

# United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 6, 2023

The Honorable Brendan Owens  
Assistant Secretary of Defense  
for Energy, Installations, and Environment  
United States Department of Defense  
2000 Defense Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Assistant Secretary Owens,

We write to you regarding oversight of privatized military housing. A recent report<sup>1</sup> by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examined whether the Department of Defense (DoD) has adequately implemented statutory requirements that are aimed at providing servicemembers and their families with quality housing, and ensuring fair treatment from private housing companies. The GAO report identified a number of areas where the Department and each of the services could do more to support servicemembers and their families living in private housing. We urge you to take all necessary action to ensure that the Department is meeting obligations towards our nation's servicemembers.

Currently there are nearly 200 installations with privatized housing across the country in the Department of Defense's inventory. Though these projects are managed by a range of private housing companies, by law, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services are responsible for project oversight, thereby ensuring that the private companies are providing quality, safe housing that meets the needs of military families.

Having spent years addressing privatized housing concerns from multiple fronts – hearing from families firsthand who are dealing with challenges, and helping them to address those; working with installation leadership to push for greater oversight and accountability for these housing projects; and demanding action from the privatized housing companies – we have been incredibly disturbed by some of the conditions to which members of the military and their families have been subjected.

In response, Congress over the years has conducted oversight of the issue, and has passed into law a range of reforms to address how the military and the private housing companies manage this process. The bulk of these reforms were passed as part of the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act (FY20 NDAA).

GAO's recent report "DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program," looked specifically at how a number of the Congressionally-mandated reforms –

---

<sup>1</sup> *DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program*, United States Government Accountability Office (GAO-23-105377)

including the creation of a formal dispute resolution process for residents, access to tenant advocates, and requirements for pre-residency inspections of privatized homes – were being implemented across services.

Overall, GAO found that “DoD has taken steps to implement these requirements, but gaps in guidance and training remain.” In examining implementation of these requirements, the report highlights a litany of ways in which the function of some of these reforms differs across the services, and varies installation-to-installation. This echoes a concern that we have had – which is that as DoD and each of the services worked to implement these reforms, many of these efforts have happened in a piecemeal or stove piped manner, in some instances with an eye more towards compliance, rather than resident experience.

The purpose of these reforms and continued Congressional oversight is to provide long-overdue improvement to the experience that military members and their families have with the privatized housing system. It is vital that the protections and reforms that we have put in place are implemented in a way that works for residents, and there must be a continual effort to examine the use of these reforms and processes – including by regularly soliciting feedback from residents – to ensure their effectiveness.

To the maximum extent possible, DoD and each of the services should be working to standardize implementation of these reforms, so that all members of the military across the country can utilize the same protections – informed by implementation best-practices of what is working and what is not – with the aim of providing them with quality and safe housing that they have earned.

To better understand the DoD’s implementation of some of these reforms, to improve their usability for military members and their families, and to aid in standardization efforts across the country, we ask that you share answers to the following questions:

1. The FY20 NDAA established that tenants are to be provided a “plain-language briefing” prior to signing a lease, and then again 30 days following move-in. Implementation of this requirement has been addressed by each military department individually, with each developing their own briefings. What steps have you taken to ensure that these briefings are providing clear and effective guidance to residents, and that residents find them to be helpful?
2. The FY20 NDAA also established a requirement for inspectors to inspect privatized homes when occupancy transfers from one tenant to another, ensuring that they are of appropriate quality for a new tenant. GAO notes in their report, however, inconsistency in the standards that different inspectors and companies use in evaluating a home. Standardizing this process has been a consideration by DoD for some time – responsibility for drafting standardized inspection policy across military departments was delegated to the Navy, who provided draft policy in August 2020. According to GAO, as of the beginning of this year, “discussions or consistent meetings of a working group to refine, draft, and seek concurrence on a jointly developed policy have not occurred.”

- a. What is your current role in coordinating department- and service-wide efforts to agree to and implement standardized inspection guidance? What is the timeline for developing consistent department-wide inspection guidance?
  - b. We have previously raised concerns about the relevance of specific performance metrics used to evaluate each of the privatized housing companies, and their ability to accurately reflect the quality of housing provided to residents. Absent standardized guidance across departments and installations, do you have confidence that inspection data provides a consistent and accurate input into a housing company's performance?
3. The FY20 NDAA created a Tenant Bill of Rights (TBOR), codifying 18 rights for all residents of privatized military housing. There are three remaining installations nationwide where the private housing companies have not fully implemented the TBOR – Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst. What steps are you taking to complete full, nationwide implementation?
4. The GAO report includes data summarizing the number of “Eligible Formal Disputes Filed by Residents of Privatized Housing as of November 2022”. The data indicates that there have only been 33 eligible disputes filed by residents<sup>2</sup> – in a footnote to the data, GAO indicates that “Military department officials indicated that additional disputes have been filed, but those disputes did not meet the formal dispute resolution process criteria.” Is DoD aware of how many disputes were filed by residents, which the military departments then determined did not meet the formal dispute resolution criteria?
5. The GAO report highlights the need for DoD and each of the services to complete studies looking at housing oversight personnel levels, to ensure housing offices are appropriately staffed and resourced. According to GAO, as of the beginning of this year “OSD has not yet initiated a study of its personnel needs or provided a timeframe for doing so.” What is your timeline for being able to evaluate personnel needs within DoD related to privatized housing oversight?
6. In order for enacted reforms to meet their intended purpose, they must be implemented in a way that is usable for residents. How does DoD evaluate the effectiveness of the measures? How does DoD engage with residents or receive feedback, on an ongoing basis, to collect resident input on the implementation and usability of these housing reform measures? How does DoD incorporate this feedback into the function of the measures? What steps will you take to increase resident feedback regarding satisfaction and usability of these reform measures, as a factor in how DoD and the military departments continue to implement them?

---

<sup>2</sup> Four eligible formal disputes filed with the Army, five with the Navy, eight with the Marine Corps, and 16 with the Air Force (Air Force number is as of June 2022)

- a. What efforts are you engaged in to coordinate the incorporation of best practices across military departments, so that implementation of these processes and reforms can improve and become more standardized, regardless of the service branch or installation where a military member is located?

Our servicemembers and their families have been forced to navigate housing conditions and processes as part of the privatized housing system that have been woefully unacceptable. Military families deserve safe and healthy housing – providing this standard and caring for these families more generally must remain among your highest concerns.

We appreciate your prompt response to these questions, and urge concerted and continued effort to improve privatized housing for the men and women of the United States military, and their families who serve alongside them.

Sincerely,



MARK R. WARNER  
United States Senator



TIM KAINE  
United States Senator

# United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 6, 2023

The Honorable Frank Kendall  
Secretary of the Air Force  
United States Air Force  
1670 Air Force Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330

Dear Secretary Kendall,

We write to you regarding the Department of the Air Force's oversight of privatized military housing. A recent report<sup>1</sup> by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examined whether the Department of Defense (DoD) has adequately implemented statutory requirements that are aimed at providing servicemembers and their families with quality housing, and ensuring fair treatment from private housing companies. The GAO report identified a number of areas where the Air Force could do more to support servicemembers and their families living in private housing. We urge you to take all necessary action to ensure that the Air Force is meeting obligations towards its servicemembers.

Currently there are 31 privatized housing projects across the country in the Air Force's inventory. Though these projects are managed by a range of private housing companies, by law, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Air Force are responsible for project oversight, thereby ensuring that the private companies are providing quality, safe housing that meets the needs of military families.

Having spent years addressing privatized housing concerns from multiple fronts – hearing from families firsthand who are dealing with challenges, and helping them to address those; working with installation leadership to push for greater oversight and accountability for these housing projects; and demanding action from the privatized housing companies – we have been incredibly disturbed by some of the conditions to which members of the military and their families have been subjected.

In response, Congress over the years has conducted oversight of the issue, and has passed into law a range of reforms to address how the military and the private housing companies manage this process. The bulk of these reforms were passed as part of the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act (FY20 NDAA).

GAO's recent report "DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program," looked specifically at how a number of the Congressionally-mandated reforms – including the creation of a formal dispute resolution process for residents, access to tenant

---

<sup>1</sup> *DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program*, United States Government Accountability Office (GAO-23-105377)

advocates, and requirements for pre-residency inspections of privatized homes – were being implemented across services.

Overall, GAO found that “DoD has taken steps to implement these requirements, but gaps in guidance and training remain.” In examining implementation of these requirements, the report highlights a litany of ways in which the function of some of these reforms differs across the services, and varies installation-to-installation. This echoes a concern that we have had – which is that as DoD and each of the services worked to implement these reforms, many of these efforts have happened in a piecemeal or stove piped manner, in some instances with an eye more towards compliance, rather than resident experience.

The purpose of these reforms and continued Congressional oversight is to provide long-overdue improvement to the experience that military members and their families have with the privatized housing system. It is vital that the protections and reforms that we have put in place are implemented in a way that works for residents, and there must be a continual effort to examine the use of these reforms and processes – including by regularly soliciting feedback from residents – to ensure their effectiveness.

To the maximum extent possible, DoD and each of the services should be working to standardize implementation of these reforms, so that all members of the military across the country can utilize the same protections – informed by implementation best-practices of what is working and what is not – with the aim of providing them with quality and safe housing that they have earned.

To better understand the Air Force’s implementation of some of these reforms, to improve their usability for military members and their families, and to aid in standardization efforts across the country, we ask that you share answers to the following questions:

1. The FY20 NDAA created a Tenant Bill of Rights (TBOR), codifying 18 rights for all residents of privatized military housing. There are three remaining installations nationwide where the private housing companies have not fully implemented the TBOR – Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst. What is the estimated timeline for full implementation at each?
2. The FY20 NDAA established a requirement for inspectors to inspect privatized homes when occupancy transfers from one tenant to another. In inspecting the home, the inspector will ultimately assign a passing, passing with conditions, or failing grade to each home. According to the above-mentioned GAO report, while the Air Force has issued guidance to its inspectors, it “does not include specific standards for each of these categories.” Does the Air Force plan to issue standards or further guidance to better standardize ratings across inspectors and across housing projects, and on what timeline?
3. The GAO report includes data summarizing the number of “Eligible Formal Disputes Filed by Residents of Privatized Housing as of November 2022”<sup>2</sup>. The data indicates that

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the report, the Air Force data includes only eligible formal disputes filed as of June 2022.

there have only been 16 eligible disputes filed with the Air Force – in a footnote to the data, GAO indicates that “Military department officials indicated that additional disputes have been filed, but those disputes did not meet the formal dispute resolution process criteria.” How many disputes have been filed with the Air Force that were determined to not meet the formal criteria? Please characterize common causes for rejection.

4. One of the challenges identified with residents’ use of the dispute resolution process is confusion related to how it functions, which would likely present a barrier to submitting “eligible” disputes. Recommendation 2 in the GAO report notes that you should clarify guidance for Air Force residents related to the dispute resolution process. While DoD notes, in partial concurrence with this recommendation, that the Air Force has “robust existing guidance” for residents, GAO found that the guidance documents “do not provide clear information about the roles and responsibilities of military housing office officials or guidance about how they should engage with residents once a dispute has been filed.” What steps will the Air Force take to update its guidance to include this information?
5. As part of the dispute resolution process, the FY20 NDAA required that residents have access to a housing advocate who could provide advice and assistance in the process. In meeting this requirement, the Air Force was the only service branch that established a new Resident Advocate position, as opposed to designating an existing employee. GAO identified however, a need for greater clarity among both Air Force personnel and residents as to the scope of the new Resident Advocate role. What steps is the Air Force taking to clearly define the role, and to conduct outreach to residents to promote increased understanding of the Resident Advocate’s roles and responsibilities?
6. The GAO report highlights the need for each of the services to complete studies looking at housing personnel levels across each of their installations, to ensure housing offices are appropriately staffed and resourced. What is the status of the Air Force Manpower Agency’s personnel study? What is the Air Force’s timeline for being able to evaluate personnel needs related to privatized housing oversight across the country?
7. In order for enacted reforms to meet their intended purpose, they must be implemented in a way that is usable for residents. How does the Air Force evaluate the effectiveness of the measures? How does the Air Force engage with residents, on an ongoing basis, to receive feedback on the implementation and usability of these housing reform measures? How does the Air Force incorporate this feedback into the function of the measures? What steps will you take to increase resident feedback regarding satisfaction and usability of these reform measures, as a factor in how the Air Force continues to implement them?

Our servicemembers and their families have been forced to navigate housing conditions and processes as part of the privatized housing system that have been woefully unacceptable.

Military families deserve safe and healthy housing – providing this standard and caring for these families more generally must remain among your highest concerns.

We appreciate your prompt response to these questions, and urge concerted and continued effort to improve privatized housing for the men and women of the Air Force, and their families who serve alongside them.

Sincerely,



MARK R. WARNER  
United States Senator



TIM Kaine  
United States Senator



# United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 6, 2023

The Honorable Christine Wormuth  
Secretary of the Army  
United States Army  
101 Army Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20310

Dear Secretary Wormuth,

We write to you regarding the Department of the Army's oversight of privatized military housing. A recent report<sup>1</sup> by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examined whether the Department of Defense (DoD) has adequately implemented statutory requirements that are aimed at providing servicemembers and their families with quality housing, and ensuring fair treatment from private housing companies. The GAO report identified a number of areas where the Army could do more to support servicemembers and their families living in private housing. We urge you to take all necessary action to ensure that the Army is meeting obligations towards its servicemembers.

Currently there are 34 privatized housing projects across the country in the Army's inventory. Though these projects are managed by a range of private housing companies, by law, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Army are responsible for project oversight, thereby ensuring that the private companies are providing quality, safe housing that meets the needs of military families.

Having spent years addressing privatized housing concerns from multiple fronts – hearing from families firsthand who are dealing with challenges, and helping them to address those; working with installation leadership to push for greater oversight and accountability for these housing projects; and demanding action from the privatized housing companies – we have been incredibly disturbed by some of the conditions to which members of the military and their families have been subjected.

In response, Congress over the years has conducted oversight of the issue, and has passed into law a range of reforms to address how the military and the private housing companies manage this process. The bulk of these reforms were passed as part of the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act (FY20 NDAA).

GAO's recent report "DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program," looked specifically at how a number of the Congressionally-mandated reforms – including the creation of a formal dispute resolution process for residents, access to tenant

---

<sup>1</sup> *DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program*, United States Government Accountability Office (GAO-23-105377)

advocates, and requirements for pre-residency inspections of privatized homes – were being implemented across services.

Overall, GAO found that “DoD has taken steps to implement these requirements, but gaps in guidance and training remain.” In examining implementation of these requirements, the report highlights a litany of ways in which the function of some of these reforms differs across the services, and varies installation-to-installation. This echoes a concern that we have had – which is that as DoD and each of the services worked to implement these reforms, many of these efforts have happened in a piecemeal or stove piped manner, in some instances with an eye more towards compliance, rather than resident experience.

The purpose of these reforms and continued Congressional oversight is to provide long-overdue improvement to the experience that military members and their families have with the privatized housing system. It is vital that the protections and reforms that we have put in place are implemented in a way that works for residents, and there must be a continual effort to examine the use of these reforms and processes – including by regularly soliciting feedback from residents – to ensure their effectiveness.

To the maximum extent possible, DoD and each of the services should be working to standardize implementation of these reforms, so that all members of the military across the country can utilize the same protections – informed by implementation best-practices of what is working and what is not – with the aim of providing them with quality and safe housing that they have earned.

To better understand the Army’s implementation of some of these reforms, to improve their usability for military members and their families, and to aid in standardization efforts across the country, we ask that you share answers to the following questions:

1. One of the reforms implemented by the FY20 NDAA is a requirement for military housing offices to check in with residents 15 days and 60 days after moving into a new home, in order to gauge satisfaction. According to the above-mentioned GAO report, the Army had not yet put forward a policy requiring these check-ins – rather they existed as a “responsibility” of military housing offices. What is the Army’s plan for promulgating requirements for this outreach across housing projects?
2. The FY20 NDAA also established a formal dispute resolution process, whereby residents could seek to resolve ongoing issues with their private housing company. The Army has initiated a process where a resident, prior to entering the “formal” resolution, would initiate an “informal” dispute, which would be mediated by the Garrison Commander. How many times has this “informal” process been initiated by residents? Of those, how many disputes have been resolved, versus advanced to the formal dispute resolution process, or otherwise closed?
3. The GAO report includes data summarizing the number of “Eligible Formal Disputes Filed by Residents of Privatized Housing as of November 2022”. The data indicates that

there have only been four eligible disputes filed with the Army – in a footnote to the data, GAO indicates that “Military department officials indicated that additional disputes have been filed, but those disputes did not meet the formal dispute resolution process criteria.” How many disputes have been filed with the Army that were determined to not meet the formal criteria? Please characterize common causes for rejection.

4. One of the challenges identified with residents’ use of the dispute resolution process is confusion related to how it functions, which would likely present a barrier to submitting “eligible” disputes. Recommendation 1 in the GAO report notes that you should clarify guidance for Army residents related to the dispute resolution process, “explaining how and when they can enter into the formal dispute resolution process.” In concurrence with this recommendation, the Army “acknowledges that additional education of Tenants...is necessary.” What steps is the Army taking to provide this education? On what timeline is that process occurring?
5. The GAO report highlights the need for each of the services to complete studies looking at housing personnel levels across each of their installations, to ensure housing offices are appropriately staffed and resourced. What is the status of the Army Manpower Analysis Agency’s manpower study? What is the Army’s timeline for being able to evaluate personnel needs related to privatized housing oversight across the country?
6. In order for enacted reforms to meet their intended purpose, they must be implemented in a way that is usable for residents. How does the Army evaluate the effectiveness of the measures? How does the Army engage with residents, on an ongoing basis, to receive feedback on the implementation and usability of these housing reform measures? How does the Army incorporate this feedback into the function of the measures? What steps will you take to increase resident feedback regarding satisfaction and usability of these reform measures, as a factor in how the Army continues to implement them?

Our servicemembers and their families have been forced to navigate housing conditions and processes as part of the privatized housing system that have been woefully unacceptable. Military families deserve safe and healthy housing – providing this standard and caring for these families more generally must remain among your highest concerns.

We appreciate your prompt response to these questions, and urge concerted and continued effort to improve privatized housing for the men and women of the Army, and their families who serve alongside them.

Sincerely,



MARK R. WARNER  
United States Senator



TIM Kaine  
United States Senator

# United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 6, 2023

The Honorable Carlos Del Toro  
Secretary of the Navy  
United States Navy  
1000 Navy Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20350

Dear Secretary Del Toro,

We write to you regarding the Department of the Navy's oversight of privatized military housing. A recent report<sup>1</sup> by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examined whether the Department of Defense (DoD) has adequately implemented statutory requirements that are aimed at providing servicemembers and their families with quality housing, and ensuring fair treatment from private housing companies. The GAO report identified a number of areas where the Navy could do more to support servicemembers and their families living in private housing. We urge you to take all necessary action to ensure that the Navy is meeting obligations towards its servicemembers.

Currently there are 13 privatized housing projects across the country in the Navy and Marine Corps' inventory. Though these projects are managed by a range of private housing companies, by law, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Navy are responsible for project oversight, thereby ensuring that the private companies are providing quality, safe housing that meets the needs of military families.

Having spent years addressing privatized housing concerns from multiple fronts – hearing from families firsthand who are dealing with challenges, and helping them to address those; working with installation leadership to push for greater oversight and accountability for these housing projects; and demanding action from the privatized housing companies – we have been incredibly disturbed by some of the conditions to which members of the military and their families have been subjected.

In response, Congress over the years has conducted oversight of the issue, and has passed into law a range of reforms to address how the military and the private housing companies manage this process. The bulk of these reforms were passed as part of the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act (FY20 NDAA).

GAO's recent report "DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program," looked specifically at how a number of the Congressionally-mandated reforms – including the creation of a formal dispute resolution process for residents, access to tenant

---

<sup>1</sup> *DOD Can Further Strengthen Oversight of Its Privatized Housing Program*, United States Government Accountability Office (GAO-23-105377)

advocates, and requirements for pre-residency inspections of privatized homes – were being implemented across services.

Overall, GAO found that “DoD has taken steps to implement these requirements, but gaps in guidance and training remain.” In examining implementation of these requirements, the report highlights a litany of ways in which the function of some of these reforms differs across the services, and varies installation-to-installation. This echoes a concern that we have had – which is that as DoD and each of the services worked to implement these reforms, many of these efforts have happened in a piecemeal or stove piped manner, in some instances with an eye more towards compliance, rather than resident experience.

The purpose of these reforms and continued Congressional oversight is to provide long-overdue improvement to the experience that military members and their families have with the privatized housing system. It is vital that the protections and reforms that we have put in place are implemented in a way that works for residents, and there must be a continual effort to examine the use of these reforms and processes – including by regularly soliciting feedback from residents – to ensure their effectiveness.

To the maximum extent possible, DoD and each of the services should be working to standardize implementation of these reforms, so that all members of the military across the country can utilize the same protections – informed by implementation best-practices of what is working and what is not – with the aim of providing them with quality and safe housing that they have earned.

To better understand the Navy’s implementation of some of these reforms, to improve their usability for military members and their families, and to aid in standardization efforts across the country, we ask that you share answers to the following questions:

1. The FY20 NDAA established a requirement for inspectors to inspect privatized homes when occupancy transfers from one tenant to another. In inspecting the home, the inspector is required to work through a checklist of rooms and home features, rating each “Good,” “Fair,” “Poor,” or “Not Applicable”. According to the above-mentioned GAO report, while the Navy has issued guidance to its inspectors, it “does not include specific standards for what constitutes ‘Good,’ ‘Fair,’ or ‘Poor’ ratings.” Does the Navy plan to issue standards or further guidance to better standardize ratings across inspectors and across housing projects, and on what timeline?
  - a. The report notes that the Marine Corps’ guidance “does not include instructions or standards for conducting inspections.” Do you plan to issue further instruction and guidance, and on what timeline?
2. The GAO report includes data summarizing the number of “Eligible Formal Disputes Filed by Residents of Privatized Housing as of November 2022”. The data indicates that there have only been five eligible disputes filed with the Navy, and eight with the Marine Corps – in a footnote to the data, GAO indicates that “Military department officials indicated that additional disputes have been filed, but those disputes did not meet the

formal dispute resolution process criteria.” How many disputes have been filed with the Navy and Marine Corps that were determined to not meet the formal criteria? Please characterize common causes for rejection.

3. One of the challenges identified with residents’ use of the dispute resolution process is confusion related to how it functions, which would likely present a barrier to submitting “eligible” disputes. Recommendation 3 in the GAO report notes that you should clarify guidance for Navy residents related to the dispute resolution process, “explaining how and when they can enter into the formal dispute resolution process.” In concurrence with this recommendation, the Navy commits to creating “supplemental materials to better clarify for Tenants how and when they may use the formal dispute resolution process.” How will the Navy make those materials available to tenants? Will the information be provided on a proactive basis? On what timeline is that process occurring?
4. The GAO report highlights the need for each of the services to complete studies looking at housing personnel levels across each of their installations, to ensure housing offices are appropriately staffed and resourced. What is the status of the Navy’s Housing Manpower Model? What is the Navy’s timeline for being able to evaluate personnel needs related to privatized housing oversight across the country?
  - a. Does the Marine Corps anticipate using this same Housing Manpower Model for its analysis?
5. In order for enacted reforms to meet their intended purpose, they must be implemented in a way that is usable for residents. How does the Navy evaluate the effectiveness of the measures? How does the Navy engage with residents, on an ongoing basis, to receive feedback on the implementation and usability of these housing reform measures? How does the Navy incorporate this feedback into the function of the measures? What steps will you take to increase resident feedback regarding satisfaction and usability of these reform measures, as a factor in how the Navy continues to implement them?

Our servicemembers and their families have been forced to navigate housing conditions and processes as part of the privatized housing system that have been woefully unacceptable. Military families deserve safe and healthy housing – providing this standard and caring for these families more generally must remain among your highest concerns.

We appreciate your prompt response to these questions, and urge concerted and continued effort to improve privatized housing for the men and women of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and their families who serve alongside them.

Sincerely,



MARK R. WARNER  
United States Senator



TIM Kaine  
United States Senator