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Abstract
Only hotels in the New England region, and to a lesser extent the Midwest region, experienced a positive price momentum this quarter, although both regions suffered poor performance from a year-over-year perspective. Hotels located in gateway cities outperformed hotels in non-gateway cities. Hotel financial operating performance continued to post positive profit with operating profit exceeding both a hotel property’s operating costs and its financial (borrowing) cost based on economic value analysis (EVA). Although the price of large hotels increased in the fourth quarter (as compared to quarter three), the price of small hotels declined quarter to quarter, and the price of both large and small hotels fell on a year-over-year basis. It appears that the price of both types of hotels is reverting to their moving average. The cost of hotel debt financing remained flat this quarter, while the cost of equity financing declined. In terms of risk premiums, there was no change in the risk premium for hotels compared to the risk-free rate. Besides this, the relative risk premium that lenders require for hotels over and above other commercial real estate has narrowed, indicating that lenders aren’t demanding a higher compensation for originating hotel loans. However, the spread between the 10-year Treasury and the 3-month Treasury was flat in the current period, which continues to raise concerns over its impact on market liquidity as well as its contribution to slower price growth in hotels. A reading of our tea leaves suggests that large hotels should be expected to decline in price. In contrast, the price of smaller hotels is anticipated to rise. This is report number 33 of the index series.
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EXHIBIT 1A

Times series hotel performance for 7 regions (post-recession)

Indices are set equal to 100 at 2011Q1. The graph shows that if an investor invested $100 in a representative hotel in each region, what the value of each hotel is at the end of 2019Q4.

ANALYSIS OF INDICES THROUGH Q4, 2019

Only hotels in the New England and Midwest regions exhibited positive price momentum. Exhibits 1a and 1b show that in the most recent quarter (2019Q4), hotels in the New England region (i.e., Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont) had positive price performance, increasing 10 percent quarter over quarter. Hotels in the Midwest region also exhibited positive price momentum, albeit to a lesser extent (3% quarter over quarter). All other regions experienced price declines. However, hotel price performance was negative on a year-over-year basis for all regions—ending 2019 on a sour note.
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In our inaugural issue of the Cornell Hotel Index series, we introduced three new quarterly metrics to monitor real estate activity in the hotel market. These are a large hotel index (hotels transactions of $10 million or more), a small hotel index (hotels under $10 million), and a repeat sales index (RSI) that tracks actual hotel transactions. These indices are constructed using the CoStar and RCA commercial real estate databases. The large and small hotel indices are similar in nature and construction to the consumer price index (CPI), while the repeat sale hotel index is analogous to the retail concept of same store sales. Using a similar logic process for hotels, we compare the sales and resales of the same hotel over time for that index. All three measures provide a more accurate representation of the current hotel real estate market conditions than does reporting the average transaction prices, because the average-price index doesn’t account for differences in the quality of the hotels, which also is averaged. A more detailed description of these indices is found in the first edition of this series, “Cornell Real Estate Market Indices,” which is available at no charge from the Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance. Starting with our 2018Q1 issue, we introduced the Gateway Cities Index as a new metric in our hotel analytics arsenal.

In this issue, we introduce our new Regional Indices to add further granularity to hotel performance. We also present updates and revisions to our hotel indices along with commentary and supporting evidence from the real estate market. New in this issue.

Cross-section hotel performance for 7 regions (post-recession)

Using the estimated hedonic prices for hotels in each region, this graph reports the price appreciation for a hotel in a given region on a quarter-over-quarter and a year-over-year basis. Gains are highlighted in bold, blue. The study of Corgel, J. B., Liu, C., & White, R. M. (2015). Determinants of hotel property prices. Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics, 51, 175-203 finds that a significant driver of hotel property prices is whether a hotel is located in a gateway city. The presumption is that hotels (and other real estate) in gateway cities exceed other cities as RIR generations in part due to a generally stronger economic climate as a result of higher barriers to entry, lighter supply, and, to relatively stronger performance in terms of revenue per available room than other top cities that are not gateways.

Sources: Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance, CoStar, Real Capital Analytics

About the Cornell Hotel Indices

New in this issue. Starting with this issue, we include 30+ days delinquent data for hotel loans that have been securitized into CMBS from Trepp to offer further insights to our readers on hotel trends.

Although the performance of hotels in gateway cities rose this quarter, it declined year over year. Non-gateway cities continued to exhibit poor performance. Exhibit 2 shows the relative price performance for hotels sold in gateway cities versus non-gateway cities. The performance of hotels in gateway cities reversed itself, rising 3.4 percent this quarter compared to a drop of 0.1 percent in the previous quarter. Hotels in non-gateway cities continued to decline further this quarter, falling from a reduction of 1.8 percent to a drop of 5.1 percent. Year over year, however, the price of hotels in both gateway and non-gateway cities fell, with a reduction of 8.7 percent for gateway cities and a drop of 10.2 percent for non-gateway cities. This continues the negative momentum that we noted in the prior year-over-year period in gateway cities (which saw a drop of 5 percent) and in non-gateway cities (which had gained just 0.6 percent in the third quarter).

The Center for Real Estate and Finance • Cornell University
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Hotel investment based on operating performance continues to be in the green (showing modest profit). Our Economic Value Added (EVA) indicator for 2019 Q3, shown in Exhibit 3, continues to be positive at 0.7 percent, compared to a 1.1-percent rise in the prior quarter (that is, 2019Q2). This indicates that at least some of the return on hotels is coming from operations, with profits not only covering operating costs but also financial costs (both the cost of debt and the cost of equity). Taken from a slightly different perspective (no-equity financing considered), the ACLI hotel cap rate, which is a proxy for the return on invested capital (ROIC) fell from 8.3 percent (in 2019Q2) to 6.67 percent (in 2019Q3), while the cost of debt financing as measured by the mortgage constant also declined over the same period, from 7.14 percent to 5.1 percent. Thus, as shown in Exhibit 4, positive leverage continued to exist in 2019Q3, the latest quarter for which ACLI data are available, making penciling deals feasible. Positive leverage means that the return that an investor receives from operations is higher than his or her borrowing cost (cost of debt financing).

The median price of hotels rose on a quarterly basis but declined on a year over year basis continuing the trend in the prior period. The median price based on all hotel transactions (both large hotels and small hotels combined) increased 5 percent from the previous quarter ($4.9M vs $4.7M) on weaker volume (381 transactions for 2019Q4 versus 402 transactions for 2019Q3), as reported...
### Transaction volume (obs) and median sale price, 1995–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Large Hotels (≥ $10 Million)</th>
<th>Small Hotels (&lt; $10 Million)</th>
<th>Gateway Cities</th>
<th>Non-Gateway Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>52,367.96</td>
<td>30,487.64 (55.7%)</td>
<td>21,880.32 (41.5%)</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>42,012.40</td>
<td>25,068.47 (59.6%)</td>
<td>16,943.93 (40.2%)</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>39,406.78</td>
<td>22,396.47 (56.9%)</td>
<td>17,010.31 (42.5%)</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>37,982.22</td>
<td>21,692.57 (56.9%)</td>
<td>16,289.65 (40.7%)</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>36,557.97</td>
<td>20,503.97 (55.9%)</td>
<td>16,054.00 (44.1%)</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>35,133.66</td>
<td>19,359.97 (55.3%)</td>
<td>15,773.69 (44.7%)</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33,709.34</td>
<td>18,126.47 (53.6%)</td>
<td>15,582.87 (45.4%)</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>32,285.02</td>
<td>16,992.57 (53.2%)</td>
<td>15,292.45 (47.0%)</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>30,860.70</td>
<td>15,858.57 (51.3%)</td>
<td>15,002.13 (49.6%)</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>29,436.38</td>
<td>14,724.57 (49.8%)</td>
<td>14,711.81 (49.8%)</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transaction volume (obs) and median sale price, 2005–2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>Large Hotels (≥ $10 Million)</th>
<th>Small Hotels (&lt; $10 Million)</th>
<th>Gateway Cities</th>
<th>Non-Gateway Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>54,330.00</td>
<td>31,410.00 (57.9%)</td>
<td>22,920.00 (41.8%)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>55,807.50</td>
<td>33,215.00 (59.7%)</td>
<td>22,592.50 (40.3%)</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>57,285.00</td>
<td>34,983.00 (62.4%)</td>
<td>22,292.00 (39.2%)</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>58,762.50</td>
<td>36,750.00 (62.1%)</td>
<td>21,912.50 (37.0%)</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>60,240.00</td>
<td>38,510.00 (63.9%)</td>
<td>21,630.00 (36.0%)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61,717.50</td>
<td>40,275.00 (64.3%)</td>
<td>21,342.50 (34.3%)</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>63,195.00</td>
<td>42,040.00 (66.2%)</td>
<td>21,055.00 (33.1%)</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>64,672.50</td>
<td>43,805.00 (66.3%)</td>
<td>21,267.50 (33.2%)</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>66,150.00</td>
<td>45,570.00 (69.3%)</td>
<td>20,580.00 (30.7%)</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>67,627.50</td>
<td>47,335.00 (69.7%)</td>
<td>20,292.50 (30.2%)</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Median Sale Price, Number of Sold Transactions, and the Percent of Total Sales is reported for the Full Sample, Large Hotels (≥ $10 Million), Small Hotels (< $10 Million), Gateway Cities and Non-Gateway Cities.
The median price of hotels fell by 23.8 percent compared to a drop of 8.2 percent in the prior year-over-year period, albeit on stronger volume (36.6% compared to 20.4% in the prior period).

A similar situation exists on a quarter-over-quarter basis for large hotels, with the median sale price of large hotels rising 8.6 percent on weaker transaction volume (-4.2%), while the median sale price of smaller hotels fell 5.7 percent on weaker volume (-5.6%). Exhibits 6 and 7 show this year-over-year trend in the number of transactions for large and small hotels.

Note that the number of transactions is limited to the sales that are included in the hedonic index. As such, it should not be construed as being the total market activity.
Our moving average trendlines and our standardized unexpected price (SUP) performance metrics both point to the price for both large hotels and small hotels reverting toward their long run average. Exhibit 9, which graphs the prices reported in Exhibit 8, shows that the price of large hotels reversed their downward trend, rising 1.74 percent this quarter compared to a decline of 2.1 percent last quarter. However, the price of small hotels fell 0.31 percent.

The first four columns are hedonic price indices while the remaining two columns are repeat sale indices. The hedonic price indices are similar in nature to consumer price indices. The repeat sales method assesses how hotel prices change over time by focusing on the different sale prices of the same hotel property.
Year-over-year change in large-hotel index with a moving average trendline

This exhibit graphs the year over year change in the large-hotel index and includes a moving average trendline using the data in Exhibit 8. The graph displays the long-term price trend of large hotels while eliminating seasonality.

Year-over-year change in Small-hotel index with a moving average trendline

This exhibit graphs the year over year change in the small-hotel index and includes a moving average trendline using the data in Exhibit 8. The graph displays the long-term price trend of small hotels while eliminating seasonality.

Sources: Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance, CoStar, Real Capital Analytics

Sources: Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance, CoStar, Real Capital Analytics

This quarter, compared to a drop of 1.1 percent last quarter. Year over year, Exhibit 10 shows that large hotels fell 4.3 percent (2018Q3–2019Q3) compared to a reduction of 7.7 percent posted in the prior year-over-year period (2018Q3–2019Q3). Exhibit 11 shows that smaller hotels declined 2.9 percent year over year (2018Q4–2019Q4), compared to the 0.35 percent increase in the prior period (2018Q3–2019Q3).

Consistent with our analysis thus far, our moving average trend lines for large hotels (in Exhibit 12) shows that the price for large hotels continues to hover below both its short-term and long-term moving average trend lines. This signals that large hotels continue to exhibit a weakness in price (negative price momentum). In contrast to this, Exhibi-
it 13 shows that the price for small hotels is still above both its short term and longer term moving average trend lines, although the spread between the price and these trend lines continued to narrow from the prior period. As stated earlier, this is due to declining price momentum for small hotels this period. This indicates a continued signal that small hotels are still a hold with a sell signal indicated for larger hotels.

Our Standardized Unexpected Price (SUP) metrics in Exhibit 14 show that the standardized price for large hotels has bounced back and is now above its lower confidence band. The standardized price for small hotels continued its negative price momentum converging toward its standardized mean of zero. In other words, Exhibit 15 shows that the standardized price of small hotels is reverting back toward its long-term average.

Sources: Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance, CoStar, Real Capital Analytics

EXHIBIT 13
Moving average trendline for small-hotel index

EXHIBIT 14
Standardized Unexpected Price (SUP) for large-hotel index

EXHIBIT 15
Standardized unexpected price (SUP) for small-hotel index
Repeat-sales metrics. Prices are slowly reverting to the mean. Our repeat-sale indicator, which reflects the price of hotels that have sold more than once, continues to revert toward both its short-term and long-term moving average, although it is still higher than both averages as displayed in Exhibit 16.\(^3\) Our SUP performance metric in Exhibit 17 indicates that standardized prices remained relatively stationary this quarter. Exhibit 18 shows that the repeat sale price index rose 2.8 percent year over year (2019Q4 to 2019Q3) compared to 3.5 percent in the prior period (2018Q3 to 2019Q3). From a quarter-over-quarter perspective, the index remained relatively flat, growing 0.48 percent in the current period (2019Q3-2019Q4) compared to 0.41 percent in the previous quarter (2019Q2-2019Q3).

\(^3\) Recall from our initial publication that we report two repeat sale indices. The repeat sale full sample index uses all repeat sale pairs whereas the repeat sale index with a base of 100 at 2000Q1 uses only those sales that occurred on or after the first quarter of 2000. In other words, the latter repeat sale index doesn’t use information on sales prior to the first quarter of 2000. As such, if a hotel sold in 1995 and then sold again in 2012, it would be included in the first repeat sale index e.g., repeat sale full sample index but it would not be included in the latter repeat sale index.
Mortgage financing volume for hotels fell year-over-year and quarter-over-quarter. Exhibit 19 shows that the mortgage origination volume for hotels as reported for 2019Q3 fell 20.3 percent year over year, continuing the declining trend from the prior period (-28.5%). From a quarterly perspective, mortgage origination volume fell 22.1 percent. The maximum loan-to-value (LTV) ratio for hotels remains at 70 percent.

The cost of hotel debt financing remained flat this quarter, although it has fallen on a year-over-year basis. The cost of obtaining hotel debt financing as reported by Cushman Wakefield Sonnenblick Goldman remained relatively flat this quarter for both Class A and Class B and C hotels. Exhibit 20 shows that interest rates on Class A and Class B and C hotel deals declined on a year-over-year basis by 22 percent compared to a 24.4-percent fall in the prior period. In particular, interest rates were 3.97 percent for Class A properties and 4.12 percent for Class B and C hotels this quarter, compared to 3.96 percent for Class A and 4.11 percent for Class B and C in the third quarter (August) of 2019. Year over year, interest rates fell from 5.09 percent to 3.97 percent for Class A Hotels, and from 5.29 percent to 4.12 percent for Class B and C Hotels. This downward trend in interest rates started in November 2018.

No change in the risk premium for hotels over the risk-free rate. Exhibit 21 depicts the interest rate spread between Class A (as well as Class B and C) interest rates on full-service hotels over the ten-year Treasury bond which is a leading indicator of hotel loan delinquencies. As this spread widens (narrows), lenders demand a higher (lower) compensation for making hotel loans.
is a leading indicator of hotel loan delinquencies. Exhibit 22 indicates that as this spread widens, which signals that lenders demand a higher compensation for making hotel loans, this demand is justified since delinquencies on hotel loans tend to rise in the subsequent quarters. Likewise, as the spread narrows, signaling that lenders demand lower compensation, the expectation is that delinquencies on hotel loans will tend to fall.

The relative risk premium that lenders require for hotels over other commercial real estate has narrowed. Exhibit 23 shows the spread between the interest rate on Class A (as well as B and C) full-service hotels compared to the equally weighted interest rate on other (non-hotel) commercial real estate. A positive spread associated with this hotel real estate premium indicates that lenders demand more compensation to make hotel loans compared to loans on office, retail, industrial and apartment properties because hotels are perceived to be a relatively riskier property type e.g., daily lease contracts.

The delinquency rate on hotel loans has inched up, but there is no cause for concern. The CMBS delinquency rate (30+ days) for lodging properties stands at 1.53 percent in December, up from 1.47 percent in September. A year ago, the rate was 1.51 percent. For comparison purposes, the monthly delinquency rate in December for other property types as reported by Trepp is as follows: industrial, 1.45 percent; multifamily, 2 percent; office, 1.98 percent; and retail, 4.42 percent. Thus we see that lodging recorded the second-lowest delinquency rate (after industrial properties), while retail was by far the worst performing major property type. Exhibit 24 displays the historical 30-plus-day delinquency rate for hotels.
day delinquency rate for hotels, while Exhibit 25 shows the standardized version of the 30-plus-day delinquency rate for hotels. Both exhibits reveal that the delinquency rate for hotels whose loans are securitized as part of CMBS deals are currently below their long-term average, although the standardized version of the hotel delinquency rate shows that the rate is reverting to its standardized average. The advantage of standardizing an indicator is that the mean is set equal to zero and the standard deviation is set equal to 1. If the indicator is above or below 1.645 (Z-score) then this indicates that the 30+ day hotel delinquency rate has reached a statistically significant (10% significance) new high or low respectively.

Cost of equity financing is now less expensive. The riskiness of hotels has shrunk relative to other types of commercial real estate. The cost of using equity financing for hotels as measured using the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) on hotel REIT returns continued to decline this quarter, as shown in Exhibit 26. The cost of using equity funds is currently at 6.9 percent for 2019Q3, compared to 7.3 percent for 2019Q2 (and 8.18 percent for 2019Q1). The cost of borrowing equity capital has thus fallen. In terms of total risk (systematic risk + risk that is unique to hotel REITs), Exhibit 27 shows that the total risk of hotel REITs relative to the total risk of equity REITs declined this quarter (-14.8%), and it declined as well on a year-over-year basis (-21.6%). This indicates that the perceived default risk for hotels has narrowed relative to other types of commercial real estate consistent with our other hotel-risk-premium indicators. Expect borrowing costs for hotel loans to remain constant if this trend persists, all else equal.

---

Sources: Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance, NAREIT

---

We calculate the total risk for hotel REITs using a 12-month rolling window of monthly returns on hotel REITs. As the risk differentials increases, the default risk for hotels relative to other types of commercial real estate is expected to increase as well which in turn should increase the interest rate on hotel properties.

---

We calculate the total risk for hotel REITs using a twelve-month rolling window of monthly returns on hotel REITs.
The spread between the 10-year Treasury and 3-month Treasury is flat this quarter and continues to be the Joker in the deck. The difference between the 10-year constant maturity U.S. Treasury rate and the 3-month constant maturity Treasury rate is widely used metric to study the yield curve. As the spread approaches zero, the yield curve flattens while a negative spread has historically been a leading indicator of a recessionary period. Exhibit 28 shows that the spread has now climbed back into positive territory, although for all practical purposes the yield curve is essentially flat. This situation poses a problem for banks who borrow short and lend long, as well as the CMBS market, which relies on an upward sloping yield curve for arbitrage (i.e., liquidity starts to dry up). Expect the price of large hotels to continue to fall, while the price of small hotels is anticipated to rise, based on our reading of the tea leaves. Exhibit 29 compares the performance of the repeat sales index relative to the NAREIT Lodging/Resort Price Index. The repeat sales index tends to lag the NAREIT index by at least one quarter or more. This is consistent with prior academic studies which find that securitized real estate is a leading indicator of underlying real estate performance since the stock market is forward looking or efficient. Looking ahead, the NAREIT lodging index rose 2.7 percent this quarter, compared to a decline of 2.7 percent in the previous quarter. It also increased 8.8 percent year-over-year, compared to a decline of 17.25 percent in the previous year-over-year period.

The architecture billings index (ABI) for commercial and industrial property, which represents another forward-looking metric, rose this quarter from the previous quarter, as shown in Exhibit 30 (52.9 versus 45.3). As of the time of this writing, only the November 2019 AIA Billings Index has been reported (as reported on December 18, 2019). See: www.aia.org/practicing/economics/aias076265.
the ABI increased 3.3 percent in the current period, compared to a fall of 10.8 percent in the previous year-over-year period. Expect positive price momentum based on the year-over-year trend in the ABI.

The National Association of Purchasing Managers (NAPM) index shown in Exhibit 31, which is an indicator of anticipated business confidence and thus business traveler demand, decreased 12.8 percent year over year (1.3% on a quarter-over-quarter basis), compared to a drop of 20.1 percent in the prior year over year period (2019Q3–2018Q3). Based on this indicator, expect the price of large hotels to continue to decline on a year-over-year basis.

The Consumer Confidence Index from the Conference Board graphed in Exhibit 32, which we use as a proxy for anticipated consumer demand for leisure travel and a leading indicator of the hedonic index for low priced hotels, gained 1.1 percent quarter-over-quarter, but fell 1.2 percent year over year, continuing the trend from the previous period (3%, quarter over quarter; -9.6% year over year). Expect the price momentum for small hotels to rise in the next quarter.

Sources: Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance, Institute for Supply Management (ISM)

Sources: Cornell Center for Real Estate and Finance, Conference Board

This graph compares the National Association of Purchasing Managers (NAPM) index which is an indicator of anticipated business confidence and thus business traveler demand to high-priced hotels. A reading over 50% indicates that business confidence is rising (shifting).

This graph compares the Consumer Confidence Index from the Conference Board which we use as a proxy for anticipated consumer demand for leisure travel to low-priced hotels (<$10 million). The consumer confidence index is a leading indicator of the hedonic index for low price hotels.

We have updated our hotel valuation regression model to include the transaction data used to generate this report. We provide this user-friendly hotel valuation model in an excel spreadsheet entitled HOTVAL Toolkit as a complement to this report which is available for download from our CREF website.
To implement this model in our current context, we use the three- or five-year moving average as our measure of \( \mu \) and the rolling three- or five-year average as our measure of \( \sigma \). The Standardized Unexpected Price (SUP) is calculated using the formula:

\[
SUP_Q = \frac{A_Q - \bar{A}}{\sigma_Q}
\]

where \( SUP_Q \) = quarter Q standardized unexpected earnings, \( A_Q \) = quarter Q actual earnings per share reported by the firm, \( \bar{A} \) = quarter Q consensus earnings per share forecasted by analysts in quarter Q-1, and \( \sigma_Q \) = quarter Q standard deviation of earnings estimates.

From statistics, the SUP is normally distributed with a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one (~N(0,1)). This calculation shows an earnings surprise when earnings are statistically significant, when SUP exceeds either \( \pm 1.645 \) (90% significant) or \( \pm 1.96 \) (95% significant). The earnings surprise is positive when SUP > 1.645, which is statistically significant at the 90% level assuming a two-tailed distribution. Similarly, if SUP < -1.645 then earnings are negative, which is statistically significant at the 90% level. Intuitively, SUP measures the earnings surprise in terms of the number of standard deviations above or below the consensus earnings estimate.

From our perspective, using this measure complements our visual analysis of the movement of hotel prices relative to their three-year and five-year moving average (\( \mu \)). What is missing in the visual analysis is whether prices diverge significantly from the moving average in statistical terms. In other words, we wish to determine whether the current price diverges at least one standard deviation from \( \mu \), the historical average price. The question we wish to answer is whether price is reverting to (or diverging from) the historical mean. More specifically, the question is whether this is price mean reverting.

To implement this model in our current context, we use the three- or five-year moving average as our measure of \( \mu \) and the rolling three- or five-year standard deviation as our measure of \( \sigma \). Following is an example of how to calculate the SUP metric using high hotel prices with regard to their three-year moving average. To calculate the three-year moving average from quarterly data we sum 12 quarters of data then divide by 12:

\[
\text{Average} (\mu) = \frac{Q_{78} + Q_{79} + \ldots + Q_{89}}{12}
\]

\[
\text{Standard Deviation} (\sigma) = 18.99
\]

\[
\text{Standardized Unexpected Price (SUP)} = \frac{Q_{89} - \mu}{\sigma} = 1.19
\]

The SUP data and Price surprise indicator (SUP) calculation for high-price hotels (12 quarters/3 years) are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>High-price hotels</th>
<th>Moving average</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>Price surprise indicator (SUP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q78</td>
<td>70.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q79</td>
<td>69.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q80</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q81</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q82</td>
<td>67.05</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q83</td>
<td>66.62</td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q84</td>
<td>65.99</td>
<td>67.15</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q85</td>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>66.46</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q86</td>
<td>64.99</td>
<td>65.84</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q87</td>
<td>64.25</td>
<td>65.37</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q88</td>
<td>63.11</td>
<td>64.28</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q89</td>
<td>62.36</td>
<td>63.55</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CREF Advisory Board includes various professionals from the hospitality industry, including hotel owners and managers, investors, and academics. The board is involved in various advisory capacities, ranging from real estate advisory to finance and investment management. The center’s reports and advisories are typically distributed to a selective audience of members and subscribers in the hospitality real estate industry.