8%	50.0%	28.6%	44.7%
TRAINING	HUACHUCA	18.2%	16.7%	9.1%	18.2%
TRAINING	JACKSON	26.8%	24.4%	31.6%	41.5%
TRAINING	KNOX	6.3%	10.4%	11.9%	16.3%
TRAINING	LEAVENWORTH	30.0%	20.0%	30.8%	32.3%
TRAINING	LEONARD WOOD	6.3%	11.5%	13.2%	8.2%
TRAINING	MONTEREY	18.6%	20.7%	25.0%	27.6%
TRAINING	MOORE	31.0%	34.3%	30.2%	39.2%
TRAINING	NOVOSEL	19.5%	18.2%	14.6%	20.9%
TRAINING	SILL	43.6%	28.3%	39.2%	38.2%

C. Awards – Army UH Housing

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 Buildings and/or Installations/Firms that provide an excellent level of service to tenants.

Installation Crystal Award Winners

One (1) Installation achieved a Crystal Service Award for FY25.

Line	Directorate	Installation	Service Score	
			FY25	% Rec.
1	READINESS	SOTO CANO	90.7	30.1%

Building A List and Platinum Awards

Properties Receiving Platinum A List Award			
Multifamily criteria: Service Satisfaction Score of at least 92.7, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.			
Property Name		Service Score	Response Rate
1	BENELUX,BRUNSSUM	94.1	36.4%
2	CARLISLE BRK,460	99.5	44.4%
3	SOTO CANO,R76-R121	94.8	37.1%

Properties Receiving A List Award			
Multifamily criteria: Service Satisfaction Score of at least 85.0, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.			
Property Name		Service Score	Response Rate
1	CAMP ZAMA,781-795	91.9	30.3%
2	HUMPHREYS,6021,6023	91.2	24.0%
3	RILEY,27-402	88.3	69.8%
4	RILEY,685	86.2	21.8%
5	RILEY,686	85.9	34.6%
6	SOTO CANO,B0097-B0099	89.0	30.5%
7	SOTO CANO,L2-N64	86.0	23.5%
8	SOTO CANO,P01-P12	91.0	26.6%
9	STEWART,H328	90.9	34.1%
10	WSMR,504	89.7	59.1%

Award Eligibility by Type of Award

Installation Crystal Award Eligibility:

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

Building Awards Eligibility

To be award eligible a Building 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%.

Addendum A

The Survey Process: CEL worked with the Army to set up the survey process and obtain information on each Building 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 **93,725** surveys to tenants living in Army Unaccompanied Housing. There were a total of **785** Buildings within **46** Installations.
- ♦ **Population:** The survey was distributed to **one tenant per bed** 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. **Each email 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. **Tenants also had the option of using their DODID if provided and matched eMH.** 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 Building to ensure each currently occupied room/bed 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 Army UH Overall, Directorate, Installation, or single Building 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 Unaccompanied Housing, OCONUS, CONUS, Directorate, and Installation, as well as for each Individual Building 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 Building level within an Installation/Building.