



CEL & Associates, Inc.

Real Estate Strategies, Benchmarking & Performance Solutions

2019 SUMMARY OF NAVY PPV HOUSING
“OUT OF CYCLE” SURVEY
FOR
COMMANDER NAVY INSTALLATIONS COMMAND

Prepared by: CEL & Associates, Inc.

Prepared: June 2019



Introduction

Commander Navy Installations Command (“CNIC”) engaged CEL & Associates, Inc. (“CEL”) to conduct a Resident “Out of Cycle” Satisfaction and Opinion Survey of Family Housing (“FH”) and Unaccompanied Housing (“UH”) residents living in Navy privatized (“PPV”) housing. The survey was conducted at 42 Installations⁽¹⁾ within 12 projects between April and May of 2019.

This Summary is a high-level overview of results.

The complete REACT Methodology and Scope have been added as Addendum A and B.

A. Initial Observations

Initial observations are being provided at the beginning of this summary with references to the pages that include detailed information.

The results of the 2019 Navy PPV “Out of Cycle” resident survey project indicate a decline in scores for most locations compared to the most recent prior surveys.

1. Family Housing Scores for the 2019 Navy PPV Out of Cycle Survey are Overall (70.1), Property (68.3) and Service (71.0). *Reference page 3.*
2. Of the 42 Installations, 59.5% (25) rated in the Outstanding, Good to Average range (100.0 thru 75.0), 28.6% (12) rated Below Average (69.9 thru 65.0) and 11.9% (5) rated Poor/Very Poor (64.9 thru 55.0). *Reference page 5.*
3. In part, the score decline may be attributed to a downward trend of resident sentiment and heightened expectations based on awareness of current events. Many resident comments indicated an awareness of the recent Senate Hearings, news articles, concern about PPV profits and cited sympathy for other residents experiencing significant Health and Safety issues. *Reference page 6.*
4. The comment analysis of most frequent topics included Outstanding Issues 31.7%, Suggestions 12.0%, Value for BAH 9.7% and Management Company- Positive 8.0%. *Reference page 10.*
5. 39.0% of residents surveyed indicate they were not aware the Navy Housing Service Center is their advocate for all housing including PPV. *Reference page 12.*
6. 67.4% of residents surveyed like having HSC and PPV leasing offices co-located or have no preference. *Reference page 12.*
7. 78.2% of residents indicated they did not feel pressured to provide higher ratings, while 6.0% selected Yes, they felt pressured. *Reference page 12.*
8. Navy PPV Partners achieved 14 Platinum Neighborhood Awards, 15 A List Awards and 9 Installations achieved a Crystal Award. *Reference page 15.*
9. Recommendations are provided on page 16. *Reference pages 16 and 17.*

Note (1): NCR Flagg/JBAB/Thurmont is non-Installation affiliated. It is included as an Installation for the purposes of this analysis only, thus the installation count is 42 instead of 41.

B. Overall Family Housing Results

1. Response Rates:

The response rate for the Navy PPV FH survey of 24.0% is considered in the average range for multifamily housing and a reflection of the resident opinion. The response rates for the Unaccompanied projects of 8.8% is not statistically valid, but it is suggestive of the resident opinions. Historically, response rates have averaged around 35% for the same population. The lower response rates may be attributed to a difference in how the survey was publicized and/or lack of promotion. A response rate of 24% however is reflective of a majority of the residents' opinions.

Response Rate Data FH

# of Projects	10
# of Installations	42
Surveys Distributed	35,125
Surveys Received	8,416
Response Rate	24.0%

A minimum response rate goal of 20% was set for each Installation as well as each neighborhood within an Installation. All but one installation achieved this goal.

2. Overall Satisfaction Index Results for FH:

The Overall Score (70.1) and Service Score (71.0) for Navy Family PPV is within the CEL rating of the low range of "Average" (70.0 to 74.9). The Property Score (68.3) is within the range of "Below Average".

3. Overall Satisfaction Results by Project:

Overall satisfaction scores ranged from a high of 78.6 (Kingsville) to a low of 63.4 (Northwest).

Project	Overall	Property	Service	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.
Navy PPV Overall FH	70.1	68.3	71.0	35,125	8,416	24.0%
HAWAII (Hunt)	68.2	66.6	68.4	4,229	936	22.1%
KINGSVILLE II (Hunt)	78.6	74.1	82.5	141	25	17.7%
MASD (Lincoln)	77.9	78.1	77.7	239	79	33.1%
MID-ATLANTIC (Lincoln)	64.9	64.2	64.6	5,274	1,318	25.0%
MIDWEST (Hunt)	66.2	63.9	67.7	1,646	463	28.1%
NEW ORLEANS (Patrician)	75.3	74.2	76.2	888	230	25.9%
NORTHEAST (BBC)	71.9	68.9	73.2	3,050	830	27.2%
NORTHWEST (Hunt)	63.4	63.8	63.3	3,268	721	22.1%
SDFH (Lincoln)	74.9	71.9	76.9	11,832	2,458	20.8%
SOUTHEAST (BBC)	70.1	69.0	70.7	4,558	1,356	29.7%
Navy PPV Overall UH	74.9	75.3	73.6	5,091	449	8.8%
HRUH UH (ACC)	68.8	69.6	66.5	2,730	295	10.8%
SDUH UH (Clark)	86.7	86.2	87.5	2,361	154	6.5%

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

Sores are not a percentile. 1-100 scoring range. Converted to 5-point range example 70 = 3.5



4. Results by Overall and Project by Business Success Factor:

CEL has developed a proprietary scoring system for purposes of assessing Resident opinions. Residents respond to each survey question using a five-point Likert scale. Aggregated answers are then grouped into three overall categories termed Satisfaction Indexes [Overall (“O”), Property (“P”) and Service (“S”) and into nine sub-categories termed Business Success Factors.

A review of the Business Success Factors (BSFs) indicates areas of strength and areas of opportunity. BSF #9 Renewal Intention is the lowest scoring for all projects and contains prompts such as “I would recommend this community to others”.

Highest Rated BSF is #5 Leasing.
Lowest rated BSF is #9 Renewal Intention, which contains prompts such as “I would recommend this community to others”.

Portfolio Name	Satisfaction Scores			Business Success Factors								
	O	P	S	SF 1	SF 2	SF 3	SF 4	SF 5	SF 6	SF 7	SF 8	SF 9
PPV Overall FH	70.1	68.3	71.0	71.6	67.0	70.4	68.0	79.1	75.9	67.1	69.3	61.0
HAWAII	68.2	66.6	68.4	68.5	64.0	70.1	66.2	77.1	72.6	64.6	67.7	62.5
KINGSVILLE II	78.6	74.1	82.5	85.0	81.1	75.8	79.1	84.8	85.3	73.2	80.2	67.8
MASD	77.9	78.1	77.7	80.2	72.4	79.7	77.6	85.4	80.5	77.2	76.7	67.2
MID-ATLANTIC	64.9	64.2	64.6	65.2	59.5	66.0	63.0	76.3	68.5	63.1	63.8	55.1
MIDWEST	66.2	63.9	67.7	67.1	62.8	59.0	64.8	75.2	74.7	66.7	64.9	55.2
NEW ORLEANS	75.3	74.2	76.2	77.6	72.8	76.2	72.1	82.4	80.9	73.0	74.3	65.9
NORTHEAST	71.9	68.9	73.2	74.1	69.4	68.9	71.0	83.2	77.1	68.9	71.9	62.7
NORTHWEST	63.4	63.8	63.3	62.6	58.1	66.1	56.9	72.3	72.4	62.5	60.3	50.9
SDFH	74.9	71.9	76.9	77.8	73.9	77.0	73.2	82.3	81.9	68.9	74.8	67.2
SOUTHEAST	70.1	69.0	70.7	71.6	66.8	68.4	68.4	79.0	75.0	69.3	69.1	59.3
PPV Overall UH	74.9	75.3	73.6	75.1	70.4	75.5	74.3	80.5	72.8	75.1	75.0	70.7
HOMEPORT HAMPTON ROADS	68.8	69.6	66.5	68.3	62.0	69.3	67.7	76.7	65.6	69.9	68.3	64.1
PACIFIC BEACON	86.7	86.2	87.5	88.5	86.4	87.4	87.0	87.8	87.0	84.6	88.1	83.4

The highlighted cells represent the high, low and median score range. Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

Note: O = Overall Score, P = Property Score and S = Service Score.

Business Success Factors	
1 - Readiness to Solve Problems	6- Quality of Maintenance
2- Responsiveness & Follow-Through	7 - Property Rating
3 - Property Appearance and Condition	8- Relationship Rating
4 - Quality of Management Services	9- Renewal Intention
5- Quality of Leasing	



5. Scores and Rating by Installation sorted by Overall Score:

Of the 42 Installations, 59.5% (25) rated in the Outstanding, Good to Average range (100.0 thru 75.0), 28.6% (12) rated Below Average (69.9 thru 65.0) and 11.9% (5) rated Poor/Very Poor (64.9 thru 55.0).

Line	Partner	Installation Name	Overall	Property	Service	CEL Rating Scale Overall Score	Dist.	% Rec.
1	Lincoln	MECHANICSBURG	96.5	95.4	97.3	Outstanding	31	35.5%
2	Hunt	CRANE NSA	91.7	85.6	95.2	Outstanding	23	34.8%
3	Hunt	BARKING SANDS PMRF	89.1	85.7	90.7	Outstanding	47	27.7%
4	BBC	SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU	86.6	80.3	90.8	Outstanding	174	32.2%
5	Lincoln	FALLON NAS	86.4	80.9	89.9	Outstanding	136	24.3%
6	Lincoln	DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF	84.3	80.4	87.1	Very Good	172	32.6%
7	Lincoln	EL CENTRO NAF	83.6	81.6	85.0	Very Good	92	30.4%
8	Lincoln	CHINA LAKE NAWs	83.4	79.8	86.1	Very Good	179	29.1%
9	Lincoln	SEAL BEACH NWS	83.1	77.7	86.6	Very Good	184	23.9%
10	BBC	MITCHEL FIELD NY	79.9	74.3	83.7	Good	241	26.6%
11	BBC	LAKEHURST NAWC ACFTDIV	79.6	75.4	82.5	Good	97	41.2%
12	Hunt	KINGSVILLE NAS	78.6	74.1	82.5	Good	141	17.7%
13	BBC	EARLE NWS	78.3	78.0	79.0	Good	77	39.0%
14	Lincoln	NCR Flags/JBAB/Thurmont (MASD)	77.9	78.1	77.7	Good	79	33.1%
15	BBC	WHITING FIELD NAS	77.6	78.1	77.5	Good	266	32.3%
16	Lincoln	INDIAN HEAD NSASP-NSF	76.4	82.2	72.6	Good	123	29.3%
17	Lincoln	ANNAPOLIS NAVACAD	75.3	73.0	75.8	Good	273	38.5%
18	Patrician	NEW ORLEANS NC	75.3	74.2	76.2	Good	888	25.9%
19	Lincoln	SAN DIEGO NB	75.3	72.0	77.4	Good	8,593	20.3%
20	BBC	CHARLESTON NWS	75.2	73.1	76.7	Good	879	32.4%
21	BBC	NEWPORT NS	74.9	71.3	76.8	Average	634	30.9%
22	Hunt	MID-SOUTH NSA	74.1	68.5	77.6	Average	268	31.3%
23	BBC	FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	74.0	70.0	77.9	Average	79	29.1%
24	Lincoln	LEMOORE NAS	73.3	71.3	74.6	Average	1,497	18.2%
25	BBC	GULFPORT NCBC	71.3	74.1	68.2	Average	528	24.4%
26	Lincoln	VENTURA COUNTY NAVBASE	69.4	67.1	70.9	Below Average	1,151	24.7%
27	BBC	KEY WEST NAS	68.9	66.3	70.7	Below Average	631	30.7%
28	BBC	PENSACOLA NAS	68.0	66.5	68.5	Below Average	492	34.6%
29	Hunt	PEARL HARBOR NB	67.9	66.3	68.1	Below Average	4,182	22.1%
30	BBC	NEW LONDON NSB	67.8	66.2	67.5	Below Average	1,622	23.3%
31	BBC	KINGS BAY SUBASE	67.0	66.2	67.4	Below Average	386	29.3%
32	Hunt	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66.9	65.8	68.0	Below Average	1,459	20.1%
33	Lincoln	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	66.8	72.6	63.1	Below Average	714	31.7%
34	BBC	JACKSONVILLE NAS	66.6	67.9	64.7	Below Average	276	24.3%
35	BBC	MAYPORT NAVSTA	66.5	63.9	68.2	Below Average	824	28.3%
36	Hunt	EVERETT NS FH	66.0	71.6	62.5	Below Average	138	40.6%
37	BBC	MERIDIAN NAS	64.6	67.8	64.0	Below Average	151	25.8%
38	Hunt	GREAT LAKES NS	63.8	62.4	64.8	Poor	1,355	27.4%
39	BBC	PANAMA CITY NSA	62.3	62.9	62.5	Poor	46	37.0%
40	Lincoln	HAMPTON ROADS NB	61.1	58.8	61.4	Poor	3,960	22.3%
41	Hunt	KITSAP NB	60.1	60.9	59.4	Poor	1,668	22.2%
42	BBC	PORTSMOUTH NSY	58.5	53.9	61.5	Very Poor	205	32.2%

Note: NCR Flags/JBAB/Thurmont is non-Installation affiliated and included for the purposes of this analysis only. Washington Navy Yard and NW Executive Homes received only one survey each and are excluded from this analysis.

6. Current and Prior Scores by FH PPV Project:

Scores decreased for the three Satisfaction Indexes from 2018 to 2019 for all Navy FH PPV Projects. The average decline for the Overall Satisfaction Index was 11.6 points. The largest decrease was 15.9 points for Southeast and the smallest decrease was 7.5 points for Hawaii.

Current and Prior Scores by Project

Portfolio Name	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score		
	Current	Prior	Change	Current	Prior	Change	Current	Prior	Change
HAWAII (Hunt)	68.2	75.7	(7.5)	66.6	74.6	(8.0)	68.4	75.5	(7.1)
KINGSVILLE II (Hunt)	78.6	88.8	(10.2)	74.1	86.0	(11.9)	82.5	91.4	(8.9)
MASD (Lincoln)	77.9	89.1	(11.2)	78.1	88.1	(10.0)	77.7	89.5	(11.8)
MID-ATLANTIC (Lincoln)	64.9	78.7	(13.8)	64.2	77.6	(13.4)	64.6	79.5	(14.9)
MIDWEST (Hunt)	66.2	77.5	(11.3)	63.9	75.8	(11.9)	67.7	78.7	(11.0)
NEW ORLEANS (Patrician)	75.3	85.5	(10.2)	74.2	84.9	(10.7)	76.2	86.1	(9.9)
NORTHEAST (BBC)	71.9	84.5	(12.6)	68.9	82.7	(13.8)	73.2	85.1	(11.9)
NORTHWEST (Hunt)	63.4	74.7	(11.3)	63.8	74.0	(10.2)	63.3	74.9	(11.6)
SDFH (Lincoln)	74.9	86.6	(11.7)	71.9	84.1	(12.2)	76.9	88.5	(11.6)
SOUTHEAST (BBC)	70.1	86.0	(15.9)	69.0	84.8	(15.8)	70.7	86.6	(15.9)

Note: Current Scores below 70 (Below Avg or lower) are highlighted in Purple.

7. Score Decline:

In part, the score decline may be attributed to a downward trend of resident sentiment and heightened expectations based on awareness of current events. Many residents cited comments indicating awareness of the recent Senate Hearings, news articles, PPV profits, and cited sympathy for other residents experiencing significant Health and Safety issues.

Below are a few examples of comments received.

Resident Comment: East Coast:

- “The (Company Name Redacted) housing team here has hired new folks in the front office before there was a nation awareness”.

Resident Comments: Southeast Area:

- “I appreciate that our concerns seem to be brought to attention”.

Resident Comment: Southeast Area:

- “They put profits over people and knowingly rent out apartments in unsafe conditions”.



8. Current and Prior Scores by FH PPV Project for 5 years:

Between 2019 and 2018 all FH PPV Index scores decreased. A review of the Overall Scores for each PPV indicates that there is not a common trend in scoring changes prior to 2019. For example, between 2015 and 2018, SDFH Overall scores increased, although the scores dipped in 2017. Southeast Overall scores decreased between 2015 and 2018; however, there was a noted increase between 2017 and 2018.

	Project	Partner	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Overall Score	Hawaii	Hunt	68.2	75.7	73.1	81.1	78.6
	Kingsville II	Hunt	78.6	88.8	81.9	81.1	75.7
	MASD	Lincoln	77.9	89.1	91.5	91.0	89.7
	Mid-Atlantic	Lincoln	64.9	78.7	82.4	78.4	78.8
	Midwest	Hunt	66.2	77.5	76.8	79.1	78.5
	New Orleans	Patrician	75.3	85.5	80.9	82.9	86.1
	Northeast	BBC	71.9	84.5	86.2	87.0	86.8
	Northwest	Hunt	63.4	74.7	76.0	78.6	76.5
	SDFH	Lincoln	74.9	86.6	84.4	85.9	85.8
	Southeast	BBC	70.1	86.0	83.3	85.6	87.0
	Project	Partner	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Property Score	Hawaii	Hunt	66.6	74.6	72.4	79.9	77.4
	Kingsville II	Hunt	74.1	86.0	80.1	77.3	73.0
	MASD	Lincoln	78.1	88.1	91.3	91.7	90.8
	Mid-Atlantic	Lincoln	64.2	77.6	81.4	77.2	78.5
	Midwest	Hunt	63.9	75.8	75.9	78.3	78.4
	New Orleans	Patrician	74.2	84.9	81.1	82.3	85.1
	Northeast	BBC	68.9	82.7	84.5	85.3	84.9
	Northwest	Hunt	63.8	74.0	74.6	77.3	75.9
	SDFH	Lincoln	71.9	84.1	82.1	83.5	83.9
	Southeast	BBC	69.0	84.8	82.0	84.1	84.7
	Project	Partner	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Service Score	Hawaii	Hunt	68.4	75.5	72.9	81.5	79.0
	Kingsville II	Hunt	82.5	91.4	83.0	83.7	77.5
	MASD	Lincoln	77.7	89.5	91.7	91.2	88.7
	Mid-Atlantic	Lincoln	64.6	79.5	83.3	79.4	79.4
	Midwest	Hunt	67.7	78.7	76.9	79.8	78.7
	New Orleans	Patrician	76.2	86.1	81.6	83.3	87.0
	Northeast	BBC	73.2	85.1	87.1	88.0	87.7
	Northwest	Hunt	63.3	74.9	76.8	79.3	76.6
	SDFH	Lincoln	76.9	88.5	86.2	87.6	87.7
	Southeast	BBC	70.7	86.6	84.0	86.5	88.5

The highlighted cells represent the high, low and median score range. Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

9. Current and Prior Scores by Installation:

Current and Prior Scores by Installation have been sorted by Project and summarized for comparison.

Installation - Project		Overall			Property			Service		
Project	Installation	2019	2018	Var.	2019	2018	Var.	2019	2018	Var.
HAWAII	BARKING SANDS PMRF	89.1	90.2	(1.1)	85.7	86.4	(0.7)	90.7	93.0	(2.3)
HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR NB	67.9	75.4	(7.5)	66.3	74.4	(8.1)	68.1	75.1	(7.0)
KINGSVILLE II	KINGSVILLE NAS	78.6	88.8	(10.2)	74.1	86.0	(11.9)	82.5	91.4	(8.9)
MASD	NCR Flags/JBAB/Thurmont	77.9	89.1	(11.2)	78.1	88.1	(10.0)	77.7	89.5	(11.8)
MID-ATLANTIC	ANNAPOLIS NAVACAD	75.3	83.0	(7.7)	73.0	81.8	(8.8)	75.8	83.7	(7.9)
MID-ATLANTIC	DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF	84.3	90.8	(6.5)	80.4	88.8	(8.4)	87.1	92.5	(5.4)
MID-ATLANTIC	HAMPTON ROADS NB	61.1	77.1	(16.0)	58.8	75.3	(16.5)	61.4	78.3	(16.9)
MID-ATLANTIC	INDIAN HEAD NSASP-NSF	76.4	80.6	(4.2)	82.2	84.7	(2.5)	72.6	77.4	(4.8)
MID-ATLANTIC	MECHANICSBURG	96.5	96.7	(0.2)	95.4	95.7	(0.3)	97.3	97.7	(0.4)
MID-ATLANTIC	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	66.8	79.7	(12.9)	72.6	81.7	(9.1)	63.1	78.8	(15.7)
MIDWEST	CRANE NSA	91.7	95.4	(3.7)	85.6	92.4	(6.8)	95.2	97.4	(2.2)
MIDWEST	GREAT LAKES NS	63.8	74.3	(10.5)	62.4	73.5	(11.1)	64.8	74.9	(10.1)
MIDWEST	MID-SOUTH NSA	74.1	86.7	(12.6)	68.5	82.0	(13.5)	77.6	90.2	(12.6)
NEW ORLEANS	NEW ORLEANS NC	75.3	85.5	(10.2)	74.2	84.9	(10.7)	76.2	86.1	(9.9)
NORTHEAST	EARLE NWS	78.3	83.1	(4.8)	78.0	84.8	(6.8)	79.0	81.9	(2.9)
NORTHEAST	LAKEHURST NAWC ACFTDIV	79.6	87.4	(7.8)	75.4	83.3	(7.9)	82.5	89.9	(7.4)
NORTHEAST	MITCHEL FIELD NY	79.9	88.0	(8.1)	74.3	84.6	(10.3)	83.7	90.2	(6.5)
NORTHEAST	NEW LONDON NSB	67.8	84.9	(17.1)	66.2	83.5	(17.3)	67.5	85.2	(17.7)
NORTHEAST	NEWPORT NS	74.9	80.8	(5.9)	71.3	79.7	(8.4)	76.8	80.5	(3.7)
NORTHEAST	PORTSMOUTH NSY	58.5	78.7	(20.2)	53.9	75.1	(21.2)	61.5	81.8	(20.3)
NORTHEAST	SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU	86.6	94.1	(7.5)	80.3	90.8	(10.5)	90.8	96.2	(5.4)
NORTHWEST	EVERETT NS	66.0	80.4	(14.4)	71.6	83.0	(11.4)	62.5	78.9	(16.4)
NORTHWEST	KITSAP NB	60.1	70.1	(10.0)	60.9	70.1	(9.2)	59.4	69.5	(10.1)
NORTHWEST	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	66.9	79.8	(12.9)	65.8	77.8	(12.0)	68.0	81.4	(13.4)
SDFH	CHINA LAKE NAWs	83.4	90.8	(7.4)	79.8	87.6	(7.8)	86.1	92.9	(6.8)
SDFH	EL CENTRO NAF	83.6	91.7	(8.1)	81.6	88.7	(7.1)	85.0	93.8	(8.8)
SDFH	FALLON NAS	86.4	93.7	(7.3)	80.9	90.0	(9.1)	89.9	96.0	(6.1)
SDFH	LEMOORE NAS	73.3	84.9	(11.6)	71.3	82.9	(11.6)	74.6	86.0	(11.4)
SDFH	SAN DIEGO NB	75.3	86.7	(11.4)	72.0	84.2	(12.2)	77.4	88.6	(11.2)
SDFH	SEAL BEACH NWS	83.1	89.0	(5.9)	77.7	87.2	(9.5)	86.6	90.8	(4.2)
SDFH	VENTURA COUNTY NAVBASE	69.4	85.2	(15.8)	67.1	81.8	(14.7)	70.9	87.5	(16.6)
SOUTHEAST	CHARLESTON NWS	75.2	87.0	(11.8)	73.1	85.0	(11.9)	76.7	88.3	(11.6)
SOUTHEAST	FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	74.0	91.4	(17.4)	70.0	88.5	(18.5)	77.9	93.8	(15.9)
SOUTHEAST	GULFPORT NCBC	71.3	92.1	(20.8)	74.1	93.0	(18.9)	68.2	90.0	(21.8)
SOUTHEAST	JACKSONVILLE NAS	66.6	88.3	(21.7)	67.9	86.8	(18.9)	64.7	89.1	(24.4)
SOUTHEAST	KEY WEST NAS	68.9	81.5	(12.6)	66.3	80.1	(13.8)	70.7	82.7	(12.0)
SOUTHEAST	KINGS BAY SUBASE	67.0	83.0	(16.0)	66.2	82.0	(15.8)	67.4	83.5	(16.1)
SOUTHEAST	MAYPORT NAVSTA	66.5	82.9	(16.4)	63.9	80.2	(16.3)	68.2	85.3	(17.1)
SOUTHEAST	MERIDIAN NAS	64.6	82.3	(17.7)	67.8	83.6	(15.8)	64.0	82.0	(18.0)
SOUTHEAST	PANAMA CITY NSA	62.3	91.2	(28.9)	62.9	90.9	(28.0)	62.5	91.5	(29.0)
SOUTHEAST	PENSACOLA NAS	68.0	84.0	(16.0)	66.5	82.4	(15.9)	68.5	84.6	(16.1)
SOUTHEAST	WHITING FIELD NAS	77.6	89.2	(11.6)	78.1	90.0	(11.9)	77.5	88.2	(10.7)

Note: NCR Flags/JBAB/Thurmont is non-Installation affiliated and included for the purposes of this analysis only. Washington Navy Yard and NW Executive Homes received only one survey each and are excluded from this analysis.



10. Select Questions for Navy PPV Overall FH Results:

The following questions were selected as areas indicative of Overall Resident Satisfaction. As an example, the responses to question 2j) Overall level and quality of service you are receiving, indicates 55% of respondents were “Very Satisfied” or “Somewhat Satisfied”, 15% “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied” and 29% “Somewhat Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”. More residents would recommend their community (52%) than would not (28%) based on the response to Question 7c.

See Exhibit A for Results by Project

2j. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving.

CEL Score 68.3 or 3.4	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	2,417	2,173	1,301	1,295	1,138	92	8,416
	29%	26%	15%	15%	14%	1%	100%
	4,590		1,301	2,433		92	
	55%		15%	29%		1%	
	% Satisfied		Neutral	% Dissatisfied		No Opinion	

3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel.

CEL Score 77.8 or 3.9	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	3,630	2,444	705	846	710	81	8,416
	43%	29%	8%	10%	8%	1%	99%
	6,074		705	1,556		81	
	72%		8%	18%		1%	
	% Satisfied		Neutral	% Dissatisfied		No Opinion	

5a. Overall condition of your home.

CEL Score 66.1 or 3.3	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	1,849	2,752	941	1,814	1,034	26	8,416
	22%	33%	11%	22%	12%	0%	100%
	4,601		941	2,848		26	
	55%		11%	34%		0%	
	% Satisfied		Neutral	% Dissatisfied		No Opinion	

7c. I would recommend this community to others.

CEL Score 66.6 or 3.3	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	1,921	2,422	1,667	1,075	1,231	100	8,416
	23%	29%	20%	13%	15%	1%	100%
	4,343		1,667	2,306		100	
	52%		20%	28%		1%	
	% Agreed		Neutral	% Disagreed		No Opinion	



11a. FH Comment Analysis Overall:

The resident comments were analyzed for frequency of response. Items were color coded in red font for a negative comment and blue for positive. Since all residents completing a survey had an opportunity to make comments the frequency of response was based on the total number of FH surveys completed (8,416).

Each resident who provided comments may have commented on more than one topic. Each topic listed below was mentioned more than 200 times.

The results of the survey question “Do you have any unresolved issues management is aware of but has not been resolved” was added in as a comment topic as Outstanding Issues. This is also the highest frequency of response item with 2,669 (31.7%) mentions. Resident suggestions such as “It would be nice to have a pool” were categorized as Suggestions. This was the second highest frequency category with 1,062 (12.0 %) mentions. Value for BAH was mentioned 864 times (9.7%). Items mentioned under 3% are listed on the next page.

Top Frequency of topics included Outstanding Issue 31.7%, Suggestions 12.0%, Value for BAH 9.7% and Management Company Positive (8.0%)

Category	OVERALL	%
Outstanding Issues	2,669	31.7%
Suggestions	1,062	12.0%
Value for BAH	864	9.7%
Management Company - Positive	711	8.0%
Staff Positive	677	7.6%
Home - Positive	564	6.4%
Overall Condition - Interior	503	5.7%
Landscaping - Outside Home	461	5.2%
Base - Positive	411	4.6%
Security - Theft	393	4.4%
Management - Communication	385	4.3%
Management - Unspecified	370	4.2%
Appliances	359	4.0%
Maintenance - Quality of Work	347	3.9%
Maintenance - Response Time	329	3.7%
Management Company - Negative	324	3.7%
Pest Control (Nuisance) Non-Rodent	323	3.6%
Move in Condition	281	3.2%

11b. FH Comment Analysis Overall Cont.

Items mentioned with a frequency of less than 3.0% listed below.

Category	OVERALL	%
Open Work Order	254	2.9%
Manager/Management - Positive	251	2.8%
Litter Control - Community	234	2.6%
Playground - Needs Updated/Repairs	225	2.5%
# of Parking Spaces	219	2.5%
Street Light Outages	210	2.4%
Roads	207	2.3%
Health & Safety Other	192	2.2%
Carpet Old/Worn/Won't Replace	166	1.9%
Overall Home Condition - Exterior	161	1.8%
Parking Enforcement - Resident	142	1.6%
Landscaping - Neighborhood	139	1.6%
Mold - Interior – not specified	127	1.4%
Move Out Fees	127	1.4%
Pets - Policy Unrelated to Breed	123	1.4%
Pest or Pet Feces	120	1.4%
Speeding	115	1.3%
Security - Break ins	109	1.2%
Fees or Expenses - Other	103	1.2%
Security - Not Specified	102	1.2%
Manager/Management Negative	92	1.0%
Leasing - Negative	91	1.0%
No AC	91	1.0%
RECP - Not Specified	90	1.0%
Home or Bedrooms - Small	89	1.0%
Maintenance - Negative	87	1.0%
Lack of Follow-up – Maintenance	81	0.9%
Assignment - Housing Choices	79	0.9%

Category	OVERALL	%
Lawn Maintenance- Enforce	71	0.8%
Parking - Visitor	66	0.7%
Staff - Not Specified	65	0.7%
RECP - Unfair Groupings	63	0.7%
# of Visitor Spaces	61	0.7%
RECP - Other Billing Issues	58	0.7%
Mold interior reported but not remedied	56	0.6%
Noise - Neighbors	55	0.6%
Paint - Interior	55	0.6%
Trash Dumpsters - Dirty/overflow	54	0.6%
Staff - Not Specified - Negative	51	0.6%
RECP - Home Not Energy Efficient	51	0.6%
Follow-up - Management	46	0.5%
Pool - Negative	45	0.5%
Leasing - Positive	42	0.5%
Children - Enforce rules	40	0.5%
Assignment - Size for Family	39	0.4%
Assignment - Rank Issue	31	0.3%
Water Quality – Poor	24	0.3%
Mold - Already Abated	22	0.2%
Mold – Exterior – not specified	22	0.2%
Fitness Center - Repair	18	0.2%
Security Gates - Not working	18	0.2%
Pets - Breed Control	16	0.2%
Lead-Based paint	15	0.2%
Smoking - enforce or create rules	13	0.1%
Unauthorized Entry - Maintenance	12	0.1%



C. FH Supplemental Question Results for Q10, Q11 and Q12

The following questions were asked to assess how well residents understand the role of the Housing Office, preferences regarding co-located Housing Offices, and if residents believe there was pressure to give high scores in previously conducted surveys.

10) Are you aware that the Navy Housing Service Center is your advocate for on and off Installation housing including Privatized Housing?					
Yes		No		Don't Know, No Answer	
Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
3,764	44.7%	3,281	39.0%	1371	16.0%

39.0% of residents surveyed indicated they were not aware the Navy Housing Service Center is their advocate for all housing including PPV.

11) Please tell us your preference in regard to the Navy Housing Center office being co-located with the PPV partner community leasing office.		
I like having the HSC and PPV leasing offices co-located	2,441	29.0%
I would prefer the HSC and PPV leasing offices to be separate	1,077	12.8%
I do not have a preference regarding co-location	3,235	38.4%
Don't Know, or Not Applicable	1,640	19.5%
No Answer	23	0.3%
Total	8,416	100%

67.4% of residents surveyed like having HSC and PPV leasing offices co-located or have no preference.

12) When completing previous surveys regarding your satisfaction with privatized housing, were you directly pressured to give higher ratings?					
Yes		No		Don't Know, No Answer	
Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
536	6.0%	6,929	78.2%	1,400	15.8%

78.2% of residents indicated they did not feel pressured to provide higher ratings, while 6.0% selected Yes, they felt pressured.

For Q12 (pressure on previous surveys) results were similar among all projects. A review of the resident comments of those selecting "Yes, I felt pressured" indicate the following:

- Several residents confused the CEL annual survey with other surveys conducted by the PPV's that are not confidential. These are point in time surveys sent out after an interaction such as Move In or maintenance.
- Several residents believe the "Strive for 5" campaigns are a form of pressure. It should be noted that many industries including banking, telecom, medical, hotels, etc. use similar techniques.



1A. Supplemental Questions by Project Q10 and Q11:

Results for Q10 (HSC as advocate) were reviewed to determine if any Project score was substantially variant from the Overall results. Although results were similar, additional education at all Project sites is recommended. Locations where “lack of awareness” was above 40% and projects with large populations would be the highest priority for this additional education.

10) Are you aware that the Navy Housing Service Center is your advocate for on and off Installation housing including Privatized Housing?						
Project	Yes		No		Don't Know, No Opinion, or No Answer	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Overall	3,764	44.7%	3,281	39.0%	1,371	16.0%
HAWAII	406	43.4%	388	41.5%	142	15.2%
KINGSVILLE II	14	56.0%	2	8.0%	9	36.0%
MASD	42	53.2%	22	27.8%	15	19.0%
MID-ATLANTIC	594	45.1%	524	39.8%	200	15.2%
MIDWEST	169	36.5%	204	44.1%	90	19.4%
NEW ORLEANS	128	55.7%	57	24.8%	45	19.6%
NORTHEAST	407	49.0%	246	29.6%	177	21.3%
NORTHWEST	358	49.7%	266	36.9%	97	13.5%
SDFH	1053	42.8%	1018	41.4%	387	15.7%
SOUTHEAST	593	43.7%	554	40.9%	209	15.4%

11) Please tell us your preference in regard to the Navy Housing Center office being co-located with the PPV partner community leasing office:								
Project	I like having the HSC and PPV leasing offices co-located		I would prefer the HSC and PPV leasing offices to be separate		I do not have a preference regarding office co-location		Don't Know, Not Applicable, or No Answer	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Overall	2,441	29.0%	1,077	12.8%	3,235	38.4%	1,663	19.8%
HAWAII	334	35.7%	90	9.6%	384	41.0%	128	13.7%
KINGSVILLE II	1	4.0%	4	16.0%	12	48.0%	8	32.0%
MASD	19	24.1%	8	10.1%	30	38.0%	22	27.8%
MID-ATLANTIC	364	27.6%	191	14.5%	485	36.8%	278	21.1%
MIDWEST	130	28.1%	76	16.4%	160	34.6%	97	21.0%
NEW ORLEANS	65	28.3%	35	15.2%	94	40.9%	36	15.7%
NORTHEAST	207	24.9%	102	12.3%	300	36.1%	221	26.6%
NORTHWEST	184	25.5%	109	15.1%	301	41.7%	127	17.6%
SDFH	723	29.4%	263	10.7%	960	39.1%	512	20.8%
SOUTHEAST	414	30.5%	199	14.7%	509	37.5%	234	17.3%

1B. Supplemental Questions by Project Q12:

This question is regarding whether a resident felt pressured to provide higher ratings in previous surveys. Overall, 6% of the total respondents indicated pressure for positive ratings. Five of the projects had 7% or more of respondents answer that they had been pressured.

Results by Project indicate the majority of residents did not feel pressured to provide higher ratings on past surveys.

This initial question has a response choice of (Yes/No/ Don't Know, No Opinion or No Answer) with a comment section provided for respondents choosing "Yes". While there were a few isolated comments such as "I was paid to give a higher response" or "We were told we would get better prizes if we rated a 5", there were not enough comments to support these claims.

A further review of the comments indicates similar reasoning for the "Yes" responses which are "Confusing CEL survey with other surveys that are not confidential" and "Strive for 5" campaigns.

It is suggested that the full comments be reviewed for any location where additional information is warranted.

12) When completing previous surveys regarding your satisfaction with privatized housing, were you directly pressured to give higher ratings?						
Project	Yes		No		Don't Know, No Opinion, or No Answer	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Overall PPV	536	6.0%	6,929	78.2%	1,400	15.8%
HAWAII	36	3.8%	763	81.5%	137	14.6%
KINGSVILLE II	0	0.0%	19	76.0%	6	24.0%
MASD	6	7.6%	60	75.9%	13	16.5%
MID-ATLANTIC	106	8.0%	1013	76.9%	199	15.1%
MIDWEST	19	4.1%	372	80.3%	72	15.6%
NEW ORLEANS	8	3.5%	188	81.7%	34	14.8%
NORTHEAST	60	7.2%	609	73.4%	161	19.4%
NORTHWEST	54	7.5%	562	77.9%	105	14.6%
SDFH	130	5.3%	1964	79.9%	364	14.8%
SOUTHEAST	112	8.3%	1014	74.8%	230	17.0%

D. FH Awards

Awards for Service Excellence: All Navy FH locations surveyed participated in the CEL National Award Program for Service Excellence. This award recognizes those private sector and military housing locations and/or Installations/Firms that provide an excellent level of service to residents.

To be award eligible, neighborhood/Installation must meet Service Index score and Response Rate criteria as follows:

- **Platinum Award:** Neighborhood - Service Satisfaction Score of at least 93.1 (varies annually), and a Response Rate of at least 20%.
- **A List Award:** Neighborhood - Service Satisfaction Score of at least 85.0, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.
- **Crystal Award:** Installation - Must have multiple neighborhoods with a consolidated score of at least 85.0, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.

- ◆ 14 Platinum Awards
- ◆ 15 A List Awards
- ◆ 9 Crystal Awards by Installation

Neighborhood Awards - Navy PPV FH has 14 Platinum Award winners and 15 A List Award winners, for a total of 29 Award winners of 243 neighborhoods surveyed (11.9%).

Navy PPV Out of Cycle - Installations Level Crystal Awards

Line	Partner	Installation	Overall	Property	Service	Dist.	% Rec.
1	Lincoln	MECHANICSBURG	96.5	95.4	97.3	31	35.5%
2	Hunt	CRANE NSA	91.7	85.6	95.2	23	34.8%
3	Hunt	BARKING SANDS PMRF	89.1	85.7	90.7	47	27.7%
4	BBC	SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU	86.6	80.3	90.8	174	32.2%
5	Lincoln	FALLON NAS	86.4	80.9	89.9	136	24.3%
6	Lincoln	DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF	84.3	80.4	87.1	172	32.6%
7	Lincoln	EL CENTRO NAF	83.6	81.6	85.0	92	30.4%
8	Lincoln	CHINA LAKE NAWS	83.4	79.8	86.1	179	29.1%
9	Lincoln	SEAL BEACH NWS	83.1	77.7	86.6	184	23.9%



E. Recommendations

Due to recent events, such as increased media reporting on privatized military housing and the related Senate Hearings, the Privatized Partners and each Service Branch should escalate efforts to increase resident outreach through education, communication, staff training, addition of new programs, and improved business processes and procedures. CEL suggests the following:

1. **Continue with Resolution of Current Issues:** Continue the process of working with the Projects/PPVs to:
 - Determine and resolve top resident concerns; and
 - Evaluate and correct all Health and Safety Issues.
2. **Determine Health and Safety Processes Going Forward:** CNIC should re-examine how Health and Safety issues should be documented and addressed going forward, including the level of involvement CNIC should have in this process. (Please note that CEL surveys are confidential and not designed to isolate an issue within a specific home). The CEL survey results are an indicator of overall resident satisfaction in a variety of areas that impact the success of a Project. The concerns identified by the CEL Survey are often areas that management otherwise has no ability to measure e.g. customer service provided, effectiveness of new initiatives, changes needed in staffing, effectiveness of vendors or business processes, residents likes or dislikes.)
3. **Establish Action Plan Process:** Determine how CNIC will work with PPVs on the creation and/or review of Action Plans, as well as the process for periodic follow-up to assess Action Plan completion and effectiveness. Some action items can be addressed immediately, while others may require a longer project effort including capital expenditures.
4. **Staff to Attend Action Plan Trainings:** Have a representative from each project/installation attend the Action Plan Training provided by CEL. The Action Plan Training will cover how to complete an Action Plan, as well as tips to correct deficiencies.
5. **Educate Residents with Communication:** Based on the survey results, there are areas that require additional resident education. Resident communication should encompass multiple and consistent methods of communication.

An issue will resurface if communication efforts are lacking or inconsistent. Some communication tools will be effective with some residents, but not with others, so all methods must be utilized consistently and frequently.

- a) **Value for BAH:** Due to the many resident complaints regarding BAH, residents should be educated as to how BAH was handled historically (prior to PPV) and how it is handled for military managed locations and why. The PPV staff should be educated on BAH and have written reference guides so they provide consistent and accurate information to residents.



- b) **Safety:** This is an area where there is a noted increase in resident complaints as observed through the survey comments. Residents need to be educated on how they can be a part of the safety process.
- Consider a crime watch program with possible use of “Block Captains”.
 - Conduct semi-annual training for residents by inviting a “Crime Prevention Officer” to speak and provide tips.
- c) **Create a Navy Housing Fact Sheet:** Create a Fact Sheet provided by the Navy for inclusion in all Move In packets, including a signed receipt from residents. The Fact Sheet should address Safety, value for BAH, processes for reporting different types of issues, RECP information and any additional information that is often misconstrued or re-directed to the wrong source. This Fact Sheet should also include how and when to contact the Housing Office and further reinforce to residents that the Housing Office is their advocate.

Exhibit A: FH Scores for Select Questions:

BBC (Northeast and Southeast)

NORTHEAST (BBC)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	59%	12%	27%	1%	490	103	227	10	70.9	85.2
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	73%	7%	19%	1%	608	61	154	7	78.6	85.7
5a. Overall condition of your home	53%	12%	35%	0%	436	99	292	3	64.9	
7c. I would recommend this community to others	52%	20%	26%	2%	434	167	215	14	67.7	84.2

SOUTHEAST (BBC)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	54%	16%	29%	1%	734	211	398	13	67.9	86.8
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	69%	9%	21%	1%	936	119	286	15	75.6	87.1
5a. Overall condition of your home	51%	10%	40%	0%	687	132	536	1	63.3	
7c. I would recommend this community to others	48%	20%	31%	1%	651	269	423	13	64.5	84.3

Hunt (Hawaii, Kingsville II, Midwest & Northwest)

Hawaii (Hunt)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	52%	18%	30%	1%	485	165	277	9	66.2	75.3
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	65%	9%	26%	1%	605	80	240	11	71.8	74.9
5a. Overall condition of your home	60%	11%	29%	0%	559	106	267	4	68.5	
7c. I would recommend this community to others	58%	23%	19%	1%	539	214	176	7	70.4	77.9

KINGSVILLE II (Hunt)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	60%	20%	8%	12%	15	5	2	3	79.1	91.5
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	88%	4%	4%	4%	22	1	1	1	91.7	97.1
5a. Overall condition of your home	72%	4%	20%	4%	18	1	5	1	75.0	N/A
7c. I would recommend this community to others	60%	16%	20%	4%	15	4	5	1	71.7	87.0



MIDWEST (Hunt)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	50%	16%	33%	1%	232	75	151	5	64.7	77.7
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	73%	7%	20%	1%	336	32	91	4	77.4	82.3
5a. Overall condition of your home	53%	14%	32%	1%	247	63	149	4	66.3	
7c. I would recommend this community to others	44%	18%	36%	2%	204	85	167	7	61.1	77.5

NORTHWEST (Hunt)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	40%	19%	40%	1%	289	138	285	9	59.2	72.7
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	63%	12%	23%	2%	454	83	166	18	72.4	79.1
5a. Overall condition of your home	45%	11%	44%	0%	326	80	314	1	59.9	
7c. I would recommend this community to others	37%	21%	40%	2%	270	155	285	11	57.5	71.4

Lincoln (MASD, Mid-Atlantic & San Diego)

MASD (Lincoln)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	67%	10%	23%	0%	53	8	18	0	74.9	89.7
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	80%	10%	10%	0%	63	8	8	0	84.1	89.0
5a. Overall condition of your home	66%	5%	27%	3%	52	4	21	2	72.5	N/A
7c. I would recommend this community to others	62%	10%	25%	3%	49	8	20	2	72.2	89.8

MID-ATLANTIC (Lincoln)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	44%	15%	39%	1%	579	204	518	17	61.3	79.0
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	62%	11%	27%	0%	821	140	353	4	71.2	84.7
5a. Overall condition of your home	46%	12%	42%	0%	605	157	550	6	60.9	N/A
7c. I would recommend this community to others	42%	20%	36%	2%	553	266	472	27	60.5	76.7



San Diego (Lincoln)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	64%	15%	21%	1%	1570	357	508	23	74.6	88.6
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	83%	7%	9%	1%	2047	166	225	20	85.6	93.7
5a. Overall condition of your home	62%	11%	26%	0%	1536	271	647	4	71.3	
7c. I would recommend this community to others	60%	19%	20%	1%	1486	459	495	18	72.0	85.3

Patrician (New Orleans)

NEW ORLEANS (Patrician)	Percent				Count				CEL Score	Prior Score
	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	5/4"s	3	2/1's	0	2019	2018
2J. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	62%	15%	21%	1%	143	35	49	3	73.5	86.3
3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	79%	7%	14%	0%	182	15	32	1	82.5	87.1
5a. Overall condition of your home	59%	12%	29%	0%	135	28	67	0	68.7	
7c. I would recommend this community to others	62%	17%	21%	0%	142	40	48	0	71.4	84.4



Addendum A

The Survey: The survey was developed by using a core set of questions provided by CEL. The “core” question set for the FH resident surveys is identical to all private sector and military residents surveyed. By utilizing a core set of questions, CEL can compare results of the Navy PPV Resident survey with other military and private sector housing results.

CNIC added supplemental, un-coded questions to the survey. The results derived from the supplemental questions were reported separately so as to not impact the overall scores, nor prevent a direct comparative analysis between all locations and service branches surveyed by CEL.

The Survey Process: CEL worked with CNIC and each PPV Partner to set up the survey process and to obtain information on each neighborhood to be surveyed within each Installation. The PPV Partners provided the email addresses which were compared to a Master Unit List of all homes and occupancy. All surveys were completed online and only CEL had access to the results of any individual survey.

- ◆ **Core set of questions used for comparison to private sector and military housing.**
- ◆ **The Navy PPV Out of Cycle survey was conducted online. Email invitations were sent to each home.**
- ◆ **The results derived from the supplemental questions were reported separately so as to not impact the overall scores.**

- ◆ **Distribution:** The survey was distributed to 35,125 residents living in Navy PPV Family Housing with 8,416 responding for a response rate of 24.0%. Additionally, 5,091 surveys distributed to UH residents with a response rate of 8.8%.
- ◆ **Population:** The survey was distributed to one resident per household living in Navy PPV Family and Unaccompanied at the time of the survey launch.
- ◆ **Online Survey:** A survey invitation was sent via email to all Residents with a valid email address. Each email included a unique link to the online survey. Up to three email Reminders were then sent out to non-respondents at seven-day intervals. CEL provided an email address that was publicized by CNIC for residents to request a survey in the event the email containing the survey link was not received or deleted. CEL verified the resident address provided and survey completion status for the address prior to sending a survey link to any home.
- ◆ **Quality Control:** The unique survey link was associated with a specific Resident address within a neighborhood to ensure each home only completed one survey, thus ensuring quality control and a consistent distribution methodology.

Addendum B

Analytics: For purposes of assessing Resident opinions, CEL has developed a proprietary scoring system. Residents 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 company, Directorate, Installation, or single neighborhood is performing.

The Overall Satisfaction Index includes scores from all coded questions. These question scores are included in each of the Business Success Factors. Questions pertaining to Quality of Leasing 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 Navy, Partner and Installation, as well as for each Individual Neighborhood within an Installation. Additional reporting included pre-populated Action Plan templates at both the Installation and Individual Neighborhood levels.

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

The CEL scoring methodology is a 1-100 calculated scoring and not a percentile or average. As an example, a 1-100 score can be divided by 20 to obtain a 5-point scale i.e. score of 70 can be divided by 20 to obtain a 5-point scale of 3.5.

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 direct comparison of all surveys conducted by CEL for purposes of comparative data and in-depth trending analysis.