



# 2025 Navy Tenant Satisfaction Survey: Executive Summary for Government- Owned/Leased Unaccompanied Housing (GOL-UH)

Prepared for Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC)



Prepared by Robert D. Niehaus, Inc. (RDN)  
6 June 2025



## Contents

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Overview.....	1
2. Survey Distribution and Execution .....	1
3. Scoring Methodology .....	2
4. Summary Results and Comparisons to Prior Survey .....	3
5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question .....	10
6. Comment Analysis.....	10
7. Discussion.....	15
8. Awards.....	16
9. Action Plans.....	17
10. Summary.....	18
11. Appendix: Survey Changes and Question Mapping .....	19

## Tables

Table 1. Rating Scale Levels .....	2
Table 2. Score Index Range Interpretation .....	3
Table 3. GOL-UH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Comparison to Previous Survey (1 of 3).....	4
Table 4. GOL-UH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey (1 of 3) .....	7
Table 5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question .....	10
Table 6. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation (1 of 2).....	11
Table 7. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation (1 of 2).....	13
Table 8. GOL-UH Installations: Crystal Award Winners .....	17
Table 9. GOL-UH Installations: Action Plan Required .....	17
Table 10. Legend for 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map.....	19
Table 11. 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map.....	19



## 1. Overview

The 2025 Navy Tenant Satisfaction Survey (TSS) for Government-Owned/Leased (GOL) Unaccompanied Housing (UH) was launched on 3 March 2025 and closed on 1 May 2025. All active-duty US Navy UH tenants were eligible to take the survey. While participation was expressly voluntary, all residents were encouraged to participate. A total of 7,766 responses were received from 64 installations, representing approximately 27.1 percent of the 28,692 surveys distributed.

Robert D. Niehaus, Inc. (RDN) was contracted to administer the survey and analyze the results on behalf of Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC). The following report provides an executive summary of the survey results for key metrics, including scores by “Satisfaction Index” and “Business Success Factor,” comparisons to last year, the highest/lowest scores for individual questions, and common themes expressed in respondents’ free-form comments.

## 2. Survey Distribution and Execution

CNIC provided RDN with a current snapshot of Navy GOL-UH inventory and resident information in mid-February 2025. This data included the address and contact information for each household. RDN cleaned and reconciled these data to match the set of Properties/Neighborhoods, Installations, and Regions used in prior surveys or as otherwise directed by CNIC. These data were then used as the basis for distributing surveys and calculating response rates and scores for each reporting level.

All eligible GOL-UH tenants with email addresses on file were sent personalized invitations to participate in the survey. Additionally, RDN crafted promotional posters, flyers, and videos for distribution and created a universal survey link for CNIC, Regional, and Installation-level housing management staff to share with residents who did not receive a personalized email invitation. Residents did not receive a survey invitation via email in cases where (1) the resident did not have an email on file or (2) the email provided “bounced,” i.e., the email address was invalid/inactive or the message was otherwise rejected by the tenant’s email server. The official count of “distributed surveys” includes only households that received a personalized survey invitation or otherwise submitted a provisional survey through the general survey website and were later verified as residents by CNIC.

RDN developed and hosted a dedicated web environment for the survey, featuring additional information pages, messages from command, and access to the general survey link. These materials and resources were utilized to promote and distribute the survey link through both physical and digital CNIC channels, ensuring that residents without a personal or work email on file could participate as well.

RDN sent weekly reminders by email to any residents who had not yet completed the survey. Each electronic invitation and reminder utilized a unique and anonymous code in the survey link to track response rates by location and ensure that no more than one response was counted per household. UH residents who instead used the general survey link to take the survey were prompted to submit their DOD ID to verify their eligibility and prevent duplicate responses. All respondents participated in the survey through a secure, web-based platform.



In addition to the open-response comment section, the 2025 TSS questionnaire consisted of 8 Likert-type rating scales containing a total of 30 items about different dimensions of tenant satisfaction, such as community appearance and maintenance services. Table 1 displays the five-point rating scales respondents used to indicate their level of Satisfaction or Agreement, depending on the survey item. Respondents also had the option for each question to select “Don’t Know, No Opinion, or Not Applicable,” in which case the response was not scored.

<b>Rating Level</b>	<b>Satisfaction Level</b>	<b>Agreement Level</b>
1	Very Dissatisfied	Strongly Disagree
2	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Disagree
3	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4	Somewhat Satisfied	Agree
5	Very Satisfied	Strongly Agree

The survey questionnaire concluded with an open-response comment section for residents to provide their thoughts and recommendations. All of the questions and text used within the questionnaire were developed and approved by the Deputy of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition & Sustainment (OUSD(A&S)), in accordance with the 16 November 2020 Memorandum, *Tenant Satisfaction Survey Policy for DoD Privatized, Owned, or Leased Housing*.

### 3. Scoring Methodology

The TSS results are summarized by Satisfaction Index for three major topics or categories: Property, Service, and Overall. The Property and Service scores both contribute to the Overall score, but there are also questions that only counted towards the Overall score. These Satisfaction Indexes are comprised of nine Business Success Factor (BSF) scores, which are in turn each comprised of one or more question-level scores. The Appendix to this report contains the mapping between the survey questions, BSF categories, and Satisfaction Indexes as approved by CNIC.

The question-level scores represent the average rating (1-5 scale) for all responses, which are multiplied by 20 to re-scale the scores to be out of 100 for ease of interpretation. The scores for each BSF and Satisfaction Index are similarly calculated as the average score over all responses to their component questions. Separate scores are calculated for each level of analysis (CNIC, Region, Installation, and Property/Complex). For example, when calculating the Overall Score for a specific property, we only use the responses from that property. When calculating the topic score for an entire installation, we use the responses for all GOL-UH properties at that installation.

The resulting question, BSF, and Satisfaction Index scores can be broadly categorized into different ranges and interpreted similar to a conventional letter-grading scale. Consistent with the previous (2023) TSS, these ranges are:



Table 2. Score Index Range Interpretation		
Range	Level	Explanation
100 - 85	Outstanding	Exceptional performance and tenant satisfaction
84 - 80	Very Good	Robust performance and tenant satisfaction
79 - 75	Good	Above average levels of satisfaction but with room for improvement
74 - 70	Average	Indicates mixed perceptions and unmet expectations
69 - 65	Below Average	Signifies inadequate performance in need of attention
64 - 60	Poor	Signifies low satisfaction that requires immediate attention
59 - 55	Very Poor	Conveys broad dissatisfaction below acceptable levels
Below 55	Crisis	Signals critical issues that demand urgent resolution

#### 4. Summary Results and Comparisons to Prior Survey

Table 3 presents summary results for the 2025 TSS for GOL-UH, including the number of residents, number of responses, response rates, and the Overall, Property, and Service Satisfaction Index scores by Region, Installation, and for CNIC as a whole. For comparison, Table 3 also includes the results for the previous TSS and the changes between the current and previous TSS, relative to the results of the previous survey. The Overall, Property, and Service Satisfaction Indexes represent broad categories of tenant satisfaction which can be subdivided into BSF categories. Table 4 supplements Table 3 with a breakdown of the Satisfaction Indexes by BSF, and their changes in score compared with the previous survey. Changes highlighted green or orange mark the largest increase or decrease for each score, respectively, across all installations.

It is important to note that the TSS questionnaire and mapping of questions to BSF and Satisfaction Indexes changed between 2023 and 2025. As a result, some scores may not be directly comparable. Please see the Appendix to this report for a summary of these changes. Besides the changes in the survey questions and scoring methodology, changes in the characteristics of the respondent population between the survey years may also impact the score and their comparability from year-to-year. Locations with few residents and thus few responses can be vulnerable to outliers and response biases. These caveats should be considered while evaluating changes over time.



**Table 3. GOL-UH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Comparison to Previous Survey (1 of 3)**

Area	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			FY25 Response Rate			FY23	Var
	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.
<b>OVERALL GOL-UH</b>	<b>80.4</b>	<b>80.5</b>	<b>(0.1)</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>79.2</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>	<b>82.0</b>	<b>81.6</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>28,692</b>	<b>7,766</b>	<b>27.1%</b>	<b>26.0%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>
<b>EURAFCENT</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>78.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>82.2</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1,925</b>	<b>713</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>36.5%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
BAHRAIN NSA	81.2	83.7	(2.5)	81.0	83.6	(2.6)	82.4	84.4	(2.0)	465	205	44.1%	47.6%	(3.5%)
DEVESELU NSF	86.7	74.2	12.5	85.4	75.7	9.7	87.3	74.4	12.9	81	48	59.3%	61.9%	(2.6%)
NAPLES NSA	74.8	74.8	0.0	74.5	76.4	(1.9)	75.1	73.8	1.3	190	68	35.8%	25.6%	10.2%
REDZIKOWO POLAND NSF	73.4	66.0	7.4	68.1	63.4	4.7	79.4	70.2	9.2	113	63	55.8%	35.9%	19.9%
ROTA NAVSTA	81.8	81.3	0.5	78.7	80.6	(1.9)	84.3	82.2	2.1	671	176	26.2%	16.9%	9.3%
SIGONELLA NAS	65.7	67.1	(1.4)	64.2	65.5	(1.3)	67.9	68.9	(1.0)	295	66	22.4%	36.1%	(13.7%)
SOUDA BAY NSA	90.7	82.1	8.6	88.0	81.1	6.9	92.9	84.3	8.6	110	87	79.1%	88.3%	(9.2%)
<b>GUAM</b>	<b>76.3</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>71.7</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>650</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>
GUAM NB	76.3	72.3	4.0	73.2	72.1	1.1	78.4	71.7	6.7	650	91	14.0%	4.6%	9.4%
<b>HAWAII</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>71.8</b>	<b>(4.2)</b>	<b>66.8</b>	<b>71.2</b>	<b>(4.4)</b>	<b>68.7</b>	<b>73.0</b>	<b>(4.3)</b>	<b>2,422</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>24.1%</b>	<b>(8.6%)</b>
BARKING SANDS PMRF	98.6	84.6	14.0	99.0	86.7	12.3	98.2	84.8	13.4	12	8	66.7%	63.6%	3.1%
PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM JB	66.9	71.7	(4.8)	66.1	71.0	(4.9)	67.9	72.9	(5.0)	2,410	368	15.3%	24.0%	(8.7%)
<b>JAPAN</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>77.0</b>	<b>(2.7)</b>	<b>72.4</b>	<b>75.1</b>	<b>(2.7)</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>(2.8)</b>	<b>3,724</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>16.5%</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
ATSUGI NAF	60.0	58.7	1.3	58.2	56.3	1.9	62.1	61.4	0.7	366	96	26.2%	11.4%	14.8%
DIEGO GARCIA NSF	80.5	79.4	1.1	75.6	76.3	(0.7)	83.8	81.1	2.7	293	83	28.3%	31.0%	(2.7%)
MISAWA NAF	84.3	86.4	(2.1)	79.7	81.0	(1.3)	89.5	91.7	(2.2)	17	9	52.9%	20.5%	32.4%
OKINAWA CFA	72.8	72.2	0.6	73.0	65.1	7.9	73.3	77.6	(4.3)	60	10	16.7%	20.8%	(4.1%)
SASEBO CFA	77.3	83.1	(5.8)	76.4	82.6	(6.2)	78.7	84.3	(5.6)	965	125	13.0%	21.3%	(8.3%)
SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	80.9	98.9	(18.0)	78.1	96.4	(18.3)	82.0	100.0	(18.0)	7	4	57.1%	16.7%	40.4%
YOKOSUKA CFA	75.5	69.1	6.4	74.0	68.5	5.5	76.6	70.5	6.1	2,016	288	14.3%	2.9%	11.4%

Note: Cells highlighted green/orange are the largest increases/decreases for each Satisfaction Index, respectively. Table continues on next page.



**Table 3. Continued (2 out of 3)**

Area	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			FY25 Response Rate			FY23	Var
	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.
<b>KOREA</b>	<b>93.2</b>	<b>98.1</b>	<b>(4.9)</b>	<b>91.2</b>	<b>96.8</b>	<b>(5.6)</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>99.3</b>	<b>(5.3)</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>54.3%</b>	<b>38.6%</b>	<b>15.7%</b>
CHINHAE CFA	93.2	98.1	(4.9)	91.2	96.8	(5.6)	94.0	99.3	(5.3)	46	25	54.3%	38.6%	15.7%
<b>MID-ATLANTIC</b>	<b>77.7</b>	<b>79.2</b>	<b>(1.5)</b>	<b>75.7</b>	<b>78.0</b>	<b>(2.3)</b>	<b>79.2</b>	<b>79.7</b>	<b>(0.5)</b>	<b>4,802</b>	<b>1,256</b>	<b>26.2%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>(5.1%)</b>
CHARLESTOWN NAVY YARD	94.4	91.1	3.3	91.7	90.8	0.9	95.6	90.7	4.9	6	6	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%
EARLE NWS	95.5	97.7	(2.2)	95.8	95.1	0.7	94.9	99.6	(4.7)	23	12	52.2%	29.2%	23.0%
GREAT LAKES NAVSTA	83.0	70.0	13.0	77.6	68.4	9.2	86.8	72.3	14.5	256	158	61.7%	27.6%	34.1%
LITTLE CREEK JEB	70.2	80.5	(10.3)	67.9	79.7	(11.8)	72.1	80.7	(8.6)	741	123	16.6%	35.0%	(18.4%)
NEW LONDON NSB	75.4	82.9	(7.5)	70.4	78.7	(8.3)	78.5	86.3	(7.8)	448	62	13.8%	20.5%	(6.7%)
NEWPORT NAVSTA	83.9	87.0	(3.1)	82.4	85.0	(2.6)	85.3	88.9	(3.6)	151	47	31.1%	24.2%	6.9%
NORFOLK NAVSTA	77.9	76.2	1.7	77.5	76.0	1.5	78.2	75.4	2.8	1,709	455	26.6%	33.9%	(7.3%)
NORFOLK NSY	70.9	69.2	1.7	70.4	64.0	6.4	72.4	74.3	(1.9)	181	37	20.4%	13.7%	6.7%
NORTHWEST ANNEX	90.4	93.2	(2.8)	90.7	93.7	(3.0)	90.4	92.2	(1.8)	28	9	32.1%	42.9%	(10.8%)
OCEANA NAS	62.1	77.9	(15.8)	59.7	77.1	(17.4)	63.7	78.2	(14.5)	723	118	16.3%	27.3%	(11.0%)
PORTSMOUTH NAVMEDCEN	74.1	90.9	(16.8)	74.5	89.5	(15.0)	75.3	92.8	(17.5)	313	91	29.1%	41.6%	(12.5%)
PORTSMOUTH NSY	81.9	76.6	5.3	78.0	70.9	7.1	83.8	81.3	2.5	19	15	78.9%	40.7%	38.2%
YORKTOWN NWS	90.4	91.3	(0.9)	87.2	88.2	(1.0)	92.6	93.7	(1.1)	204	123	60.3%	94.5%	(34.2%)
<b>NDW</b>	<b>84.8</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>(1.6)</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>(0.4)</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
ANNAPOLIS NSA	93.8	95.7	(1.9)	92.3	93.1	(0.8)	94.7	98.0	(3.3)	53	43	81.1%	43.5%	37.6%
BETHESDA NSA	72.8	77.3	(4.5)	73.9	79.3	(5.4)	73.1	76.9	(3.8)	229	85	37.1%	19.3%	17.8%
DAHLGREN NSF	81.4	82.7	(1.3)	75.4	79.8	(4.4)	86.0	84.6	1.4	107	46	43.0%	10.6%	32.4%
PATUXENT RIVER NAS	95.0	92.9	2.1	95.8	93.1	2.7	94.5	93.0	1.5	132	72	54.5%	30.5%	24.0%
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	<b>82.8</b>	<b>82.8</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>(0.6)</b>	<b>83.8</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>4,309</b>	<b>1,242</b>	<b>28.8%</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>(6.9%)</b>
BREMERTON NAVHOSP	45.8	87.9	(42.1)	50.4	86.3	(35.9)	43.2	91.3	(48.1)	47	7	14.9%	100.0%	(85.1%)
EVERETT NAVSTA	88.5	87.4	1.1	87.8	85.9	1.9	89.1	88.5	0.6	625	228	36.5%	36.2%	0.3%
KITSAP NB	83.7	81.7	2.0	82.0	81.1	0.9	84.8	81.9	2.9	2,609	648	24.8%	32.6%	(7.8%)
WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	78.1	80.1	(2.0)	76.6	79.5	(2.9)	79.2	80.9	(1.7)	1,028	359	34.9%	36.6%	(1.7%)

Note: Cells highlighted green/orange are the largest increases/decreases for each Satisfaction Index, respectively. Table continues on next page.



**Table 3. Continued (3 out of 3)**

Area	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			FY25 Response Rate			FY23	Var
	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	FY25	FY23	Var.	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.	% Rec.
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>80.3</b>	<b>(0.1)</b>	<b>78.0</b>	<b>78.8</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>	<b>82.0</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>29.7%</b>	<b>23.1%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>
BEAUFORT NAVHOSP	69.7	91.6	(21.9)	68.5	90.4	(21.9)	72.2	93.5	(21.3)	30	10	33.3%	67.9%	(34.6%)
FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	81.7	74.5	7.2	80.3	70.1	10.2	83.3	79.0	4.3	272	81	29.8%	27.0%	2.8%
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	58.9	63.7	(4.8)	52.9	62.0	(9.1)	63.5	66.2	(2.7)	250	81	32.4%	27.0%	5.4%
GULFPORT NCBC	82.6	82.4	0.2	79.6	80.2	(0.6)	84.8	84.5	0.3	291	97	33.3%	22.8%	10.5%
JACKSONVILLE NAS	77.9	87.5	(9.6)	73.6	85.5	(11.9)	81.0	88.9	(7.9)	659	181	27.5%	26.1%	1.4%
KINGS BAY NSB	77.2	69.7	7.5	74.5	67.7	6.8	80.2	73.1	7.1	1,062	239	22.5%	12.0%	10.5%
KINGSVILLE NAS	60.0	94.9	(34.9)	65.0	95.5	(30.5)	60.0	94.4	(34.4)	9	2	22.2%	25.0%	(2.8%)
MAYPORT NAVSTA	87.2	84.1	3.1	85.9	84.2	1.7	87.9	83.9	4.0	1,087	319	29.3%	26.0%	3.3%
MERIDIAN NAS	72.9	90.4	(17.5)	64.6	88.2	(23.6)	81.0	92.8	(11.8)	42	11	26.2%	29.4%	(3.2%)
MID-SOUTH NSA	94.4	88.4	6.0	93.5	86.2	7.3	94.6	91.0	3.6	41	40	97.6%	97.7%	(0.1%)
NEW ORLEANS NAS-JRB	81.9	88.1	(6.2)	83.4	87.8	(4.4)	81.0	88.2	(7.2)	306	166	54.2%	26.2%	28.0%
PENSACOLA NAS	74.9	67.2	7.7	73.0	64.8	8.2	77.4	69.7	7.7	424	98	23.1%	16.7%	6.4%
WHITING FIELD NAS	87.8	91.4	(3.6)	79.7	86.5	(6.8)	93.7	96.9	(3.2)	23	10	43.5%	43.8%	(0.3%)
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>84.8</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>	<b>82.3</b>	<b>82.8</b>	<b>(0.5)</b>	<b>86.5</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>5,797</b>	<b>1,867</b>	<b>32.2%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>
CHINA LAKE NAWS	85.8	90.2	(4.4)	84.4	89.7	(5.3)	87.0	90.0	(3.0)	89	22	24.7%	29.9%	(5.2%)
CORONADO NAVBASE	87.0	88.3	(1.3)	84.8	86.9	(2.1)	88.7	89.3	(0.6)	1,982	766	38.6%	34.1%	4.5%
EL CENTRO NAF	94.1	92.2	1.9	91.3	90.0	1.3	95.4	94.8	0.6	52	21	40.4%	30.9%	9.5%
FALLON NAS	81.2	78.2	3.0	78.8	74.7	4.1	83.6	80.2	3.4	125	36	28.8%	28.3%	0.5%
LEMOORE NAS	73.8	64.2	9.6	71.6	61.2	10.4	75.4	66.8	8.6	1,362	174	12.8%	12.2%	0.6%
SAN CLEMENTE IS NALF	82.8	87.8	(5.0)	77.2	84.8	(7.6)	87.4	89.8	(2.4)	99	22	22.2%	29.4%	(7.2%)
SAN DIEGO NB	86.1	82.6	3.5	84.1	80.3	3.8	87.6	84.7	2.9	1,255	513	40.9%	26.3%	14.6%
SAN DIEGO NMCS D	77.3	83.3	(6.0)	73.8	82.5	(8.7)	80.8	84.0	(3.2)	199	86	43.2%	26.7%	16.5%
SAN DIEGO SUBASE	83.2	86.7	(3.5)	81.1	85.1	(4.0)	85.1	88.0	(2.9)	223	102	45.7%	38.0%	7.7%
SAN NICOLAS NOLF	81.7	91.5	(9.8)	78.1	87.1	(9.0)	82.3	93.8	(11.5)	27	7	25.9%	41.9%	(16.0%)
SEAL BEACH NWS	98.0	90.6	7.4	96.4	90.1	6.3	99.3	91.1	8.2	30	20	66.7%	31.4%	35.3%
VENTURA CTY NAVBASE	81.5	80.8	0.7	78.1	78.6	(0.5)	84.0	81.6	2.4	354	98	27.7%	36.4%	(8.7%)

Note: Cells highlighted green/orange are the largest increases/decreases for each Satisfaction Index, respectively. Table continues on next page.



**Table 4. GOL-UH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey (1 of 3)**

Satisfaction Index (SI):	Service										Property				Overall Only			
Business Success Factor (BSF):	(1) Readiness to Solve Problems		(2) Responsiveness & Follow-Through		(4) Quality of Management Services		(6) Quality of Maintenance Services		(8) Relationship Rating		(3) Property Appearance & Condition		(7) Property Rating		(5) Quality of Leasing Services		(9) Renewal Intention	
Area	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.
<b>OVERALL GOL-UH</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>78.8</b>	<b>(2.1)</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>81.6</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>83.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>(1.4)</b>	<b>83.8</b>	<b>(0.7)</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>(0.1)</b>
<b>EURAFCENT</b>	<b>83.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>(0.5)</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>73.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>
BAHRAIN NSA	81	(2.8)	77.9	(6.3)	80.9	(3.6)	84.9	(0.5)	83.5	(0.4)	83.5	(0.1)	80.2	(3.4)	80.9	(1.6)	74.7	(5.8)
DEVESELU NSF	88.8	13.4	85.5	13.7	88.8	12.3	84.7	9.1	89.2	16.0	87.4	13.3	84.7	8.0	88.9	14.2	86.2	22.0
NAPLES NSA	80.6	3.4	70.6	(1.9)	77.1	(0.2)	70	1.6	78.8	2.1	77.3	1.0	73.6	(2.9)	83.1	3.4	69	0.9
REDZIKOWO POLAND NSF	80	3.1	78.6	7.6	78.7	9.2	79.4	13.7	80.7	10.1	69.8	9.7	67.5	2.2	74.8	(0.2)	54.8	12.0
ROTA NAVSTA	86.6	4.1	82.1	0.6	83.4	2.0	83.1	1.1	86.8	3.9	78.9	(0.9)	78.6	(2.4)	82.6	(3.0)	78	2.4
SIGONELLA NAS	69	(3.3)	62.3	(4.2)	67.6	(1.7)	67.3	1.2	71.2	0.2	60.9	(3.4)	65.3	(0.8)	67.9	(6.5)	56.2	(0.7)
SOUDA BAY NSA	93.4	7.9	89.3	6.0	93.4	11.1	92.7	5.7	93.5	11.3	86.4	4.5	88.6	8.0	91.7	8.6	86.2	14.2
<b>GUAM</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>77.7</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>72.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>73.5</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>79.8</b>	<b>(5.9)</b>	<b>73.1</b>	<b>3.1</b>
GUAM NB	78.3	3.4	73.3	9.1	79	5.6	77.7	8.2	81.4	5.6	72.6	2.4	73.5	0.2	79.8	(5.9)	73.1	3.1
<b>HAWAII</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>(3.5)</b>	<b>62.6</b>	<b>(8.5)</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>(4.6)</b>	<b>67.7</b>	<b>(5.3)</b>	<b>71.6</b>	<b>(1.7)</b>	<b>67.7</b>	<b>(2.1)</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>(5.5)</b>	<b>73.9</b>	<b>(1.6)</b>	<b>60.8</b>	<b>(2.4)</b>
BARKING SANDS PMRF	98.7	15.8	100	14.0	95.9	11.3	99.4	14.1	98.8	14.0	98.8	13.7	99.1	11.5	97.5	20.0	100	18.9
PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM JB	70.1	(4.0)	61.7	(9.3)	67.9	(5.2)	66.9	(6.0)	71	(2.2)	67.1	(2.5)	65.8	(6.0)	73.2	(2.3)	59.9	(3.1)
<b>JAPAN</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>(4.3)</b>	<b>71.5</b>	<b>(6.2)</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>(2.6)</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>(2.4)</b>	<b>77.4</b>	<b>(1.2)</b>	<b>74.1</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>71.8</b>	<b>(4.3)</b>	<b>78.1</b>	<b>(4.7)</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>
ATSUGI NAF	61	(3.3)	57.8	(1.1)	62.9	3.7	62.4	(2.4)	63.5	5.0	59.8	5.4	57.7	0.3	63.8	(4.7)	50.4	4.5
DIEGO GARCIA NSF	88.2	2.6	79.5	(1.0)	84	0.8	80.3	4.4	87.6	4.4	77.5	5.8	75	(3.9)	85.2	(3.1)	77.5	1.3
MISAWA NAF	90	(1.7)	88.6	(2.4)	88.3	(6.7)	86	(6.8)	96.2	6.8	81.1	4.4	79.2	(4.4)	84.4	(3.9)	74.3	2.3
OKINAWA CFA	67	(12.5)	76	0.1	71.7	(5.3)	75.5	(2.7)	77	(0.1)	71	6.9	73.7	8.0	73.3	(7.4)	69	1.9
SASEBO CFA	77	(7.0)	75.8	(8.2)	76.9	(6.0)	81.6	(5.2)	79	(3.5)	79.2	(3.1)	75.5	(7.3)	77.6	(7.3)	71.6	(3.9)
SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	82.5	(17.5)	70	(30.0)	82.9	(17.1)	82.7	(17.3)	85	(15.0)	80	(20.0)	77.5	(16.8)	90	(10.0)	80	(20.0)
YOKOSUKA CFA	77	5.7	71.4	3.1	77.2	7.2	76.6	6.5	77.8	6.0	75.5	7.1	73.6	5.1	79.8	6.5	71.7	12.1

Note: Cells highlighted green/orange are the largest increases/decreases for each Business Success Factor, respectively.



**Table 4. Continued (2 of 3)**

Satisfaction Index (SI):	Service										Property				Overall Only			
Business Success Factor (BSF):	(1) Readiness to Solve Problems		(2) Responsiveness & Follow-Through		(4) Quality of Management Services		(6) Quality of Maintenance Services		(8) Relationship Rating		(3) Property Appearance & Condition		(7) Property Rating		(5) Quality of Leasing Services		(9) Renewal Intention	
Area	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.
<b>KOREA</b>	<b>95.6</b>	<b>(3.9)</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>(6.7)</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>(5.3)</b>	<b>93.6</b>	<b>(5.7)</b>	<b>93.6</b>	<b>(5.6)</b>	<b>91.6</b>	<b>(5.7)</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>(5.5)</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>(6.1)</b>
CHINHAЕ CFA	95.6	(3.9)	92.8	(6.7)	94	(5.3)	93.6	(5.7)	93.6	(5.6)	91.6	(5.7)	91	(5.5)	97.6	1.6	92.8	(6.1)
<b>MID-ATLANTIC</b>	<b>80.4</b>	<b>(0.6)</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>(3.6)</b>	<b>79.9</b>	<b>(0.6)</b>	<b>78.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>80.4</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>	<b>75.3</b>	<b>(2.1)</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<b>(2.6)</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>(1.8)</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>(3.7)</b>
CHARLESTOWN NAVY YARD	98.3	4.4	96.7	5.0	95.8	4.0	94.8	5.3	93.3	4.4	93.3	2.1	91.1	0.5	96	(0.3)	96.7	8.1
EARLE NWS	92.2	(7.8)	93.3	(6.7)	97	(3.0)	94.2	(5.8)	95.8	(2.9)	97.5	4.6	95.3	(1.0)	96	(4.0)	97.3	1.0
GREAT LAKES NAVSTA	88.5	13.4	84.5	13.5	85.5	14.2	87.2	14.4	88.1	16.8	75.4	11.9	78.4	7.2	85.9	11.9	77.9	18.3
LITTLE CREEK JEB	71.8	(9.4)	68.2	(12.4)	71.7	(8.6)	72.6	(7.6)	74	(7.2)	66.1	(13.3)	68.5	(11.4)	73.5	(9.2)	65.5	(14.3)
NEW LONDON NSB	79.5	(9.0)	75.7	(11.0)	80.2	(7.0)	76	(7.7)	81	(5.9)	69.7	(6.8)	70.7	(9.2)	82.4	(5.1)	71.4	(5.8)
NEWPORT NAVSTA	85.3	(4.9)	83.8	(5.8)	84.6	(2.0)	86.7	(2.1)	84.5	(4.0)	81.3	(2.3)	82.8	(3.0)	83.8	(3.6)	81.6	(2.9)
NORFOLK NAVSTA	80.4	3.3	74.4	(0.9)	80.5	3.1	74.9	3.5	80	2.6	78.2	1.5	77.3	1.7	82	0.7	74.3	(2.4)
NORFOLK NSY	77.6	1.6	70.6	(3.8)	71.3	(4.3)	69.3	(2.6)	76.6	1.5	71	7.6	70.2	5.9	74.8	0.8	60	1.0
NORTHWEST ANNEX	90.6	(1.2)	80	(11.6)	92.7	1.5	89.4	(2.4)	92.5	(1.1)	92.2	(0.8)	90.2	(3.9)	100	2.0	83.3	(8.5)
OCEANA NAS	64.3	(14.8)	57.7	(19.6)	63.9	(14.5)	64.7	(12.9)	63.6	(14.9)	59	(16.2)	59.9	(18.3)	68.6	(15.1)	57.8	(16.3)
PORTSMOUTH NAVMEDCEN	73.4	(19.8)	71.9	(21.3)	73.8	(18.5)	78.9	(14.6)	74.5	(17.3)	75.4	(12.5)	74.2	(16.2)	74.5	(18.5)	62.4	(21.4)
PORTSMOUTH NSY	88.3	4.7	81.5	2.7	82.7	0.0	81.5	(0.7)	86.2	6.2	78	11.0	78	4.9	90.7	1.7	81.7	14.4
YORKTOWN NWS	92.7	(1.7)	91.8	(1.8)	92.5	(1.4)	92.3	(0.1)	93.5	(1.2)	86.7	0.5	87.3	(2.0)	91.6	(0.7)	88.9	(1.4)
<b>NDW</b>	<b>86.9</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>(3.5)</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>(0.7)</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>86.4</b>	<b>(0.1)</b>	<b>83.8</b>	<b>(2.3)</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>(1.3)</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>(2.1)</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>1.9</b>
ANNAPOLIS NSA	93.9	(4.0)	94.8	(2.9)	94.8	(2.6)	94.8	(3.6)	95	(3.2)	90.2	(3.0)	93	(0.1)	94.7	(5.3)	94	3.6
BETHESDA NSA	75.1	(1.9)	68.7	(8.1)	72.7	(4.4)	73.5	(2.9)	73	(4.3)	73.2	(7.4)	74.2	(4.3)	75.6	(4.4)	63.8	(2.8)
DAHLGREN NSF	88.4	4.0	82.8	(0.2)	84.5	(1.2)	85	0.7	89.4	3.8	79.8	(0.5)	73.9	(5.7)	82.2	(8.1)	77.6	(3.7)
PATUXENT RIVER NAS	95.5	2.0	92.2	(1.4)	94.6	0.9	94.4	2.3	94.9	1.9	95	1.6	96.1	3.2	93.7	(0.5)	94.9	5.6
<b>NORTHWEST</b>	<b>84.3</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>(2.6)</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>83.8</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>(1.0)</b>	<b>85.3</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>0.9</b>
BREMERTON NAVHOSP	42.9	(51.8)	31.4	(61.3)	34.7	(58.4)	44.3	(43.6)	58.6	(32.3)	52.9	(28.9)	49.5	(39.4)	53.3	(33.3)	41.7	(31.7)
EVERETT NAVSTA	89	1.5	86.7	(0.7)	89	1.0	89.4	(0.8)	89.8	1.7	87.8	3.0	87.7	1.2	87.5	(1.1)	88.7	1.8
KITSAP NB	85.8	3.7	81.4	0.5	85.1	3.0	84.3	3.0	86	3.2	81.1	0.9	82.3	0.7	86.6	1.8	81.7	1.5
WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	79.2	(0.4)	73.9	(5.3)	79.1	(1.7)	80.3	(2.6)	79.6	(0.7)	76	(3.2)	76.8	(2.8)	81.3	(3.1)	74.5	0.2

Note: Cells highlighted green/orange are the largest increases/decreases for each Business Success Factor, respectively.



**Table 4. Continued (3 of 3)**

Satisfaction Index (SI):	Service										Property				Overall Only			
Business Success Factor (BSF):	(1) Readiness to Solve Problems		(2) Responsiveness & Follow-Through		(4) Quality of Management Services		(6) Quality of Maintenance Services		(8) Relationship Rating		(3) Property Appearance & Condition		(7) Property Rating		(5) Quality of Leasing Services		(9) Renewal Intention	
Area	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.	FY25	Var.
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>79.2</b>	<b>(1.7)</b>	<b>82.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>(0.7)</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>(1.5)</b>	<b>85.1</b>	<b>(0.4)</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>
BEAUFORT NAVHOSP	72.6	(22.7)	78	(16.0)	68.6	(26.7)	71	(20.8)	78	(15.0)	74	(14.6)	66.6	(24.8)	62.9	(28.0)	63.2	(22.4)
FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	85.7	5.2	81.3	2.8	83.9	6.3	81.1	0.4	85.3	8.1	80.9	16.9	80	6.3	85.7	9.8	75	9.6
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	64.9	(2.1)	55.5	(7.1)	62.8	(4.4)	60.8	(5.8)	72.3	5.5	52.6	(7.0)	53	(10.4)	68.5	(0.7)	50	(2.0)
GULFPORT NCBC	86.2	0.5	80.4	(5.1)	86.2	4.2	83	(1.0)	86.5	1.9	79.6	1.8	79.6	(2.0)	88	3.6	77.3	(1.2)
JACKSONVILLE NAS	81.8	(7.1)	76.7	(11.3)	81.3	(7.1)	81	(8.7)	81.8	(7.0)	73.3	(13.1)	73.8	(11.2)	85.2	(7.8)	70	(12.9)
KINGS BAY NSB	81.4	4.7	78.4	7.2	78.4	5.2	79.8	8.5	83.7	10.1	73.7	7.0	74.7	6.4	80.3	7.6	66.7	12.4
KINGSVILLE NAS	65	(31.0)	60	(35.0)	66.7	(29.3)	47.5	(42.0)	70	(27.0)	65	(27.0)	65	(32.6)	60	(37.5)	20	(73.3)
MAYPORT NAVSTA	88.4	5.0	86.7	3.4	89.1	4.2	87.1	2.9	87.7	3.9	85.6	1.6	86	1.6	91.5	3.0	84.5	4.6
MERIDIAN NAS	84.8	(8.1)	82	(9.0)	79.3	(14.0)	78	(14.6)	84.5	(9.4)	67.3	(17.9)	63.6	(26.4)	71.4	(16.7)	57.9	(28.6)
MID-SOUTH NSA	94.9	0.2	94.7	3.3	95.9	5.3	92.4	3.7	96.1	5.1	93	11.2	93.7	5.0	97.6	5.3	95.4	15.2
NEW ORLEANS NAS-JRB	80.6	(8.1)	77.7	(9.4)	81.8	(8.1)	80.4	(5.4)	82.5	(7.8)	83.3	(3.2)	83.5	(5.0)	82.4	(8.9)	81.1	(4.2)
PENSACOLA NAS	80	9.1	71.6	3.3	77.4	10.7	76.1	5.0	80.5	10.9	73.8	11.2	72.7	6.7	77.9	(2.1)	65.5	13.3
WHITING FIELD NAS	94.7	(3.8)	96	(0.7)	89.5	(9.7)	95.5	(1.6)	96	0.9	80	(0.9)	79.7	(10.0)	86.7	(2.8)	83	(0.1)
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>(1.0)</b>	<b>85.8</b>	<b>(0.5)</b>	<b>86.7</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>87.6</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>81.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>82.5</b>	<b>(1.2)</b>	<b>86.7</b>	<b>(1.7)</b>	<b>81.2</b>	<b>(1.1)</b>
CHINA LAKE NAWA	88.3	0.1	83.8	(7.1)	89	3.3	85.8	(7.3)	86.7	(2.5)	83.2	(4.9)	84.9	(5.7)	86.2	(8.1)	83	(7.3)
CORONADO NAVBASE	89.7	0.0	87.6	(1.5)	88	(1.9)	88.7	0.0	89.6	(0.1)	84.4	(1.3)	85	(2.6)	87.9	(2.7)	84.1	(2.2)
EL CENTRO NAF	96.1	(1.0)	91.4	(3.7)	95.4	(2.7)	96.1	3.1	95.1	1.6	91	4.4	91.5	(0.3)	94.8	0.4	97.6	13.0
FALLON NAS	84.8	5.0	77.5	0.4	82.3	3.2	85.2	4.5	84.6	2.3	78.6	6.2	78.9	2.8	78.5	(6.1)	76	(3.3)
LEMOORE NAS	75.1	8.1	71.7	6.7	75.8	8.9	75.3	6.7	76.9	11.2	70.5	11.1	71.9	9.6	79.7	6.4	69.6	14.8
SAN CLEMENTE IS NALF	88.5	(1.5)	86	(2.9)	83.1	(7.1)	89.2	(0.8)	90	0.2	75.8	(6.1)	77.7	(8.8)	86.2	(3.7)	75	(13.1)
SAN DIEGO NB	87.3	2.6	86	2.3	86.9	3.1	88.3	2.1	88.6	4.5	83.9	5.6	84.2	2.8	88.1	2.6	82.9	4.9
SAN DIEGO NMCS	79.8	(1.2)	79.8	(3.4)	78.1	(5.7)	83.9	(3.2)	80.8	(2.4)	70.5	(10.4)	74.9	(8.5)	80.6	(5.7)	67.2	(12.6)
SAN DIEGO SUBASE	86.2	(2.7)	80.7	(8.2)	84.6	(3.2)	84.4	(2.1)	88	(0.5)	81.8	(2.0)	80.8	(5.1)	84.6	(5.8)	78.7	(3.5)
SAN NICOLAS NOLF	85.7	(9.2)	82.9	(10.6)	82.4	(11.4)	80	(14.0)	82.9	(10.2)	78.6	(6.2)	78	(10.5)	94	(3.3)	83.3	(8.5)
SEAL BEACH NWS	100	4.8	100	10.0	98.3	1.9	99.5	15.1	100	6.0	95.3	3.3	96.8	7.7	96.7	4.2	96.3	8.0
VENTURA CTY NAVBASE	85.6	2.8	82.8	1.5	82.9	1.0	83.3	3.1	86.1	3.8	77.4	1.1	78.4	(1.4)	81.9	(4.5)	79.8	(1.0)

Note: Cells highlighted green/orange are the largest increases/decreases for each Business Success Factor, respectively.



## 5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question

The Satisfaction Indexes and BSF scores can be further broken down into results by question item. Table 5 presents the question items with the five highest and five lowest scores across all GOL-UH locations.

Table 5. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question	
Question	Score
3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	87.0
2a) Safety of your home/unit	86.4
6a) The assignment and sign-in/signing process	83.9
2b) Security features of your home/unit	83.8
6b) The lease renewal process	83.7
8a) Your current home/unit	78.2
5c) Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months)	77.3
7d) I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation	77.0
5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	75.3
7c) If extended at this installation, I would seek/want to live in this housing community again	75.1

## 6. Comment Analysis

Survey respondents were prompted to provide comments in an open-response section at the end of the survey. Although tenants provided a wealth of information about their individual living conditions and experiences, general trends can be observed based on the most commonly mentioned topics. RDN identified these trends by classifying tenant comments by type (Negative or Positive), category (8 for Negative and 5 for Positive), and subcategory (62 for Negative and 9 for Positive) as applicable, using categories previously defined by CNIC.

Table 6 and Table 7 respectively summarize the frequency of Negative and Positive comments by GOL-UH installation and general comment Category. Items are color-coded according to their share of total responses (including responses with no comment). In many cases, respondent comments touched on multiple subcategories within the same general category. However, for purposes of this report, each comment may only be counted once for each general category. (Please see the Comment Analysis Excel files for a detailed breakdown of comments by subcategory.)



**Table 6. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation (1 of 2)**

Region	Installation	Surveys Received	Assignment Process	Home	Maintenance Services	Mgmt Company/ Services	Neighborhood/ Amenities	Rental Rate or Other Fees	Staff	Other
EURAFCENT	BAHRAIN NSA	205	2.0%	23.9%	2.4%	3.9%	4.9%	2.9%	3.4%	4.4%
EURAFCENT	DEVESELU NSF	48	-	8.3%	-	4.2%	4.2%	2.1%	2.1%	-
EURAFCENT	NAPLES NSA	68	2.9%	20.6%	11.8%	2.9%	-	1.5%	4.4%	2.9%
EURAFCENT	REDZIKOWO POLAND NSF	63	7.9%	22.2%	1.6%	-	4.8%	-	3.2%	1.6%
EURAFCENT	ROTA NAVSTA	176	1.1%	22.2%	4.0%	2.8%	2.8%	1.1%	-	1.1%
EURAFCENT	SIGONELLA NAS	66	-	27.3%	6.1%	1.5%	13.6%	4.5%	1.5%	3.0%
EURAFCENT	SOUDA BAY NSA	87	1.1%	17.2%	1.1%	3.4%	1.1%	-	-	1.1%
GUAM	GUAM NB	91	4.4%	29.7%	19.8%	5.5%	7.7%	1.1%	4.4%	11.0%
HAWAII	BARKING SANDS PMRF	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM JB	368	2.4%	27.4%	10.1%	4.6%	10.3%	1.1%	3.0%	3.3%
JAPAN	ATSUGI NAF	96	-	27.1%	14.6%	4.2%	6.3%	-	5.2%	4.2%
JAPAN	DIEGO GARCIA NSF	83	1.2%	28.9%	6.0%	2.4%	2.4%	4.8%	1.2%	2.4%
JAPAN	MISAWA NAF	9	-	33.3%	-	-	11.1%	-	-	-
JAPAN	OKINAWA CFA	10	-	10.0%	-	10.0%	-	-	-	20.0%
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	125	0.8%	16.8%	3.2%	5.6%	3.2%	0.8%	3.2%	3.2%
JAPAN	SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	4	-	25.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	288	3.5%	19.8%	5.2%	3.1%	3.5%	1.0%	1.4%	3.1%
KOREA	CHINHAE CFA	25	-	12.0%	4.0%	4.0%	-	-	-	4.0%
MID-ATLANTIC	CHARLESTOWN NAVY YARD	6	-	33.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-
MID-ATLANTIC	EARLE NWS	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MID-ATLANTIC	GREAT LAKES NAVSTA	158	1.9%	13.3%	5.1%	1.9%	3.2%	0.6%	1.3%	0.6%
MID-ATLANTIC	LITTLE CREEK JEB	123	-	22.8%	7.3%	7.3%	8.1%	-	2.4%	4.9%
MID-ATLANTIC	NEW LONDON NSB	62	-	11.3%	-	-	3.2%	-	-	-
MID-ATLANTIC	NEWPORT NAVSTA	47	2.1%	21.3%	4.3%	2.1%	8.5%	-	2.1%	2.1%
MID-ATLANTIC	NORFOLK NAVSTA	455	1.1%	15.2%	5.7%	3.1%	9.5%	0.7%	2.0%	2.0%
MID-ATLANTIC	NORFOLK NSY	37	2.7%	27.0%	2.7%	5.4%	8.1%	5.4%	5.4%	-
MID-ATLANTIC	NORTHWEST ANNEX	9	-	11.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
MID-ATLANTIC	OCEANA NAS	118	4.2%	14.4%	3.4%	2.5%	10.2%	1.7%	3.4%	5.1%
MID-ATLANTIC	PORTSMOUTH NAVMEDCEN	91	-	18.7%	-	5.5%	1.1%	-	3.3%	8.8%
MID-ATLANTIC	PORTSMOUTH NSY	15	-	13.3%	-	-	6.7%	-	-	-
MID-ATLANTIC	YORKTOWN NWS	123	-	33.3%	-	0.8%	13.0%	-	-	2.4%

Note: Light Red: greater than 10%. Yellow: greater than 20%. Dark Red: greater than 30%.



Table 6. Continued (2 of 2)

Region	Installation	Surveys Received	Assignment Process	Home	Maintenance Services	Mgmt Company/ Services	Neighborhood/ Amenities	Rental Rate or Other Fees	Staff	Other
NDW	ANNAPOLIS NSA	43	-	32.6%	-	2.3%	7.0%	2.3%	-	2.3%
NDW	BETHESDA NSA	85	4.7%	25.9%	11.8%	4.7%	12.9%	-	3.5%	4.7%
NDW	DAHLGREN NSF	46	-	19.6%	2.2%	6.5%	-	-	2.2%	2.2%
NDW	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	72	2.8%	6.9%	1.4%	2.8%	2.8%	-	1.4%	2.8%
NORTHWEST	BREMERTON NAVHOSP	7	14.3%	57.1%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	-	14.3%	14.3%
NORTHWEST	EVERETT NAVSTA	228	0.4%	7.5%	1.8%	0.9%	1.8%	0.4%	0.4%	0.9%
NORTHWEST	KITSAP NB	648	1.4%	12.0%	3.4%	2.2%	5.7%	0.3%	0.8%	1.4%
NORTHWEST	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	359	1.7%	15.6%	3.3%	2.8%	7.8%	0.6%	1.1%	1.7%
SOUTHEAST	BEAUFORT NAVHOSP	10	-	30.0%	20.0%	10.0%	-	-	-	-
SOUTHEAST	FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	81	-	11.1%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	-	-	4.9%
SOUTHEAST	GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	81	1.2%	33.3%	17.3%	8.6%	13.6%	-	6.2%	6.2%
SOUTHEAST	GULFPORT NCBC	97	-	13.4%	5.2%	-	2.1%	-	-	-
SOUTHEAST	JACKSONVILLE NAS	181	3.3%	28.7%	7.2%	3.3%	8.3%	0.6%	1.7%	1.1%
SOUTHEAST	KINGS BAY NSB	239	1.3%	12.1%	2.1%	2.5%	5.9%	0.4%	0.4%	1.7%
SOUTHEAST	KINGSVILLE NAS	2	-	50.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	50.0%	-
SOUTHEAST	MAYPORT NAVSTA	319	0.6%	11.3%	2.8%	1.9%	3.8%	-	2.5%	1.6%
SOUTHEAST	MERIDIAN NAS	11	-	27.3%	-	-	-	9.1%	-	-
SOUTHEAST	MID-SOUTH NSA	40	-	10.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	-	2.5%	2.5%
SOUTHEAST	NEW ORLEANS NAS-JRB	166	-	6.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.6%	-	-	0.6%
SOUTHEAST	PENSACOLA NAS	98	1.0%	29.6%	9.2%	8.2%	6.1%	1.0%	4.1%	4.1%
SOUTHEAST	WHITING FIELD NAS	10	-	20.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHWEST	CHINA LAKE NAWS	22	-	18.2%	-	-	9.1%	-	-	-
SOUTHWEST	CORONADO NAVBASE	766	0.3%	10.3%	2.0%	1.0%	3.5%	0.4%	0.4%	1.8%
SOUTHWEST	EL CENTRO NAF	21	-	28.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHWEST	FALLON NAS	36	2.8%	25.0%	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%	-	-	2.8%
SOUTHWEST	LEMOORE NAS	174	2.9%	18.4%	4.6%	0.6%	2.9%	1.1%	1.1%	4.6%
SOUTHWEST	SAN CLEMENTE IS NALF	22	-	4.5%	-	-	-	4.5%	-	-
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO NB	513	0.4%	10.1%	1.6%	1.9%	3.3%	0.8%	0.4%	1.6%
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO NMCS	86	4.7%	22.1%	3.5%	4.7%	8.1%	1.2%	2.3%	4.7%
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO SUBBASE	102	-	11.8%	1.0%	2.0%	3.9%	1.0%	1.0%	3.9%
SOUTHWEST	SAN NICOLAS NOLF	7	-	14.3%	-	-	-	-	-	14.3%
SOUTHWEST	SEAL BEACH NWS	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHWEST	VENTURA CTY NAVBASE	98	2.0%	17.3%	5.1%	3.1%	7.1%	1.0%	3.1%	6.1%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7766</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>

Note: Light Red: greater than 10%. Yellow: greater than 20%. Dark Red: greater than 30%.



**Table 7. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by Installation (1 of 2)**

Region	Installation	Surveys Received	Installation	Home	Staff	Other	Suggestions
EURAFCENT	BAHRAIN NSA	205	1.0%	1.0%	1.5%	2.4%	7.8%
EURAFCENT	DEVESELU NSF	48	2.1%	4.2%	4.2%	-	-
EURAFCENT	NAPLES NSA	68	1.5%	1.5%	5.9%	8.8%	1.5%
EURAFCENT	REDZIKOWO POLAND NSF	63	-	3.2%	3.2%	4.8%	7.9%
EURAFCENT	ROTA NAVSTA	176	1.1%	2.3%	1.7%	4.0%	6.3%
EURAFCENT	SIGONELLA NAS	66	-	1.5%	1.5%	-	6.1%
EURAFCENT	SOUDA BAY NSA	87	3.4%	1.1%	3.4%	1.1%	8.0%
GUAM	GUAM NB	91	-	3.3%	2.2%	1.1%	-
HAWAII	BARKING SANDS PMRF	8	-	-	12.5%	12.5%	-
HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM JB	368	0.5%	1.1%	2.2%	1.6%	3.5%
JAPAN	ATSUGI NAF	96	-	-	1.0%	1.0%	3.1%
JAPAN	DIEGO GARCIA NSF	83	-	1.2%	8.4%	2.4%	1.2%
JAPAN	MISAWA NAF	9	-	-	-	-	11.1%
JAPAN	OKINAWA CFA	10	-	-	10.0%	-	-
JAPAN	SASEBO CFA	125	0.8%	0.8%	1.6%	2.4%	8.0%
JAPAN	SINGAPORE AREA COORD.	4	-	-	-	25.0%	-
JAPAN	YOKOSUKA CFA	288	0.3%	1.0%	1.4%	1.4%	3.1%
KOREA	CHINHAE CFA	25	-	8.0%	16.0%	12.0%	-
MID-ATLANTIC	CHARLESTOWN NAVY YARD	6	-	16.7%	-	-	-
MID-ATLANTIC	EARLE NWS	12	8.3%	8.3%	25.0%	8.3%	-
MID-ATLANTIC	GREAT LAKES NAVSTA	158	2.5%	0.6%	17.7%	8.2%	3.8%
MID-ATLANTIC	LITTLE CREEK JEB	123	0.8%	2.4%	0.8%	4.9%	4.1%
MID-ATLANTIC	NEW LONDON NSB	62	1.6%	-	3.2%	3.2%	-
MID-ATLANTIC	NEWPORT NAVSTA	47	2.1%	-	8.5%	8.5%	8.5%
MID-ATLANTIC	NORFOLK NAVSTA	455	1.1%	0.7%	1.8%	5.7%	2.4%
MID-ATLANTIC	NORFOLK NSY	37	-	-	-	5.4%	-
MID-ATLANTIC	NORTHWEST ANNEX	9	-	-	-	-	-
MID-ATLANTIC	OCEANA NAS	118	1.7%	0.8%	1.7%	0.8%	1.7%
MID-ATLANTIC	PORTSMOUTH NAVMEDCEN	91	1.1%	3.3%	2.2%	1.1%	5.5%
MID-ATLANTIC	PORTSMOUTH NSY	15	-	-	6.7%	13.3%	-
MID-ATLANTIC	YORKTOWN NWS	123	4.1%	0.8%	4.1%	7.3%	11.4%

Green highlight = greater than 10%.

Table 7. Continued (2 of 2)

Region	Installation	Surveys Received	Installation	Home	Staff	Other	Suggestions
NDW	ANNAPOLIS NSA	43	2.3%	7.0%	34.9%	16.3%	41.9%
NDW	BETHESDA NSA	85	-	5.9%	11.8%	3.5%	3.5%
NDW	DAHLGREN NSF	46	-	4.3%	13.0%	-	2.2%
NDW	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	72	4.2%	2.8%	15.3%	9.7%	2.8%
NORTHWEST	BREMERTON NAVHOSP	7	-	-	14.3%	-	14.3%
NORTHWEST	EVERETT NAVSTA	228	1.3%	3.1%	5.7%	5.3%	1.3%
NORTHWEST	KITSAP NB	648	0.3%	1.7%	1.7%	6.0%	3.4%
NORTHWEST	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	359	1.4%	1.4%	1.7%	2.8%	4.7%
SOUTHEAST	BEAUFORT NAVHOSP	10	-	-	10.0%	-	-
SOUTHEAST	FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	81	-	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	1.2%
SOUTHEAST	GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	81	1.2%	1.2%	4.9%	6.2%	1.2%
SOUTHEAST	GULFPORT NCBC	97	-	1.0%	5.2%	4.1%	3.1%
SOUTHEAST	JACKSONVILLE NAS	181	1.7%	0.6%	16.6%	5.0%	7.2%
SOUTHEAST	KINGS BAY NSB	239	-	1.3%	5.9%	2.1%	2.9%
SOUTHEAST	KINGSVILLE NAS	2	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHEAST	MAYPORT NAVSTA	319	1.6%	2.2%	6.9%	6.3%	1.3%
SOUTHEAST	MERIDIAN NAS	11	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHEAST	MID-SOUTH NSA	40	10.0%	5.0%	27.5%	5.0%	5.0%
SOUTHEAST	NEW ORLEANS NAS-JRB	166	-	-	1.8%	1.8%	0.6%
SOUTHEAST	PENSACOLA NAS	98	-	1.0%	9.2%	2.0%	2.0%
SOUTHEAST	WHITING FIELD NAS	10	-	10.0%	-	-	-
SOUTHWEST	CHINA LAKE NAWS	22	9.1%	4.5%	-	9.1%	4.5%
SOUTHWEST	CORONADO NAVBASE	766	2.2%	2.3%	6.3%	5.6%	3.4%
SOUTHWEST	EL CENTRO NAF	21	-	-	9.5%	4.8%	9.5%
SOUTHWEST	FALLON NAS	36	-	2.8%	8.3%	11.1%	8.3%
SOUTHWEST	LEMOORE NAS	174	0.6%	0.6%	1.7%	4.6%	2.3%
SOUTHWEST	SAN CLEMENTE IS NALF	22	-	-	9.1%	-	-
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO NB	513	1.6%	1.6%	1.8%	5.1%	4.3%
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO NMCS	86	-	2.3%	2.3%	3.5%	9.3%
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO SUBASE	102	-	-	2.0%	4.9%	3.9%
SOUTHWEST	SAN NICOLAS NOLF	7	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHWEST	SEAL BEACH NWS	20	15.0%	5.0%	10.0%	-	-
SOUTHWEST	VENTURA CTY NAVBASE	98	4.1%	2.0%	5.1%	8.2%	4.1%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7766</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>

Green highlight = greater than 10%.



## 7. Discussion

The 2025 GOL-UH TSS results indicate that resident satisfaction is about the same compared to 2023, with a slight decrease in the Property Index score and a slight increase in the Service Index score. For CNIC GOL-UH as a whole, the Service Index increased by 0.4 points and the Property Index decreased by 0.8 points. The Overall Index, which includes both Service and Property Index questions, declined by 0.1 points, but at 80.4, is still within the “Very Good” range. There are several large declines in the Overall Index when the results are broken down by installation. However, most appear to be based on very small sample sizes. For instance, the Overall Index for Bremerton NAVHOSP declined 42.1 points, but the current year’s results are based on only 7 responses out of 47 total surveys distributed. Similarly, there were only 2 responses for Kingsville NAS. Of installations with at least 30 respondents, the largest declines in the Overall Index were at Portsmouth NAVMEDCEN (-16.8), Oceana NAS (-15.8), and Little Creek JEB (-10.3). In most cases, installations with declines in their Overall Index were the result of decreases in both the Property Index and Service Index.

There were also many installations whose Overall Index score increased compared to last year. Like installations with the largest decreases, many of the largest increases are at installations with small resident populations and sample sizes. For instance, the installation with the largest increase (and highest Overall Index) was Barking Sands PMRF (+14.0). Of GOL-UH installations with at least 30 responses, the top three highest increases in the Overall Index were at Great Lakes NAVSTA (+13.0), Deveselu NSF (+12.5), and Lemoore NAS (+9.6).

It is unclear to what extent these comparisons to previous survey scores represent legitimate changes in tenant satisfaction or are an artifact of the changes in the TSS questionnaire and how questions are mapped to the Satisfaction Indexes. Some changes are also prone to sampling error due to their relatively small sample size. Areas with higher response rates tend to see results that are more representative of their population than areas with lower response rates. Scores for locations with low response rates, or locations with high response rates but few respondents, may be sensitive to the biases of individuals predisposed toward participation.

It is also important to note that there can be considerable differences in resident counts and scores between properties at the same installation. Ultimately, this means that while it is correct to say that residents from one region, as a whole, are less satisfied with their housing than residents from another region, this statement is not necessarily true for all residents at all installations and properties within those regions. Survey results (both scores and comments) should be reviewed down to the property-level to better understand issues impacting tenants’ satisfaction within a region/installation.

Having stressed the importance of a nuanced understanding of each location’s unique situation, there are still many useful trends and insights to be extracted from the overall data. Certain sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction appear repeatedly across the Navy’s GOL-UH portfolio. The following areas of improvement represent the most common issues highlighted by results:

- **Improvements to Interior Appliances and Features:** UH respondents tended to submit fewer and shorter comments compared to Family Housing (FH) respondents. However, of the UH personnel who did leave comments, the most commonly cited issues were with



the quality of appliances (3.9% of respondents), HVAC issues (3.8% of respondents), and the quality of interior fixtures, finishes, and flooring (3.0% of respondents). This is consistent with respondents rating their satisfaction with interior features (Question 5b) the second-lowest across all questions. Funds and staff permitting, upgrading the appliances and finishes of UH rooms with the lowest property ratings would directly address resident's complaints on this topic. Ensuring thorough room preparation before new occupants arrive would also substantially increase resident satisfaction.

- **Parking Infrastructure:** Respondents frequently mentioned wanting more parking. Constructing additional parking lots would help address these issues and improve overall resident satisfaction.
- **Develop a Dependable System for Management and Maintenance Follow-Up:** The score for BSF2: "Responsiveness and Follow-Through" across all GOL-UH respondents was 78.8, which is only slightly higher than the Property Index rating (78.4). While residents overwhelmingly appreciate the courtesy and respect shown by staff, 14 percent of respondents were either "Somewhat Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" with management's follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved. If not already implemented, introducing an automated ticketing system and enhancing communication regarding resident-reported issues (including personnel issues with other residents) would boost resident satisfaction by keeping them better informed and feeling heard.

These issues are not a comprehensive list of residents' concerns but rather some of the general insights apparent in the survey results. Every property/neighborhood has its own unique concerns and priorities. Stakeholders are encouraged to review the topic scores, question scores, and comments for the specific Properties pertinent to their area of responsibility.

## 8. Awards

CNIC issues awards to high-performing GOL-UH properties and installations in recognition of their achievements. Individual properties/neighborhoods are eligible to receive an "A List" or "A List Platinum" award if they earned a Service Index score of at least 85.0 or 91.4, respectively. The latter benchmark is based on RDN's analysis of comparable ratings data for 4,600+ multi-family properties located within an hour commute of US-based Navy installations that participate in the TSS. Properties/Complexes must also achieve at least a 20% response rate. In total, GOL-UH has 32 Platinum A List Award winners and 40 A List Award winners, for a total of 72 Award winners out of 209 properties surveyed (34.4%).

Installations may also receive an award for exhibiting general excellence across the installation-level portfolio. Installations receive a "Crystal Award" if (1) the Installation-wide Service Index is 85.0 or higher, (2) the response rate is 20% or higher, and (3) there are at least 2 properties at the Installation. Table 8 presents the 12 Crystal Award winners and their scores.



**Table 8. GOL-UH Installations: Crystal Award Winners**

Region	Installation	Award	Satisfaction Index			Surveys		
			Overall	Property	Service	Received	Distributed	% Received
SOUTHWEST	SEAL BEACH NWS	Crystal	98.0	96.4	99.3	20	30	66.7%
KOREA	CHINHAE CFA	Crystal	93.2	91.2	94.0	25	46	54.3%
MID-ATLANTIC	YORKTOWN NWS	Crystal	90.4	87.2	92.6	123	204	60.3%
NORTHWEST	EVERETT NAVSTA	Crystal	88.5	87.8	89.1	228	625	36.5%
SOUTHWEST	CORONADO NAVBASE	Crystal	87.0	84.8	88.7	766	1,982	38.6%
SOUTHEAST	MAYPORT NAVSTA	Crystal	87.2	85.9	87.9	319	1,087	29.3%
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO NB	Crystal	86.1	84.1	87.6	513	1,255	40.9%
SOUTHWEST	SAN CLEMENTE IS NALF	Crystal	82.8	77.2	87.4	22	99	22.2%
MID-ATLANTIC	GREAT LAKES NAVSTA	Crystal	83.0	77.6	86.8	158	256	61.7%
NDW	DAHLGREN NSF	Crystal	81.4	75.4	86.0	46	107	43.0%
MID-ATLANTIC	NEWPORT NAVSTA	Crystal	83.9	82.4	85.3	47	151	31.1%
SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO SUBASE	Crystal	83.2	81.1	85.1	102	223	45.7%

Blue highlight = Service Score is 85.0 or higher.

## 9. Action Plans

Housing management teams at properties and installations who do not meet CNIC’s target performance thresholds for the TSS are required to submit an “Action Plan” to address areas for improvement. Per CNIC guidance, Action Plans must be filled out and submitted to CNIC for all installations that have an Overall, Property, or Service Score of 69.5 or lower. Table 9 present the 11 GOL-UH installations and their scores that meet this requirement.

**Table 9. GOL-UH Installations: Action Plan Required**

Region	Installation	Satisfaction Index			Surveys		
		Overall	Property	Service	Rec.	Distr.	% Received
NORTHWEST	BREMERTON NAVHOSP	45.8	50.4	43.2	7	47	14.9%
SOUTHEAST	GUANTANAMO BAY NAVSTA	58.9	52.9	63.5	81	250	32.4%
JAPAN	ATSUGI NAF	60.0	58.2	62.1	96	366	26.2%
SOUTHEAST	KINGSVILLE NAS	60.0	65.0	60.0	2	9	22.2%
MID-ATLANTIC	OCEANA NAS	62.1	59.7	63.7	118	723	16.3%
EURAFCENT	SIGONELLA NAS	65.7	64.2	67.9	66	295	22.4%
HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM JB	66.9	66.1	67.9	368	2,410	15.3%
SOUTHEAST	BEAUFORT NAVHOSP	69.7	68.5	72.2	10	30	33.3%
MID-ATLANTIC	LITTLE CREEK JEB	70.2	67.9	72.1	123	741	16.6%
SOUTHEAST	MERIDIAN NAS	72.9	64.6	81.0	11	42	26.2%
EURAFCENT	REDZIKOWO POLAND NSF	73.4	68.1	79.4	63	113	55.8%

Orange highlight = Score is 69.5 or lower.



Though not required, local housing offices are also encouraged to complete Action Plans for individual properties or complexes that have any Satisfaction Index below the Action Plan threshold. RDN has produced Action Plan templates for each GOL-UH property and installation to help stakeholders address issues of concern. Housing offices are encouraged to focus on survey questions with the lowest satisfaction scores and develop a plan to address them, including actionable goals, deadlines, and the personnel responsible for implementing them.

## 10. Summary

Tenants of the Navy’s GOL-UH units were surveyed between 3 March 2025 and 1 May 2025. A total of 7,766 responses were received from residents at 209 properties/neighborhoods across 64 installations. These responses provide insight into the thoughts and concerns of the Navy personnel who reside in GOL-UH housing. Overall, GOL-UH tenant satisfaction is about the same in 2025 as it was during the previous TSS. The Overall Index for GOL-UH decreased by 0.1 points, from 80.5 in 2023 to 80.4 in 2025. For installations with at least 30 responses, the change in the Overall Index score relative to the previous survey ranges from a 16.8 point decline at Portsmouth NAVMEDCEN to a 13.0 point increase at Great Lakes NAVSTA.



## 11. Appendix: Survey Changes and Question Mapping

The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment OUSD(A&S) oversees the annual TSS for the Military Services and is responsible for setting the TSS questions. OUSD(A&S) modified the TSS questions this year with the goal of streamlining the survey and minimizing the time required for respondents to complete it. The overall impact of these changes was to reduce the number of question items from 52 in the previous (2023) survey to 30 in the current (2025) survey, excluding the open-response comment question. While many key question items remain the same between surveys, some of those previously counted in the Business Success Factor (BSF) and Satisfaction Index scores were either combined or eliminated. Other question items were re-coded to a different BSF and Satisfaction Index. The 2025 survey also added two new question items. These changes mean that the scores reported for the 2025 TSS are similar but not necessarily directly comparable to those of previous surveys. Table 10 presents a legend summarizing the SI and BSF abbreviations/codes and the correspondence between them. Table 11 summarizes the changes in the 2025 TSS questions and their coding to the BSF and Satisfaction Index scores as compared to the 2023 TSS.

**Table 10. Legend for 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map**

Table Legend and BSF to SI Correspondence				
Business Success Factor (BSF)		Satisfaction Index (SI)		
No	Description	Property (P)	Service (S)	Overall (O)
1	Readiness to Solve Problems		•	•
2	Responsiveness & Follow-Through		•	•
3	Property Appearance & Condition	•		•
4	Quality of Management Services		•	•
5	Quality of Leasing Services			•
6	Quality of Maintenance Services		•	•
7	Property Rating	•		•
8	Relationship Rating		•	•
9	Renewal Intention			•

**Table 11. 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map**

2025 TSS				2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item		Question Item		BSF	SI
		<b>1. With regard to the appearance and condition of your housing, how satisfied are you with:</b>		<b>1. With regard to the appearance and condition of the housing community, how satisfied are you with:</b>			
P	3	1a)	Overall condition and visual appeal of your housing	1a)	Visual appeal of the community	3	P
				1b)	Overall condition of the community	3	P
P	3	1b)	Condition of the common areas (parking, sidewalks, playgrounds, etc.)	1e)	Condition of roads, parking areas, sidewalks and common areas	3	P
				1c)	Landscaping	3	P
				1d)	Recreation areas	3	P
		<b>2. With regard to safety and security of your home/unit, how satisfied are you with:</b>		<b>4. How satisfied are you with each of the following features of the housing community:</b>			
	NC	2a)	Safety of your home/unit	4a)	Safety	7	P
		2b)	Security features of your home/unit	4b)	Security	7	P
		NA	Not matched	4c)	Parking	7	P
		NA	Not matched	4d)	Visitor Parking	7	P



**2025 TSS to 2023 TSS Question Map (continued)**

2025 TSS			2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item	Question Item		BSF	SI
<b>3. With regard to the privatized property management office / MHO team, how satisfied are you with:</b>			<b>2. How would you evaluate the property management office team with regard to the following:</b>			
S	1	3a) Ease of contacting when questions or problems arise	2a)	Ease of contacting when questions or problems arise	1	S
S	8	3b) The ability to resolve problems that have been reported	2d)	Ability to do what is required to keep you satisfied	8	S
			2f)	Willingness to respond to your needs	8	S
S	2	3c) Follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved	2b)	Follow-up after problems are reported to be sure that they have been resolved	2	S
S	8	3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	2c)	Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	8	S
S	1	3e) Frequency of contact and clarity of communications	2e)	Frequency of contact and communications	1	S
			2g)	Clarity of communication with you	1	S
S	4	3f) Overall level and quality of service you are receiving in housing	2j)	Overall level and quality of service you are receiving	4	S
		NA Not matched	2h)	Willingness to do what they say they will do	2	S
		NA Not matched	2i)	Policies and procedures of the community	4	S
<b>4. With regard to the maintenance service team, how satisfied are you with:</b>			<b>3. With regard to the maintenance service team, how satisfied are you with:</b>			
S	6	4a) Courtesy of maintenance personnel	3c)	Courtesy of maintenance personnel	6	S
S	6	4b) General work order or maintenance request completion time	3a)	Responsiveness of maintenance personnel	6	S
			3b)	Problem resolution	6	S
S	6	4c) Quality of maintenance work	3d)	Quality of maintenance work	6	S
S	6	4d) Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	3e)	Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	6	S
<b>5. How satisfied are you with the following characteristics of your home/unit:</b>			<b>5. How satisfied are you with the following characteristics of your home:</b>			
P	7	5a) Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	5b)	Landscaping (immediate area around your home/building)	7	P
			5e)	Pest control	7	P
P	7	5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	5f)	Overall interior lighting, bathroom and kitchen cabinets, counters, faucets, and hardware	NC	
			5c)	Appliances provided, if applicable	7	P
P	7	5c) Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months)	5d)	Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months)	7	P
P	7	5d) Overall current condition	5a)	Overall condition of your home	7	P



**2025 TSS to 2023 TSS Question Map (continued)**

2025 TSS				2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item		Question Item		BSF	SI
		<b>6. If you moved in or signed a lease renewal in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with:<sup>1</sup></b>		<b>6. If you moved in or signed a lease renewal in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the leasing/assignment process?</b>			
O	5	6a)	The assignment and sign-in / signing process	6a)	Ease of the leasing/assignment process	5	O
				6b)	Professionalism with which you were treated by the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6c)	Follow-up and continuing contact with the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6d)	Overall level and quality of the leasing/housing office	5	O
O	5	6b)	The lease renewal process	6a)	Ease of the leasing/assignment process	5	O
				6b)	Professionalism with which you were treated by the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6c)	Follow-up and continuing contact with the leasing/housing office	5	O
				6d)	Overall level and quality of the leasing/housing office	5	O
		<b>7. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:</b>		<b>7. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:</b>			
S	4	7a)	The military housing office (MHO) team adheres to time commitments <sup>2</sup>	7a)	When the property management/housing office team promises to do something by a certain time, they do it	2	S
S	4	7b)	The privatized property management office (if applicable) adheres to time commitments <sup>2</sup>				
O	9	7c)	If extended at this installation, I would seek/want to live in this housing community again	7e)	If extended at this installation, I would want to continue living in this housing community	9	O
O	9	7d)	I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation	7c)	I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation	9	O
	NC	7e)	Housing is a significant factor in my decision to stay in or leave military service	NA	Not matched	NA	
S	4	7f)	I am aware of the formal dispute resolution process and how to access it, if needed	NA	Not matched		
		NA	Not matched	7b)	Overall Resident morale at this housing community is good	8	S
		NA	Not matched	7d)	The property management team is doing all they can to make this housing community appealing to Residents	8	S
		NA	Not matched	7f)	Given the choice in the future, I would seek/want to live in this housing community again	9	O



**2025 TSS to 2023 TSS Question Map (continued)**

2025 TSS				2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item		Question Item		BSF	SI
		<b>8. Considering all factors, please tell us how satisfied you are with the following:</b>		<b>8. Considering all Factors, please tell us how satisfied you are with the following:</b>			
P	7	8a)	Your current home/unit	8a)	Your home	NC	
P	7	8b)	The health and safety of your home	8c)	The health and safety of your home	NC	
S	4	8c)	Your housing office as your advocate <sup>1,2</sup>	8f)	The government housing office as your advocate	NC	
	NC	8d)	Engagement of the leadership within your Chain of Command on housing issues	8g)	Your Chain of Command in engaging on housing issues	NC	
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	8b)	Your current housing community	NC	
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	8d)	The health and safety of your current housing community (parks, roads, lighting, etc.)	NC	
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	8e)	The property management/housing office response to and correction of your health and safety concerns	NC	
				<b>9. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following:</b>			
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	9a)	I would recommend this housing community to others	NC	

<sup>1</sup>For these questions, respondents were additionally instructed: "If you live in government-owned / controlled housing, please rate the MHO; if you live in privatized housing, please rate the privatized Property Management office."

<sup>2</sup>Questions 7a) and 8c) are included in the Service/Overall Topic Scores for GOL housing only. Similarly, question 7b) is included in the Service/Overall Topic Scores for PPV housing only.

Note: Changes in BSF coding for similar questions are highlighted in red.

