



2025 Navy Tenant Satisfaction Survey: Executive Summary for Public Private Venture (PPV) Housing

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. Navy PPV Companies and Projects.....	3
5. Summary Results and Comparisons to Prior Survey	4
PPV-FH.....	4
PPV-UH.....	4
6. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question	11
PPV-FH.....	11
PPV-UH.....	11
7. Comment Analysis.....	12
PPV-FH.....	12
PPV-UH.....	13
8. Discussion.....	14
9. Awards.....	16
10. Action Plans	17
11. Summary.....	17
12. Appendix: Survey Changes and Question Mapping	19

Tables

Table 1. Rating Scale Levels	2
Table 2. Score Index Range Interpretation	3
Table 3. PPV Projects by PPV Company	4
Table 4. PPV-FH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates for CNIC, PPV Project, Navy Regions, and Installations, and Comparison to Previous Survey (1 of 2)	6
Table 5. PPV-FH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey (1 of 2)	8
Table 6. PPV-UH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Comparison to Previous Survey	10
Table 7. PPV-UH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey	10
Table 8. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question, PPV-FH	11
Table 9. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question, PPV-UH.....	11
Table 10. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by PPV-FH Company/Project	12



Table 11. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents,
by PPV-FH Company/Project 13

Table 12. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents,
by PPV-UH Company/Project..... 13

Table 13. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents,
by PPV-UH Company/Project..... 14

Table 14. PPV Installations: Crystal Award Winners 16

Table 15. PPV Installations: Action Plan Required 17

Table 16. Legend for 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map..... 19

Table 17. 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map 19



1. Overview

The 2025 Navy Tenant Satisfaction Survey (TSS) for Public Private Venture (PPV) Family Housing (FH) and Unaccompanied Housing (UH) was launched on 3 March 2025 and closed on 1 May 2025. All US Navy PPV tenants (including civilians living in PPV-FH housing) were eligible to take the survey. While participation was expressly voluntary, all residents were encouraged to participate. A total of 12,510 PPV-FH responses were received from 47 installations, representing approximately 35.7 percent of the 35,052 PPV-FH surveys distributed. Similarly, 2,209 PPV-UH responses were received from 2 installations, representing approximately 38.8 percent of the 5,697 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

The PPV Project teams provided RDN with a current snapshot of Navy PPV 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 PPV 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 or PPV Company.

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. PPV residents who instead used the general survey link to take the survey were



prompted to submit their name, email, and the neighborhood where they live to verify their eligibility and limit duplicate responses. All respondents participated in the survey through a secure, web-based platform.

To help increase response rates, CNIC permitted the PPV Companies to award weekly prizes to respondents via random drawings. Because the survey responses are anonymous to parties outside of RDN, RDN facilitates these drawings by randomly selecting winners each week in accordance with Government-defined limits on the number and frequency of awards permitted at each installation.

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.

Table 1. Rating Scale Levels		
Rating Level	Satisfaction Level	Agreement Level
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/Neighborhood). For example, when calculating the Overall Score for a specific property, we only use the responses from that property. When calculating the PPV-FH topic score for an entire installation, we use the responses for all PPV-FH 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. Navy PPV Companies and Projects

The Navy has a large portfolio of PPV housing built under the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI), which can be broadly grouped by the parent Company that manages the housing (PPV Company) and the specific portfolios of housing that are part of each PPV project (PPV Project). In most cases, a PPV Project is contained within a single CNIC Region. However, there are a couple Projects that contain housing sites at installations that span multiple CNIC Regions. Specifically, Hunt Project MIDWEST includes Crane NSA and Great Lakes NS from the MID-ATLANTIC Region and Mid-South NSA from the SOUTHEAST Region. Liberty MAMFC includes 8 installations in the NDW Region and 2 installations in the MID-ATLANTIC Region.

There are currently 7 PPV Companies that operate one or more of 13 Navy PPV Projects, including 2 PPV-UH Projects. Table 3 lists these PPV Companies and their respective PPV Projects. PPV-UH projects are noted in parentheses.



Table 3. PPV Projects by PPV Company	
PPV Company	Projects
American Campus Communities (ACC)	HRUH (PPV-UH)
Allied Orion	SOUTH TEXAS
Balfour Beatty Communities (BBC)	NORTHEAST, SOUTHEAST
Hunt Military Communities (Hunt)	HAWAII, KINGSVILLE II, MIDWEST, NORTHWEST
Liberty Military Housing (Liberty)	MAMFC, MASD, SDFH
The Michaels Organization (Michaels)	SDUH
Patrician	NEW ORLEANS

Given that PPV-FH and PPV-UH projects operate different housing types that service for distinctly different resident populations, this report breaks out the summary results for PPV-FH installations separately from those for PPV-UH installations.

5. Summary Results and Comparisons to Prior Survey

The Overall, Property, and Service Satisfaction Indexes represent broad categories of tenant satisfaction which can be subdivided into BSF categories. 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.

PPV-FH

Table 4 presents summary results for the 2025 TSS for PPV-FH, including the number of residents, number of responses, response rates, and the Overall, Property, and Service Satisfaction Index scores by PPV Project, Navy Region, Installation, and for CNIC as a whole. For comparison, Table 4 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.

Table 5 supplements Table 4 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.

PPV-UH

Similar to the tables presented for PPV-FH locations, Table 6 presents summary results for the 2025 TSS for PPV-UH locations, including the number of residents, number of responses,



response rates, and the Overall, Property, and Service Satisfaction Index scores by PPV Company/Project, Navy Region, Installation, and for CNIC as a whole. For comparison, Table 6 also includes the results for the previous TSS (2023) and the changes between the current and previous TSS, relative to the results of the previous survey.

Table 7 supplements Table 6 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.



**Table 4. PPV-FH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates
for CNIC, PPV Project, Navy Regions, and Installations, and Comparison to Previous Survey (1 of 2)**

PPV Project	Navy Region/Installation	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.
	OVERALL PPV-FH	78.4	76.1	2.3	73.4	72.3	1.1	82.0	78.6	3.4	35,052	12,510	35.7%	33.0%	2.7%
	HAWAII	75.3	65.9	9.4	69.7	60.8	8.9	79.0	69.9	9.1	4,341	1,605	37.0%	25.3%	11.7%
HAWAII	BARKING SANDS PMRF	81.9	66.2	15.7	75.2	69.1	6.1	87.2	65.3	21.9	53	28	52.8%	42.3%	10.5%
HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR NB	75.2	65.9	9.3	69.6	60.6	9.0	78.9	70.0	8.9	4,288	1,577	36.8%	25.1%	11.7%
	MID-ATLANTIC	73.0	70.2	2.8	67.7	66.2	1.5	77.1	72.8	4.3	5,334	1,526	28.6%	32.4%	(3.8%)
MIDWEST	CRANE NSA	89.8	90.6	(0.8)	82.3	88.6	(6.3)	94.8	92.5	2.3	23	19	82.6%	70.8%	11.8%
MIDWEST	GREAT LAKES NS	71.5	69.9	1.6	69.3	67.3	2.0	74.2	71.7	2.5	1,311	427	32.6%	18.9%	13.7%
MAMFC	HAMPTON ROADS NB	72.6	69.6	3.0	66.1	65.2	0.9	77.4	72.4	5.0	3,968	1,052	26.5%	36.1%	(9.6%)
MAMFC	MECHANICSBURG	95.6	92.4	3.2	95.7	92.9	2.8	95.5	92.3	3.2	32	28	87.5%	100.0%	(12.5%)
	NDW	83.2	83.4	(0.2)	78.9	81.5	(2.6)	86.2	85.0	1.2	1,532	625	40.8%	57.0%	(16.2%)
MASD	ANACOSTIA-BOLLING JB	85.3	80.1	5.2	80.8	80.4	0.4	88.7	80.5	8.2	183	70	38.3%	57.0%	(18.7%)
MAMFC	ANNAPOLIS NSA	74.1	78.7	(4.6)	72.6	77.1	(4.5)	75.3	79.8	(4.5)	256	113	44.1%	52.2%	(8.1%)
MAMFC	DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF	84.2	79.4	4.8	78.7	78.5	0.2	88.4	80.4	8.0	175	67	38.3%	47.0%	(8.7%)
MAMFC	INDIAN HEAD NSASP-NSF	85.1	83.5	1.6	83.7	84.4	(0.7)	86.5	83.7	2.8	142	57	40.1%	57.0%	(16.9%)
MAMFC	NDW FLAG	94.6	90.4	4.2	92.5	88.0	4.5	95.4	91.1	4.3	35	25	71.4%	52.8%	18.6%
MAMFC	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	84.2	85.4	(1.2)	78.3	82.0	(3.7)	88.4	87.9	0.5	720	279	38.8%	60.0%	(21.2%)
MASD	THURMONT NSF	90.3	96.0	(5.7)	88.1	95.1	(7.0)	91.3	97.1	(5.8)	21	14	66.7%	96.3%	(29.6%)
	NORTHEAST	72.7	72.8	(0.1)	67.2	69.3	(2.1)	76.9	74.9	2.0	3,014	1,120	37.2%	32.1%	5.1%
NORTHEAST	EARLE NWS-FH	74.3	67.3	7.0	61.4	64.6	(3.2)	85.2	71.3	13.9	69	34	49.3%	60.0%	(10.7%)
NORTHEAST	LAKEHURST NAWC ACFTDIV	80.9	74.8	6.1	75.1	74.0	1.1	84.8	76.4	8.4	107	51	47.7%	52.8%	(5.1%)
NORTHEAST	MITCHEL FIELD NY	63.1	83.8	(20.7)	56.1	76.0	(19.9)	70.9	88.4	(17.5)	216	83	38.4%	52.5%	(14.1%)
NORTHEAST	NEW LONDON NSB-FH	73.7	70.1	3.6	70.6	68.1	2.5	75.5	70.5	5.0	1,722	519	30.1%	22.0%	8.1%
NORTHEAST	NEWPORT NS	67.2	66.2	1.0	59.2	63.3	(4.1)	74.2	68.0	6.2	521	227	43.6%	38.7%	4.9%
NORTHEAST	PORTSMOUTH NSY-FH	66.9	68.2	(1.3)	60.1	62.1	(2.0)	73.3	73.5	(0.2)	197	108	54.8%	31.0%	23.8%
NORTHEAST	SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU	89.6	88.4	1.2	83.7	83.2	0.5	93.3	91.9	1.4	182	98	53.8%	54.4%	(0.6%)
	NORTHWEST	80.1	78.6	1.5	74.3	74.1	0.2	84.0	81.6	2.4	3,281	1,752	53.4%	38.1%	15.3%
NORTHWEST	EVERETT NS	87.4	88.4	(1.0)	86.1	87.0	(0.9)	87.6	89.5	(1.9)	146	107	73.3%	60.9%	12.4%
NORTHWEST	KITSAP NB	78.7	76.2	2.5	73.0	71.0	2.0	82.6	79.5	3.1	1,700	830	48.8%	33.1%	15.7%
NORTHWEST	NAVY NORTHWEST	100.0	98.9	1.1	100.0	97.8	2.2	100.0	99.4	0.6	1	1	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%
NORTHWEST	WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	80.5	79.4	1.1	74.1	75.0	(0.9)	84.8	82.4	2.4	1,434	814	56.8%	41.5%	15.3%

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



Table 4. Continued (2 out of 2)

PPV Project	Navy Region/Installation	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.
	SOUTHEAST	77.0	74.5	2.5	72.0	72.9	(0.9)	80.4	75.3	5.1	5,993	2,216	37.0%	29.7%	7.3%
SOUTHEAST	CHARLESTON NWS	79.2	74.8	4.4	75.1	74.0	1.1	81.9	75.0	6.9	934	347	37.2%	25.0%	12.2%
SOUTH TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	81.0	78.0	3.0	74.2	72.5	1.7	85.1	81.0	4.1	225	71	31.6%	28.0%	3.6%
SOUTHEAST	FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	84.3	80.7	3.6	75.0	78.5	(3.5)	91.0	83.6	7.4	79	27	34.2%	51.3%	(17.1%)
SOUTHEAST	GULFPORT NCBC	81.7	83.0	(1.3)	77.9	79.9	(2.0)	84.0	84.7	(0.7)	530	185	34.9%	28.0%	6.9%
SOUTHEAST	JACKSONVILLE NAS	77.7	71.2	6.5	75.5	70.5	5.0	79.3	71.3	8.0	306	103	33.7%	29.2%	4.5%
SOUTHEAST	KEY WEST NAS	63.6	63.0	0.6	59.1	61.9	(2.8)	66.1	63.0	3.1	552	198	35.9%	32.3%	3.6%
SOUTHEAST	KINGS BAY NSB	70.3	65.1	5.2	66.0	63.2	2.8	73.9	66.0	7.9	365	104	28.5%	21.5%	7.0%
KINGSVILLE II	KINGSVILLE NAS	86.1	89.7	(3.6)	79.7	83.6	(3.9)	91.0	93.6	(2.6)	143	75	52.4%	36.0%	16.4%
SOUTHEAST	MAYPORT NAVSTA	72.1	64.0	8.1	66.5	65.3	1.2	75.8	62.4	13.4	820	324	39.5%	28.9%	10.6%
SOUTHEAST	MERIDIAN NAS	80.3	83.9	(3.6)	73.2	81.8	(8.6)	85.2	85.6	(0.4)	145	49	33.8%	37.0%	(3.2%)
MIDWEST	MID-SOUTH NSA	78.1	79.8	(1.7)	69.7	75.8	(6.1)	84.7	82.6	2.1	273	107	39.2%	23.7%	15.5%
NEW ORLEANS	NEW ORLEANS NAS-JRB	75.6	77.1	(1.5)	71.2	77.3	(6.1)	78.5	76.6	1.9	817	260	31.8%	31.3%	0.5%
SOUTHEAST	PANAMA CITY NSA	76.7	86.2	(9.5)	66.6	80.1	(13.5)	85.2	90.8	(5.6)	47	30	63.8%	66.0%	(2.2%)
SOUTHEAST	PENSACOLA NAS	78.2	76.0	2.2	71.9	70.9	1.0	83.1	79.4	3.7	489	181	37.0%	30.0%	7.0%
SOUTHEAST	WHITING FIELD NAS	88.9	88.2	0.7	85.1	86.2	(1.1)	91.9	89.1	2.8	268	155	57.8%	39.4%	18.4%
	SOUTHWEST	83.2	80.7	2.5	78.6	76.1	2.5	86.3	83.7	2.6	11,557	3,666	31.7%	33.5%	(1.8%)
SDFH	CHINA LAKE NAWS	95.3	93.5	1.8	93.0	89.8	3.2	96.4	95.4	1.0	174	93	53.4%	60.0%	(6.6%)
SDFH	EL CENTRO NAF	95.6	92.4	3.2	92.2	89.6	2.6	97.2	93.8	3.4	90	55	61.1%	50.5%	10.6%
SDFH	FALLON NAS	91.7	92.4	(0.7)	92.0	90.7	1.3	91.1	92.8	(1.7)	216	102	47.2%	44.6%	2.6%
SDFH	LEMOORE NAS	81.4	77.0	4.4	76.7	75.9	0.8	84.4	77.3	7.1	1,162	337	29.0%	22.4%	6.6%
SDFH	SAN DIEGO NB	82.2	79.7	2.5	77.4	74.4	3.0	85.5	83.1	2.4	8,545	2,410	28.2%	32.4%	(4.2%)
SDFH	SEAL BEACH NWS	85.5	73.5	12.0	82.5	70.2	12.3	87.9	77.3	10.6	177	93	52.5%	40.4%	12.1%
SDFH	VENTURA COUNTY NAVBASE	83.1	83.1	0.0	78.1	79.2	(1.1)	87.0	86.1	0.9	1,193	576	48.3%	44.9%	3.4%

Note: Cells highlighted green/orange are the largest increases/decreases for each Satisfaction Index, respectively.



Table 5. PPV-FH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey (1 of 2)

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.
OVERALL PPV-FH	79.9	1.3	78.7	3.6	77.1	2.4	86.9	1.9	83.0	7.2	75.1	2.1	72.8	1.0	79.4	(3.4)	76.6	5.2
HAWAII	76.6	7.2	73.6	8.0	73.0	8.8	84.9	5.7	80.9	15.1	70.6	10.7	69.4	8.1	75.4	4.4	75.4	15.6
BARKING SANDS PMRF	82.9	25.3	84.3	23.7	80.5	24.1	93.4	10.5	90.0	31.3	78.2	9.7	74.1	4.7	80.0	15.8	77.8	17.2
PEARL HARBOR NB	76.5	6.8	73.4	7.7	72.9	8.6	84.8	5.6	80.7	14.8	70.4	10.7	69.3	8.2	75.3	4.2	75.3	15.5
MID-ATLANTIC	73.0	0.0	73.9	4.7	71.2	3.0	84.0	4.1	76.9	7.4	70.3	4.0	66.8	0.7	72.9	(6.9)	69.2	5.5
CRANE NSA	92.1	(2.0)	91.6	0.2	90.4	(1.4)	98.9	5.3	96.8	5.3	82.6	(5.2)	82.1	(6.9)	93.0	(0.1)	86.5	0.9
GREAT LAKES NS	64.9	(4.3)	67.9	2.4	65.6	(1.5)	87.0	3.2	72.8	6.0	70.6	6.2	68.8	(0.2)	63.7	(10.8)	70.9	5.8
HAMPTON ROADS NB	75.3	2.3	75.5	6.4	72.3	4.5	82.2	3.4	77.7	8.3	69.3	3.5	64.9	0.1	77.3	(3.0)	67.6	5.0
MECHANICSBURG	95.4	2.7	93.3	2.4	94.9	6.6	96.6	(1.6)	95.6	7.2	96.8	2.6	95.3	3.2	94.6	0.4	96.4	7.4
NDW	85.3	0.6	85.0	3.2	80.6	(2.7)	90.3	0.6	87.4	4.2	81.0	(1.7)	78.1	(2.7)	83.9	(2.6)	81.3	2.0
ANACOSTIA-BOLLING JB	86.6	6.9	88.5	12.8	83.9	4.3	92.1	5.4	90.9	12.9	84.0	1.6	79.7	0.4	86.8	4.6	82.0	8.2
ANNAPOLIS NSA	73.4	(6.3)	69.9	(5.5)	68.4	(9.0)	81.9	(3.8)	75.8	(1.7)	73.5	(4.0)	72.3	(4.5)	73.3	(10.3)	73.5	(1.0)
DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF	87.2	8.5	88.1	12.0	82.7	6.4	92.1	4.0	89.9	12.1	78.9	3.5	78.6	(1.7)	84.4	3.7	81.7	5.7
INDIAN HEAD NSASP-NSF	87.1	4.0	86.3	7.4	81.6	(0.8)	89.8	0.8	86.9	4.8	85.4	0.9	83.0	(1.4)	84.3	(1.2)	83.4	6.8
NDW FLAG	97.2	5.3	94.4	5.3	92.9	1.0	95.6	5.3	97.6	5.4	91.2	6.0	93.0	3.4	95.0	(1.1)	98.0	4.3
PATUXENT RIVER NAS	87.4	(0.3)	88.0	2.4	82.5	(3.7)	92.4	0.6	89.6	3.3	81.5	(3.0)	77.2	(3.4)	85.8	(2.9)	81.5	(0.2)
THURMONT NSF	95.0	(3.5)	92.9	(3.7)	86.8	(10.1)	90.4	(6.2)	95.0	(2.1)	92.9	(4.2)	86.4	(7.6)	93.3	(3.8)	90.7	(2.3)
NORTHEAST	74.7	(0.4)	73.0	2.3	73.2	1.0	81.2	0.6	77.7	5.1	68.9	1.8	66.6	(3.9)	74.0	(5.7)	67.6	(0.3)
EARLE NWS-FH	80.0	7.1	89.1	19.4	74.0	8.8	93.5	10.6	87.0	25.0	62.7	1.7	61.0	(5.6)	78.4	3.2	57.5	10.7
LAKEHURST NAWC ACFTDIV	85.1	7.1	79.2	7.7	81.7	10.4	87.8	4.4	85.9	12.5	76.3	3.5	74.7	(0.1)	80.0	5.8	81.5	12.0
MITCHEL FIELD NY	68.8	(21.3)	66.0	(21.3)	63.9	(23.2)	77.6	(11.4)	71.2	(16.9)	54.7	(20.2)	56.5	(20.1)	59.9	(30.7)	46.7	(37.1)
NEW LONDON NSB-FH	72.3	4.0	70.8	5.6	73.2	4.7	79.1	2.0	76.8	7.7	71.9	5.7	70.1	0.9	74.9	(2.3)	74.9	6.3
NEWPORT NS	71.7	2.4	69.5	7.5	69.4	4.2	79.7	6.0	74.5	8.3	62.3	2.6	58.2	(7.1)	69.6	(5.3)	55.9	(2.4)
PORTSMOUTH NSY-FH	72.1	(3.8)	70.9	1.3	68.3	0.4	78.2	(5.4)	72.5	6.0	62.7	3.2	59.2	(4.3)	70.6	(4.0)	54.0	(2.8)
SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU	94.4	0.9	91.8	0.6	90.5	1.1	94.5	(0.2)	94.4	5.0	85.2	2.9	83.1	(0.6)	90.3	(3.7)	90.2	6.1
NORTHWEST	81.4	0.2	81.4	2.6	78.1	1.7	89.3	0.5	85.2	6.8	75.6	(0.1)	73.9	0.7	81.3	(4.4)	79.1	5.2
EVERETT NS	85.0	(4.9)	82.0	(7.1)	83.6	(0.3)	93.6	(1.1)	87.0	0.4	89.8	(0.6)	84.9	(0.1)	84.4	(5.6)	93.1	6.6
KITSAP NB	79.8	1.0	78.7	3.0	77.5	3.4	87.7	0.1	84.4	8.4	73.1	1.0	73.0	2.6	78.8	(5.6)	77.5	6.7
NAVY NORTHWEST	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	2.0	100.0	6.7	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS	82.4	0.3	84.1	4.0	78.0	0.6	90.4	1.4	85.7	6.4	76.2	(0.7)	73.3	(0.6)	83.9	(2.5)	78.8	4.0

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



Table 5. Continued (2 of 2)

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.
SOUTHEAST	79.0	3.3	76.8	5.5	77.0	4.7	83.9	3.8	81.4	7.5	72.5	1.7	71.8	(2.2)	79.5	(1.9)	74.3	4.3
CHARLESTON NWS	80.5	5.0	79.0	8.4	78.5	4.7	85.6	7.1	82.1	7.7	77.1	5.7	74.5	(1.0)	80.2	0.3	78.8	8.0
CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	86.0	2.4	82.1	3.8	82.8	5.5	87.2	2.3	84.8	6.1	74.8	10.2	74.0	(2.9)	85.8	(1.6)	79.3	5.8
FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	88.9	4.9	86.7	4.7	87.3	8.3	94.8	4.9	93.0	13.1	76.7	1.5	74.5	(5.8)	91.9	5.2	76.3	9.0
GULFPORT NCBC	81.9	(3.8)	79.0	(2.3)	80.1	(3.5)	89.1	0.9	84.2	1.2	79.6	(0.6)	77.3	(2.4)	84.5	(5.3)	80.6	1.4
JACKSONVILLE NAS	78.2	4.7	78.1	9.1	77.3	11.4	81.3	5.3	79.8	10.9	77.2	4.6	74.9	5.5	79.8	(0.3)	76.2	11.4
KEY WEST NAS	66.6	0.8	61.7	4.4	64.0	7.4	66.9	(1.9)	69.3	7.8	59.7	(0.1)	58.9	(4.2)	72.4	1.3	60.0	0.9
KINGS BAY NSB	70.8	4.0	69.8	8.4	74.2	11.1	75.0	4.3	76.2	11.4	64.3	4.8	66.5	1.2	74.9	(1.6)	62.8	7.0
KINGSVILLE NAS	89.3	(3.5)	87.2	(4.5)	86.6	(6.4)	95.2	(1.8)	91.6	(0.5)	80.5	(1.7)	79.4	(5.0)	85.6	(9.4)	83.2	(5.2)
MAYPORT NAVSTA	74.3	12.8	70.6	12.8	73.0	13.3	79.6	11.1	75.8	15.3	65.3	4.8	67.0	(1.0)	74.8	3.7	70.8	10.5
MERIDIAN NAS	84.4	(2.1)	80.9	(2.4)	81.2	0.3	89.5	(0.5)	84.8	0.9	74.7	(6.7)	72.7	(9.4)	83.7	(3.6)	77.9	(1.9)
MID-SOUTH NSA	80.8	(3.4)	80.6	0.3	77.6	0.0	91.3	3.7	87.2	7.1	67.6	(0.6)	70.4	(9.7)	76.9	(11.1)	74.1	2.2
NEW ORLEANS NAS-JRB	78.3	1.7	75.2	4.0	74.2	(1.9)	81.7	2.1	80.2	3.3	71.2	(6.7)	71.2	(5.9)	79.2	(3.3)	72.5	(0.9)
PANAMA CITY NSA	82.0	(10.9)	78.0	(12.1)	82.4	(3.2)	91.9	(2.3)	82.7	(5.9)	73.7	(2.7)	64.2	(18.0)	78.0	(14.5)	64.7	(13.8)
PENSACOLA NAS	81.1	4.1	79.5	4.5	78.2	3.1	87.1	(0.3)	85.4	8.4	70.9	1.7	72.3	0.3	80.6	(1.1)	72.6	0.6
WHITING FIELD NAS	89.4	1.4	91.3	5.6	88.6	1.8	95.5	1.9	92.1	3.9	87.9	0.3	84.1	(1.4)	84.7	(8.3)	89.1	3.5
SOUTHWEST	84.7	1.0	83.4	2.8	81.5	1.5	90.7	0.6	87.2	6.6	81.4	2.3	77.7	3.4	84.5	(3.2)	81.9	4.8
CHINA LAKE NAWs	97.8	2.0	96.7	1.7	92.2	(2.5)	97.9	1.4	98.0	3.4	94.7	5.7	92.5	2.2	95.6	(2.3)	97.6	3.2
EL CENTRO NAF	98.2	3.3	98.2	5.6	94.0	0.7	98.2	3.6	98.2	5.1	92.9	4.1	91.9	1.8	97.9	0.8	97.9	6.1
FALLON NAS	89.1	(4.1)	91.8	(0.5)	87.1	(5.3)	94.8	1.2	91.5	(0.7)	94.4	1.3	91.2	1.9	89.9	(6.1)	94.4	0.5
LEMOORE NAS	82.9	6.6	82.2	9.1	81.4	5.8	86.8	4.7	86.7	10.3	80.3	4.6	75.5	(0.5)	82.8	(0.1)	81.5	7.0
SAN DIEGO NB	83.8	0.5	81.9	2.1	80.6	1.7	90.1	0.1	86.3	6.5	80.2	1.6	76.5	4.5	84.3	(3.3)	80.8	5.0
SEAL BEACH NWS	85.0	8.0	84.4	10.1	81.7	11.7	94.4	4.6	87.8	18.4	85.1	11.7	81.6	13.3	83.9	2.0	84.1	25.3
VENTURA COUNTY NAVBASE	85.0	(1.1)	84.6	1.0	80.8	(1.8)	92.5	0.4	87.5	4.6	81.1	1.5	77.0	(2.0)	82.6	(3.7)	80.2	0.0

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



Table 6. PPV-UH Satisfaction Scores and Response Rates for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Comparison to Previous Survey

PPV Project	Navy Region/Installation	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.
	OVERALL PPV-UH	85.6	85.0	0.6	84.2	82.1	2.1	86.2	86.2	0.0	5,697	2,209	38.8%	23.0%	15.8%
	MID-ATLANTIC	81.7	78.3	3.4	80.0	75.7	4.3	82.4	78.8	3.6	3,420	1,462	42.7%	20.2%	22.5%
HRUH	HAMPTON ROADS NB UH	81.7	78.3	3.4	80.0	75.7	4.3	82.4	78.8	3.6	3,420	1,462	42.7%	20.2%	22.5%
	SOUTHWEST	93.2	92.5	0.7	92.5	89.4	3.1	93.6	94.4	(0.8)	2,277	747	32.8%	27.4%	5.4%
SDUH	SAN DIEGO NB UH	93.2	92.5	0.7	92.5	89.4	3.1	93.6	94.4	(0.8)	2,277	747	32.8%	27.4%	5.4%

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

Table 7. PPV-UH BSF Scores for CNIC, Regions, and Installations and Change from Previous Survey

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.
OVERALL PPV-UH	87.5	0.5	83.1	(1.2)	86.3	(0.3)	85.7	0.4	87.5	(0.2)	84.6	0.8	84.1	2.9	87.5	(2.7)	86.0	1.4
MID-ATLANTIC	84.2	3.9	78.3	2.5	83.0	3.4	81.3	4.4	84.0	2.8	80.7	2.6	79.7	5.3	84.5	(1.1)	82.3	4.5
HAMPTON ROADS NB UH	84.2	3.9	78.3	2.5	83.0	3.4	81.3	4.4	84.0	2.8	80.7	2.6	79.7	5.3	84.5	(1.1)	82.3	4.5
SOUTHWEST	94.0	(0.4)	92.4	(1.3)	92.5	(1.7)	94.2	(0.2)	94.3	(0.5)	92.2	1.9	92.6	3.8	93.0	(2.3)	93.4	1.1
SAN DIEGO NB UH	94.0	(0.4)	92.4	(1.3)	92.5	(1.7)	94.2	(0.2)	94.3	(0.5)	92.2	1.9	92.6	3.8	93.0	(2.3)	93.4	1.1

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



6. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question

PPV-FH

The Satisfaction Indexes and BSF scores can be further broken down into results by question item. Table 8 presents the question items with the five highest and five lowest scores across all PPV-FH locations.

Table 8. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question, PPV-FH	
Question	Score
4a) Courtesy of maintenance personnel	90.4
4b) General work order or maintenance request completion time	88.3
3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	87.0
4c) Quality of maintenance work	84.6
4d) Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	84.1
<hr/>	
1b) Condition of the common areas (parking, sidewalks, playgrounds, etc.)	73.5
7f) I am aware of the formal dispute resolution process and how to access it, if needed	72.1
7e) Housing is a significant factor in my decision to stay in or leave military service	71.6
5a) Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	70.0
5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	66.1

PPV-UH

Table 9 presents the question items with the five highest and five lowest scores across all PPV-UH locations.

Table 9. Highest and Lowest Scores by Question, PPV-UH	
Question	Score
3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	91.4
3e) Frequency of contact and clarity of communications	88.0
7b) The privatized property management office (if applicable) adheres to time commitments	87.7
6a) The assignment and sign-in/signing process	87.5
6b) The lease renewal process	87.4
<hr/>	
5d) Overall current condition	83.5
3b) The ability to resolve problems that have been reported	83.4
5c) Overall condition when you moved in (if moved in during the last 12 months)	83.3
3c) Follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved	83.1
5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	80.5



7. 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.

PPV-FH

Table 10 and Table 11 respectively summarize the frequency of Negative and Positive comments by PPV-FH Project 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 10. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by PPV-FH Company/Project

PPV Company	PPV Project	Surveys Received	Assignment Process	Home	Maintenance Services	Mgmt Company/ Services	Neighborhood/ Amenities	Rental Rate or Other Fees	Staff	Other
Allied Orion	SOUTH TEXAS	71	7.0%	26.8%	9.9%	9.9%	11.3%	8.5%	1.4%	7.0%
BBC	NORTHEAST	1120	4.6%	35.0%	16.1%	12.1%	17.5%	18.6%	8.7%	4.9%
BBC	SOUTHEAST	1703	4.0%	27.5%	11.9%	9.8%	14.4%	10.0%	4.8%	6.4%
Hunt	HAWAII	1605	3.6%	30.5%	12.1%	13.0%	27.8%	13.9%	4.4%	6.9%
Hunt	KINGSVILLE II	75	2.7%	30.7%	4.0%	6.7%	13.3%	8.0%	1.3%	2.7%
Hunt	MIDWEST	553	5.8%	25.1%	9.2%	18.6%	18.4%	12.7%	7.1%	8.1%
Hunt	NORTHWEST	1752	4.2%	27.1%	8.3%	8.5%	18.4%	9.1%	3.9%	4.1%
Liberty	MAMFC	1597	4.0%	30.4%	13.8%	11.1%	18.7%	9.2%	7.5%	7.8%
Liberty	MASD	108	1.9%	12.0%	6.5%	6.5%	12.0%	9.3%	4.6%	2.8%
Liberty	SDFH	3666	3.5%	24.7%	7.5%	8.6%	20.5%	12.2%	3.8%	4.2%
Patrician	NEW ORLEANS	260	3.5%	29.2%	16.2%	12.3%	19.2%	10.8%	11.9%	6.2%
	TOTAL	12510	4.0%	27.9%	10.6%	10.4%	19.6%	11.8%	5.2%	5.6%

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



Table 11. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by PPV-FH Company/Project

PPV Company	PPV Project	Surveys Received	Installation	Home	Staff	Other	Suggestions
Allied Orion	SOUTH TEXAS	71	5.6%	5.6%	12.7%	9.9%	1.4%
BBC	NORTHEAST	1120	1.4%	3.1%	10.0%	5.6%	4.8%
BBC	SOUTHEAST	1703	2.6%	3.1%	8.2%	6.3%	4.0%
Hunt	HAWAII	1605	2.4%	3.2%	6.9%	4.4%	6.7%
Hunt	KINGSVILLE II	75	5.3%	5.3%	22.7%	12.0%	4.0%
Hunt	MIDWEST	553	1.6%	3.6%	8.1%	4.7%	4.5%
Hunt	NORTHWEST	1752	1.9%	3.4%	8.3%	4.9%	8.7%
Liberty	MAMFC	1597	2.1%	3.1%	10.1%	5.3%	4.8%
Liberty	MASD	108	1.9%	6.5%	13.0%	14.8%	5.6%
Liberty	SDFH	3666	3.8%	3.9%	10.0%	6.5%	7.3%
Patrician	NEW ORLEANS	260	1.5%	2.7%	9.2%	6.5%	5.4%
	TOTAL	12510	2.7%	3.5%	9.1%	5.8%	6.2%

Green highlight = greater than 10%.

PPV-UH

Table 12 and Table 13 respectively summarize the frequency of Negative and Positive comments by PPV-UH Project 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.

Table 12. Negative Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by PPV-UH Company/Project

PPV Company	PPV Project	Surveys Received	Assignment Process	Home	Maintenance Services	Mgmt Company/ Services	Neighborhood/ Amenities	Rental Rate or Other Fees	Staff	Other
ACC	HRUH	1462	0.3%	12.7%	5.7%	2.3%	5.6%	0.4%	0.9%	0.7%
Michaels	SDUH	747	0.4%	4.6%	1.3%	1.9%	4.0%	0.5%	0.4%	1.1%
	TOTAL	2209	0.4%	9.9%	4.3%	2.1%	5.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%

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



Table 13. Positive Comments by Category as a Share of Total Respondents, by PPV-UH Company/Project

PPV Company	PPV Project	Surveys Received	Installation	Home	Staff	Other	Suggestions
ACC	HRUH	1462	0.7%	1.1%	1.4%	3.0%	2.9%
Michaels	SDUH	747	3.6%	2.3%	4.8%	7.4%	2.8%
	TOTAL	2209	1.7%	1.5%	2.5%	4.5%	2.9%

Green highlight = greater than 10%.

8. Discussion

The 2025 TSS results for PPV-FH indicate that resident satisfaction has generally increased compared to 2023. Across all locations, the Service Index increased by 3.4 points and the Property Index increased by 1.1 points. The Overall Index, which includes both Service and Property Index questions, increased by 2.3 points from 76.1 to 78.4, moving towards the upper end of the “Good” range. There are some large declines in satisfaction when the results are broken down by installation. The largest declines in the Overall Index were at Mitchel Field NY (-20.7), Panama City NSA (-9.5), and Thurmont NSF (-5.7). In most cases, installations with declines in their Overall Index were the result of larger decreases in the Property Index and smaller decreases in the Service Index.

Most PPV-FH installations’ Overall Index scores increased compared to last year. The top three highest increases in the Overall Index were at Barking Sands PMRF (+15.7), Seal Beach NWS (+12.0), and Pearl Harbor NB (+9.3).

The 2025 TSS results for PPV-UH also indicate that resident satisfaction has generally increased compared to 2023. For Hampton Roads NB UH, the Service Index increased by 3.6 points and the Property Index increased by 4.3 points. The Overall Index, which includes both Service and Property Index questions, increased by 3.4 points from 78.3 to 81.7, moving into the “Very Good” range.

For San Diego NB UH, the Service Index decreased by 0.8 points and the Property Index increased by 3.1 points. The Overall Index, which includes both Service and Property Index questions, increased by 0.7 points from 92.5 to 93.2, which is solidly within the “Outstanding” range.

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 may also be partially attributed to their relatively small sample size for a given location. Areas with higher response rates tend to see results that are more representative of their population than areas with lower response rates. Scores for properties 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 PPV-FH and PPV-UH portfolio.

The following areas of improvement represent the most common issues highlighted in the question scores and respondent comments:

- **(PPV-FH) Improvements to Home Interiors:** Like residents of Navy Government-Owned/Leased (GOL) FH housing, PPV-FH residents frequently cited the quality and condition of interior fixtures, finishes, and flooring (mentioned in comments submitted by 10.1% of respondents). Resident satisfaction with their home's interior also had the lowest-rated score across all survey questions at 66.1 (with exterior features being the second-lowest at 70.0). Part of residents' dissatisfaction may also be tied to a perception that their housing is not worth the full amount of their housing allowance and that they could get better quality housing for the same cost if they were to live off-base (cited in comments submitted by 8.4% of respondents). Funds permitting, capital improvement projects to remodel/upgrade the interiors of older homes in neighborhoods with the lowest Property Index scores would directly address resident's complaints on this topic.
- **(PPV-UH) Investigate HVAC Issues:** Compared to PPV-FH residents, PPV-UH residents were less likely to submit survey comments and those who did tended to submit shorter comments as well. It is notable that PPV-UH is also the only portfolio of Navy housing for which a positive comment subcategory ("Positive – Unspecified or Other": 3.7% of responses) had a higher frequency than the highest single negative comment subcategory ("Negative – HVAC Issues": 3.0%). These results support PPV-UH's "Outstanding" Overall Index rating. Nonetheless, there is always room for improvement, and among PPV-UH respondents, the most commonly cited issue was with heating, cooling, or air quality, particularly malfunctioning AC or poor temperature control. This is also consistent with PPV-UH respondents rating their satisfaction with interior features (Question 5b) the lowest across all questions at 80.5. Investigating and resolving temperature control issues would most directly address resident's complaints on this topic.

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.



9. Awards

CNIC issues awards to high-performing PPV-FH and PPV-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/Neighborhoods must also achieve at least a 20% response rate.

- PPV-FH properties/neighborhoods include 32 Platinum A List Award winners and 64 A List Award winners, for a total of 96 Award winners out of 241 properties surveyed (39.8%).
- PPV-UH properties/neighborhoods include 2 Platinum A List Award winners and zero A List Award winners, for a total of 2 Award winners out of 8 total properties surveyed (25.0%).

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 14 presents the 17 PPV installations (16 FH and 1 UH) that are eligible to receive a Crystal Award.

Table 14. PPV Installations: Crystal Award Winners

PPV Project	Region	Installation	Award	Satisfaction Index			Surveys		
				Overall	Property	Service	Received	Distributed	% Received
MAMFC	MID-ATLANTIC	MECHANICSBURG	Crystal	95.6	95.7	95.5	28	32	87.5%
MAMFC	NDW	NDW FLAG	Crystal	94.6	92.5	95.4	25	35	71.4%
SDUH	SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO NB UH	Crystal	93.2	92.5	93.6	747	2,277	32.8%
NORTHEAST	NORTHEAST	SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU	Crystal	89.6	83.7	93.3	98	182	53.8%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	WHITING FIELD NAS	Crystal	88.9	85.1	91.9	155	268	57.8%
SDFH	SOUTHWEST	FALLON NAS	Crystal	91.7	92.0	91.1	102	216	47.2%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	FORT WORTH NAS-JRB	Crystal	84.3	75.0	91.0	27	79	34.2%
MAMFC	NDW	PATUXENT RIVER NAS	Crystal	84.2	78.3	88.4	279	720	38.8%
MAMFC	NDW	DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF	Crystal	84.2	78.7	88.4	67	175	38.3%
HAWAII	HAWAII	BARKING SANDS PMRF	Crystal	81.9	75.2	87.2	28	53	52.8%
SDFH	SOUTHWEST	VENTURA COUNTY NAVBASE	Crystal	83.1	78.1	87.0	576	1,193	48.3%
MAMFC	NDW	INDIAN HEAD NSASP-NSF	Crystal	85.1	83.7	86.5	57	142	40.1%
SDFH	SOUTHWEST	SAN DIEGO NB	Crystal	82.2	77.4	85.5	2,410	8,545	28.2%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	PANAMA CITY NSA	Crystal	76.7	66.6	85.2	30	47	63.8%
NORTHEAST	NORTHEAST	EARLE NWS-FH	Crystal	74.3	61.4	85.2	34	69	49.3%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	MERIDIAN NAS	Crystal	80.3	73.2	85.2	49	145	33.8%
SOUTH TEXAS	SOUTHEAST	CORPUS CHRISTI NAS	Crystal	81.0	74.2	85.1	71	225	31.6%

Blue highlight = Service Score is 85.0 or higher.



10. Action Plans

Housing management teams at 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 15 presents the 10 PPV installations (all PPV-FH) that meet this requirement.

Table 15. PPV Installations: Action Plan Required

Project	Region	Installation	Satisfaction Index			Surveys		
			Overall	Property	Service	Rec.	Distr.	% Received
NORTHEAST	NORTHEAST	MITCHEL FIELD NY	63.1	56.1	70.9	83	216	38.4%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	KEY WEST NAS	63.6	59.1	66.1	198	552	35.9%
NORTHEAST	NORTHEAST	PORTSMOUTH NSY-FH	66.9	60.1	73.3	108	197	54.8%
NORTHEAST	NORTHEAST	NEWPORT NS	67.2	59.2	74.2	227	521	43.6%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	KINGS BAY NSB	70.3	66.0	73.9	104	365	28.5%
MIDWEST	MID-ATLANTIC	GREAT LAKES NS	71.5	69.3	74.2	427	1,311	32.6%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	MAYPORT NAVSTA	72.1	66.5	75.8	324	820	39.5%
MAMFC	MID-ATLANTIC	HAMPTON ROADS NB	72.6	66.1	77.4	1,052	3,968	26.5%
NORTHEAST	NORTHEAST	EARLE NWS-FH	74.3	61.4	85.2	34	69	49.3%
SOUTHEAST	SOUTHEAST	PANAMA CITY NSA	76.7	66.6	85.2	30	47	63.8%

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 neighborhoods that have any Satisfaction Index below the Action Plan requirement threshold. RDN has produced Action Plan templates for each PPV-FH and PPV-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.

11. Summary

Tenants of the Navy’s PPV-FH and PPV-UH units were surveyed between 3 March 2025 and 1 May 2025. A total of 12,510 PPV-FH responses were received from 47 installations, representing approximately 35.7 percent of the 35,052 PPV-FH surveys distributed. For PPV-UH, a total of 2,209 responses were received from 2 installations, representing approximately 38.8 percent of the 5,697 surveys distributed. These responses provide insight into the thoughts and concerns of the Navy personnel who reside in PPV housing.

PPV-FH tenant satisfaction generally increased relative to the previous TSS. The Overall Index for PPV-FH increased by 2.3 points, from 76.1 points in 2023 to 78.4 points in 2025. However, results



are mixed when broken down by installation, which ranged from a decrease of 20.7 points at Mitchel Field NY to an increase of 15.7 points at Barking Sands PMRF.

PPV-UH tenant satisfaction also increased relative to the previous TSS. For Hampton Roads NB UH, the Overall Index increased by 3.4 points from 78.3 to 81.7. For San Diego NB UH, the Overall Index increased by 0.7 points, from 92.5 to 93.2.



12. 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 16 presents a legend summarizing the SI and BSF abbreviations/codes and the correspondence between them. Table 17 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 16. 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 17. 2025 to 2023 TSS Question Map

2025 TSS				2023 TSS			
SI	BSF	Question Item		Question Item		BSF	SI
		1. With regard to the appearance and condition of your housing, how satisfied are you with:		1. With regard to the appearance and condition of the housing community, how satisfied are you with:			
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
		2. With regard to safety and security of your home/unit, how satisfied are you with:		4. How satisfied are you with each of the following features of the housing community:			
	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
3. With regard to the privatized property management office / MHO team, how satisfied are you with:			2. How would you evaluate the property management office team with regard to the following:			
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
4. With regard to the maintenance service team, how satisfied are you with:			3. With regard to the maintenance service team, how satisfied are you with:			
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
5. How satisfied are you with the following characteristics of your home/unit:			5. How satisfied are you with the following characteristics of your home:			
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
		6. If you moved in or signed a lease renewal in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with:¹		6. If you moved in or signed a lease renewal in the last 12 months, how satisfied are you with the leasing/assignment process?			
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
		7. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:		7. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:			
S	4	7a)	The military housing office (MHO) team adheres to time commitments ²	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 ²				
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
		8. Considering all factors, please tell us how satisfied you are with the following:		8. Considering all Factors, please tell us how satisfied you are with the following:			
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 ^{1,2}	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	
				9. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following:			
	NA	NA	<i>Not matched</i>	9a)	I would recommend this housing community to others	NC	

¹For 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."

²Questions 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.

