



File Name: Dod Housing Management Manual.pdf

Size: 2348 KB

Type: PDF, ePub, eBook

Category: Book

Uploaded: 6 May 2019, 19:56 PM

Rating: 4.6/5 from 555 votes.

Status: AVAILABLE

Last checked: 17 Minutes ago!

In order to read or download Dod Housing Management Manual ebook, you need to create a FREE account.

[Download Now!](#)

eBook includes PDF, ePub and Kindle version

[Register a free 1 month Trial Account.](#)

[Download as many books as you like \(Personal use\)](#)

[Cancel the membership at any time if not satisfied.](#)

[Join Over 80000 Happy Readers](#)

Book Descriptions:

We have made it easy for you to find a PDF Ebooks without any digging. And by having access to our ebooks online or by storing it on your computer, you have convenient answers with Dod Housing Management Manual . To get started finding Dod Housing Management Manual , you are right to find our website which has a comprehensive collection of manuals listed.

Our library is the biggest of these that have literally hundreds of thousands of different products represented.



Book Descriptions:

Dod Housing Management Manual

Our payment security system encrypts your information during transmission. We don't share your credit card details with thirdparty sellers, and we don't sell your information to others. Please try again.Please try again.Please try again. It also addresses DoD responsibilities for privatized lodging. This Manual applies to OSD, the Military Departments, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other organizational entities within the Department of Defense. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer no Kindle device required. Register a free business account To calculate the overall star rating and percentage breakdown by star, we don't use a simple average. Instead, our system considers things like how recent a review is and if the reviewer bought the item on Amazon. It also analyzes reviews to verify trustworthiness. IEEE GlobalSpec may share your personal information and website activity with our clients for which you express explicit interest, or with vendors looking to reach people like you. IEEE GlobalSpec will retain this data until you change or delete it, which you may do at any time. You may withdraw your consent at any time.When a webinar seems like a good fit, we will send you an email to invite you to attend. When a white paper seems like a good fit, we will send you an email to invite you to download. Periodically, these affiliates, editorial sponsors, and sponsored content providers will reach out to you via email to determine if you have additional interest in their product or service. Based on information provided at registration country, job function, industry, etc., companies may wish to send you email pertaining to their products or service. Please try again in a few minutes.Please try again in a few minutes.<http://www.pamelavilloresi.it/public/carel-chiller-controller-manual.xml>

- **dod housing management manual, dod housing management manual, dod housing management manual, dod housing management manual 4165.63-m, dod housing management manual pdf, dod housing management manual download, dod housing management manual 2017, dod housing management manual 2016, dod housing management manual, dod manual 4165.63-m dod housing management, dod housing management manual 4165.63-m.**

It also addresses DoD responsibilities for privatized lodging. Establishes policy and assigns responsibilities for the DoD Lodging Program. All services are upgrading their facilities through renovation and new construction. For certain enlisted paygrades, the eligibility of unaccompanied personnel to receive the Basic Allowance for Housing is predicated, in law, on the availability of government quarters. In addition, the service secretaries can require uniformed members to live on base for various reasons, including military necessity, readiness, training missions or discipline, and to make use of underutilized housing. The new Defense Department Housing Management manual defines unaccompanied housing adequacy in terms of three factors condition, configuration and privacy. For a building to have a quality rating of 1 or 2, the cost of needed repairs and improvement cannot exceed 20 percent of the cost to replace the building. Although law restricts BAH entitlement to the nonavailability of government quarters, the services have the flexibility to require only members in lower paygrades to live on base because there is not enough unaccompanied housing for all. Other paygrades may live in unaccompanied housing, space permitting, once all unaccompanied personnel in the required paygrades are adequately assigned. However, in foreign countries, higher paygrades can be required to live on base. Operations and maintenance dollars will be used to renovate dorms in order of priority of condition until new facilities can be built. Air Force policy

allows E4s and above with at least three years of service to live off base, regardless of the onbase dormitory occupancy rate. Crews of small Coast Guard cutters often occupy governmentleased apartments. Based on local conditions, as many E4s with more than four years of service as possible should be living in unaccompanied housing. <http://www.equip-info.de/pimages/carel-easy-controller-manual.xml>

Enlisted sailors on sea duty who are authorized BAH to live in the local community do not have to give up their allowance when deployed. The Navy is on track to complete the program by 2016. This construction standard is intended to mirror modern university housing, or the type of housing commonly rented by young, single roommates in the private sector. Just as with minimum configuration and privacy standards, the DoD housing management manual also authorizes the services to approve a lesser new construction standard. To this end, the services have pursued different unaccompanied housing standards for single troops living in barracks and dorms. A central provision of this authority is to allow sailors who are not otherwise entitled to BAH to receive a higher rate of partial BAH if they live in privatized housing. Both projects include some previously Navyowned unaccompanied housing, which has been renovated as needed. The rate is based on the units market value. Shipboard sailors also must get approval from their commanding officer to live off ship and be six months out from the next scheduled deployment of more than 90 days. Washers and dryers are provided in a laundry room on each floor or in a central location in each building. Because many installations may have capacity shortfalls, junior enlisted members may be assigned to housing with less privacy, space and amenities than the current new construction standards. Some of the services have decided to put barracks building projects on hold temporarily because of force reductions, to ensure construction dollars are not wasted. Availability of bachelor officer quarters for single officers and married officers not accompanied by their families differs by service and location. Unless they are designated key and essential, single officers on U.S. installations are authorized to receive BAH and reside off base. Outside the U.S., officer quarters are often made available on base.

These projects have been built at Fort Bragg, N.C.; Fort Drum, N.Y.; Fort Stewart, Ga.; and Fort Irwin, Calif. Rents are generally marketbased, and the units are available to unaccompanied E6s and above. If unaccompanied housing is available, all services allow occupancy by geographic bachelors married members who by their own choice are not accompanied by their families. However, these spaces are decreasing as the services tighten policies to ensure all required members are housed first Priority 1 key and essential and Priority 2 bona fide bachelors within each services designated paygrade threshold. Barracks life is defined by rules and regulations. It provides guidance for assignment, visitation, alcohol consumption, inspections, maintenance and repair, and new construction programming. The program standardizes the barracks management to include assignment and termination inspections, central in and outprocessing, maintenance and repair programs, and management control of room furnishings. Each unaccompanied housing management office is staffed with professionals who provide guidance and advice on dorm life and serve as mentors to members on succeeding in the Air Force. Eligible service members with dependents may also apply to live in privatized housing or housing owned and controlled by the government. If a members family moves away, for example, the member usually will be required to move out, as well. Residents generally are responsible for minor repairs, conservation of utilities, indoor cleaning and yard maintenance. Installation or privatization partners share responsibility for maintenance of the government or privatized quarters by providing major repairs and maintenance on infrastructure, appliances and common grounds. Almost all family housing in the U.S. has been transferred to private companies under the militarys housing privatization initiative, and is being repaired or replaced.

<https://events.citeve.pt/chat-conversation/93-honda-accord-service-manual>

To encourage the services to budget the necessary funding to keep this inventory adequate, DoD has created a performance goal similar to the one for unaccompanied housing, under which 90 percent of the inventory must be in the top two quality ratings by the end of fiscal 2012. In privatized housing, eviction rules generally are based on state or local landlord-tenant laws. Installation commanders do not evict tenants from privatized housing; only the private partner has that authority. However, commanders may ban individuals from the installation. Dependents of military members who die in the line of duty may be permitted to remain in assigned adequate government-owned housing free for 365 days after the member's death, or continue to receive the housing allowance for that time. If military tenants use less than the projected average for their type of home and family size, they may receive a refund. If they use more, they are billed for the overage. Members may submit advance applications DD Form 1746 or apply when they arrive at a new location. But an easy way to get advance information about housing is to visit the DoD Automated Housing Referral Network website at www.ahrn.com, which has information about privatized, government-owned and community-based housing. Adequate community housing is available at many overseas locations, and installations may provide loaner furnishings and appliances where appropriate. Work associated with all privatization projects should be completed by 2020. But if housing units remain unoccupied for a certain period because of a lack of demand among military personnel, other tenants are allowed to rent the homes. The priority list for other tenants includes single troops, reserve-component members, military retirees, DoD civilians and contractors. BAH is designed to cover median shelter rent, normal utilities and insurance based on paygrade and geographic area. It also addresses DoD responsibilities for privatized lodging.

This Manual applies to OSD, the Military Departments, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other organizational entities within the Department of Defense. It also addresses DoD responsibilities for privatized lodging. This Manual applies to OSD, the Military Departments, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other organizational entities within the Department of Defense. It also addresses DoD responsibilities for privatized lodging. This Manual applies to OSD, the Military Departments, the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other organizational entities within the Department of Defense. Established seller since 2000. All Rights Reserved. Privatization Program Matures 28 APR 06, GAO 06-438. Because of expressed interest GAO assessed 1 whether opportunities exist to improve DOD's Report to Congressional Committees. April 2006 Contents. Tables. Figures. April 28, 2006 Letter. Congressional Committees. The Department of Defense DOD intends to privatize about 87 percent of According to. DOD officials, the purpose of the housing privatization program is to help By the end of.

December 2005, the services had awarded 52 projects to privatize over This report represents a continuation of our longstanding reviews of We initiated this engagement This report determines 1 To address these issues, we summarized program implementation status and We visited installations where We compared occupancy rates in awarded We conducted our A more detailed description of our Results in Brief. Although DOD and the individual services have implemented program As a result, there is For example, we found that funds earmarked for Also, status information for five of Compared to the Navy, the Army Army and Air Force projects we reviewed. Navy officials stated that they As a result, value of the data could Sixteen, or 36 percent, of 44 awarded privatization projects had occupancy Although the projects were originally justified on the basis of meeting For example, 20 projects had rented Still, rental If lower than expected occupancy and rental DODs

housing requirements process and to ensure maximum reliance on localWe are making five recommendations to improve the oversight of awardedSpecifically, we are recommending that. DOD require the Navy to upgrade its oversight of awarded projects, improveIn written comments on a draft of this report. DOD fully agreed with three and partially agreed with two of ourBackground. In the mid1990s, DOD became concerned that inadequate housing allowancesDOD also noted that the quality of militaryowned housing had been inDOD officials stated that much ofDOD estimatedIn response, and with the approval of Congress, DOD began two majorThis initiative was completed at theSecond, DOD began an initiative toDOD policy states that privatesector housing in the communities nearAs of DecemberTable 1 shows implementation status byTable 1 Privatization Projects Awarded and Planned as of December 2005Army 19 16 35 59,571 23,813 83,384. Navy and 17 7 24 38,106 20,500 58,606. Marines. Air Force 16 34 50 14,615 32,133 46,748. Total 52 57 109 112,292 76,446 188,738.

Source DOD. The duration of the initial development periodthat is, the period whenFigures 1 through 5 show photographs ofFigure 1 Newly Constructed left and Older right Privatized Housing at. Fort Meade, Maryland. Figure 2 Newly Constructed left and Older right Privatized Housing at. Fort Stewart, Georgia. Figure 3 Newly Constructed left and Older right Privatized Housing at. Robins Air Force Base, Georgia. Figure 4 Newly Constructed left and Older right Privatized Housing at. Patrick Air Force Base, Florida. Figure 5 Newly Constructed left and Older right Privatized Housing atServicemembers can choose whether or not to live in privatizedThose who choose to live inWithin the Office of the Secretary of Defense OSD, the Housing and. Competitive Sourcing Office, which reports to the Deputy Under SecretaryOSD designed and usesThe report, preparedThis report is a continuation of a series of reports that we have issuedThe following summarizes keyWe also reportedIn response to each report, DOD officials have stated that they plannedOpportunities Exist to Improve the Oversight of Awarded Privatization. Projects. Although OSD and the services have implemented program oversight policiesThough owned andThus, adequate program oversight is essential toHowever, we identified three areasDODs primary oversight report, and the consistency of tenant satisfactionSpecifically, as evidenced by issues identified inAs a result, inAlso, the usefulness of OSDs primaryMoreover, data on servicemember satisfaction withNavy Program Oversight Did Not Identify and Address Some Project ConcernsThe Navys oversight program for monitoring Navy and Marine Corps projectsDOD headquarters.

Adequate program oversight is essential to help monitorHowever, in contrast to the Armys and Air ForcesTo illustrate, we foundThe Army and the Air Force alsoIn contrast, the Navys oversight program was less structured, includedSpecifically, in February 2004, the NavyAlthough the groups charter stated that it wouldNavy officials initially told us that theSubsequently, Navy officials told us that theDuring our visits to Navy and Marine Corps privatization projects, weFor exampleAccording toWhen we asked aboutWhen we again questioned theNavy officials also stated that, inJanuary 2002. The memorandum stated that the project would pay the NavyCorpus Christi beginning in calendar year 2002. The initial annual payment. However, when we asked about the payments in September 2005, we were toldWhen we againAs of January 2006, 4Also, data reported to OSDDuring our review, Navy officials stated that they had begun aThe officials stated that whileThe officials said that they planned toOSDs semiannual privatization program evaluation report is of limitedEstablished in JanuaryAlthough the reportFirst, as the number of awarded projects has increased from 7, when theBoth the ArmySecond, the reports usefulness has been limited because the report is notDecember 31, 2004, was due March 15, 2005, but it was not issued until. June 2005, 3 months late, and contained data that were about 6 months old. Similarly, the report containing project information as of June 30, 2005,Third, the reports include inaccuracies because data reported by theOSD officials stated that, although theyWe previously noted similar concerns about the privatization programAlthough the report now includes information on funds accumulated inThese concerns may be of additional importanceMethods for Measuring Servicemember

Satisfaction with Privatized Housing. Are Not Consistent.

The services have adopted different methods and time frames for collecting data. This limits the data's value for tracking occupancy. Given that the overall goal of the housing privatization program is to specifically, OSD requires the services to survey occupants and to report the information required by OSD could be useful in assessing satisfaction. The 2005 survey asked 72 questions on responses to most questions were requested using. However, the requested response. The survey asks 48 questions. Navy officials. However, due to disparities in the. In June 2005, the Air Force used the same. Navy asked with responses requested on a 5-point scale, including the. With different survey methods, questions, and time frames, the information. Thus, the value. Further, because housing satisfaction information. Lower Than Expected Occupancy Creates Concerns in Some Privatization Projects. Sixteen projects, or 36 percent, of 44 awarded privatization projects had. September 30, 2005, raising concerns about project performance. Although. Or, in the worst case, there could be project financial failures. Factors. However, without. Occupancy Was Below Expectations in Some Projects. We found that some awarded projects, as shown in table 2, were not meeting. According to service officials, the expected. After completion of the. Table 2 Awarded Privatization Projects with Occupancy Rates Below. Expectations as of September 30, 2005. Army. Fort Meade 94 80 2,778 2,230 548. Fort Stewart 94 79 3,089 2,433 656. Fort Hamilton 94 70 286 199 87. Fort 94 78 7,074 5,520 1,554. Fort Leonard Wood 94 83 2,229 1,853 376. Fort Bliss 94 83 3,001 2,491 510. South Texas 80 78 398 311 87. Kingsville IIb 97 89 150 133 17. TriCommand 93 83 1,680 1,393 287. Pendleton 93 89 3,656 3,261 395. Air Force. Dyess Air Force 97 86 402 344 58. Baseb. Hanscom Air Force 88 84 722 607 115. Base. Kirtland Air Force 90 85 1,078 919 159. Base. Little Rock Air 90 86 1,320 1,141 179. Force Base. Patrick Air Force 90 73 592 433 159. Base. Robins Air Force 97 83 670 559 111.

Baseb. Source DOD. Also, the table includes only six additional projects. Occupancy rates would have been lower if 20 projects had not rented units. Although the projects were justified on the basis of meeting the needs of. Normally, project. In a typical tenant waterfall, vacant. As of September 30, 2005, more specifically, 20 projects. In all, 2,077. Although renting vacant units to non-target tenants increases rental. For example, therefore, although occupancy rates. Lower Than Expected Occupancy Causes Financial Stress and Could Reduce. Funds for Future Reinvestment. When project occupancy levels are less than expected, project rental. Although the housing privatization program is relatively young and the. While many vacancies involved. Occupancy would have been lower. Of the occupied DOD civilian employees. The shortfall of 288 expected occupants had caused. For example, the projects net operating. The officials stated that lower. First, the poor. Second, increased housing. Third, recent. Fort Meade increased the availability of local housing. In response to the. February 2002.

At the time of our visit in September 2005, the occupancy. However, of the 87 vacant units, Navy. With reduced occupancy, the project. For example, in July 2005, the. Also, the projects debt coverage. Navy officials stated. Nevertheless, Navy officials expressed concern about the project and had. In August 2004, an agreement was. Air Force officials stated two reasons. First, increased housing allowances and attractive. Second, the projects design, which. Air Force's September 2005 portfolio summary report because of financial. Non-target tenants, including 135. Air Force officials attributed the. The project, which will consist of. The officials also said that. Although the projects non-target. For the quarter ending September 30, 2005, the. Air Force officials stated their belief that, as. Service officials stated that most vacant. According to. Also, although the. With lower than expected occupancy, the. In September 2005, the project. Marine Corps officials stated that the project faced little risk of. Still, the officials expressed concern about. In an effort to improve occupancy and financial. Marine Corps officials stated that. Increased Housing Allowances and Unreliable Needs Assessments. Contribute. Increases in monthly housing allowances and unreliable estimates of. Some causes of. Also, as the condition of. However, other factors, such as the impact of DODs zero-out-of-pocket. Yet, because

DOD has yet to implement these. For example, in June 2002, we noted that uncertainties existed in the. By January 2005, the average housing allowance fully covered the average. Table 3 Examples of Changes in Monthly Housing Allowances for. Servicemembers with Dependents. a. Corpus Christi, E6 715 1,333 86. Texas O3 857 1,393 63. Robins Air Force E3 540 898 66. Base, Georgia E6 673 967 44. Base, Florida E6 662 1,437 117. Station Beaufort, E6 701 1,271 81. South Carolina O3 853 1,345 58. Source DOD.

Our report further noted that increased housing allowances from the. First, increased allowances should decrease the. Second, over time, Third, increased allowances should allow DOD to better satisfy the. Yet, as of January 2006, DOD had. We also previously reported on changes needed to increase the reliability. We noted that one. To address these matters, we recommended that DOD provide the military. We also recommended that DOD. In response, DOD stated. Although the revised. Upcoming changes in personnel assignments at some installations resulting. Conversely, However, until September 2005 portfolio summary report, the Air Force highlighted this. Conclusions. Adequate privatization program oversight is essential to help monitor and Navy management will continue to lack assurance that it can become aware. Also, unless DOD. Further, until DOD. In the long term, if lower than expected occupancy rates and rental. Such concerns may occur in future privatization projects unless DOD fully. Recommendations for Executive Action. We recommend that the Secretary of Defense direct the Deputy Under. Secretary of Defense Installations and Environment to take the following. Agency Comments and Our Evaluation.

In written comments on a draft of this report, the Director for Housing. Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics fully agreed with three. Noting that our report was an important contribution to DOD's oversight of. Also, DOD intends to closely observe. DOD also stated that its. Nevertheless, because the evaluation report is the departments primary. DOD partially agreed with our recommendation that the Navy be required to. DOD stated that it disagreed with. DOD also stated that a review of other. Finally, DOD. We disagree with DOD's description of the Navys oversight of its housing. First, our report notes that in contrast with the Army and the Air Force, Further, we continue to believe that inaccurate. Marine Corps projects we reviewed indicates a lack of adequate oversight. Second, while the Navy and its consultant. We believe that this action indicates the Navy. Third, regarding the reimbursement. For example, we. On November. As of November 15. December 13, 2005, meeting with Navy privatization program officials, we. When we asked about the month in which the billing. Navy should be required to upgrade the monitoring and oversight of its. DOD partially agreed with our recommendation that DOD provide guidance to. DOD stated that tenant survey. DOD also agreed that 1 housing. Defense has been studying how to best implement such a survey. The intent. Ensuring that the services use a. However, we continue to believe that DOD. DOD's comments are reprinted in their entirety in appendix III. We are sending copies of this report to other interested congressional. Director, Office of Management and Budget. We will also make copies. In addition, the report will be. If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please call me. Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs may be found on the. The GAO staff members who made key contributions. Barry W. Holman, Director Defense Capabilities and Management. List of Congressional Addressees. The Honorable John Warner Chairman The Honorable Carl Levin Ranking.

Minority Member Committee on Armed Services United States Senate. The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison Chair The Honorable Dianne Feinstein. Ranking Minority Member Subcommittee on Military Construction and. Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Committee on Appropriations United. States Senate. The Honorable Duncan L. Hunter Chairman The Honorable Ike Skelton Ranking. Minority Member Committee on Armed Services House of Representatives. The Honorable James T. Walsh Chairman The Honorable Chet Edwards Ranking. Minority Member Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans. Affairs and Related Agencies Committee on Appropriations

House of Representatives. Appendix I. Scope and Methodology. To determine whether opportunities exist to improve the Department of Defense's DOD oversight of awarded housing privatization projects, we reviewed DOD's goals and milestones, and discussed issues affecting program status. We relied on program status. We questioned DOD. We also compared the issue dates. Further, we visited selected military installations with housing. Specifically, we visited Fort Meade, Maryland; Fort Stewart, Georgia; Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, Texas; Naval Air Station Kingsville, Texas; Naval Station San Diego, California; Patrick Air Force Base, Florida; Robins Air Force Base, Georgia; Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, California; and Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, Georgia. These installations were chosen because they contained together, the. To determine to what extent awarded privatization projects are meeting. We obtained. When occupancy rates were below expectations, we reviewed project. Further, we determined the. We conducted our work from July 2005 through February 2006 in accordance. Appendix II. Details on 12 Housing Privatization Projects. Table 4 provides details on the 12 housing privatization projects at the. Table 4 Details on the 12 Housing Privatization Projects We Visited. Fort Meade, existing Maryland, leased. May 2002 land. Fort Stewart existing Army Air leased.

<http://www.bouwdata.net/evenement/93-gmc-jimmy-manual>