FUNDAMENTO

The Hotel Owner's & Operator's Manual

Buy it, brand it, staff it, fill it, run it by the numbers, and exit well — with the industry's own arithmetic, applied to the decision in front of you.

FREE EXCERPT · PARTS I & II OF VIII

The only two parts that answer a single question — should you own a hotel at all — before any chapter on buying, running, or exiting one. Unabridged, from the same First Edition manual.

FIRST EDITION · AUGUST 2026

Decisiones hoteleras, sobre fundamentos sólidos.

FOREWORD

The most measured business, the least translated

No asset class keeps score like this one. Hotels have kept their books to a uniform system since 1926 — a century of standardized accounts, a benchmarking industry that reports weekly, general managers who can quote last night’s rate to the dime. Reported The Uniform System of Accounts for the Lodging Industry was first published by the Hotel Association of New York City in 1926 and reaches its 12th Revised Edition — mandatory for reporting periods beginning 1 January 2026 — in its hundredth year (USALI 12th Revised Edition, HFTP/AHLA, released July 2024, adoption date 1 January 2026; first edition, Hotel Association of New York City, 1926).

And yet hotels are bought on stories. On the pro forma’s seventeen percent. On the brand deck’s conversion curve. On a broker’s trailing twelve that no one normalized. The gap in this industry has never been data — it is translation: between the operator who lives in the departmental schedules and the owner who signs for the debt; between the franchise sales office and the family that will pay the fee stack for twenty years; between what a STAR report says and what anyone does about it on Monday.

This manual is that translation layer. Two properties run through every chapter — a 92-key branded select-service hotel and a 12-room independent inn — with every number derived from inputs printed on the page, every outside figure tagged and dated, and every rule of thumb shipped with the conditions under which it breaks. It is written for the investor deciding whether hotels belong in a portfolio at all, the owner who must govern brands, managers and lenders, and the operator who has to make budget — because in this industry, sooner or later, each of them discovers they are the other two.

A note on how the book computes. Every worked figure derives from two teaching anchors whose inputs are stated once and never quietly changed, through one computation engine that accompanies the manuscript; the same code regenerates every exhibit, and an independent verification pass recomputes the headline results from fresh formulas before any edition ships. Outside figures are tagged, dated and ledgered. This is more machinery than a book usually admits to — but this industry’s pathology is confident numbers with unstated parents, and the cure had to be structural, not stylistic.

And a note on who it is for. The investor deciding whether hotels deserve a place at all should read Parts I and II and stop — the honest answer may be a REIT, and the book says so. The buyer lives in Parts III and IV. The owner-operator lives in Parts V through VII and returns to them monthly. The seller — every owner, eventually — has Part VIII waiting. Families governing hotel capital through committees have a companion volume built on this same engine; its cross-references point back into these pages.

Nothing here is a pitch. Where the honest answer is “usually no,” the chapter opens by saying so.

— Fundamento

Two hotels, one method

Every worked figure in this book belongs to one of three anchors, whose inputs are stated once, here, and never quietly changed. When a chapter says *the hotel* or *the inn*, it means these:

	HOTEL A — THE BRANDED ANCHOR	HOTEL B — THE INN
Asset	92-key premium-branded select-service, third-party managed	12-room independent coastal inn, owner-operated
Basis	$14,720,000 — $160,000 per key	$2,340,000, bought without debt
Year-one market	71% occupancy · $138.00 ADR	58% occupancy · $210.00 ADR, heavily seasonal
Contracts	Franchise stack 11.9% of rooms revenue; management 3% base + incentive; 4% FF&E reserve	No flag, no manager; a market-rate owner-manager salary is charged to the P&L
Debt	Sized by the market in Chapter 11 — the binding constraint, not the ask	None at purchase; Chapter 11 prices the SBA route

A third case — a 110-key ground-up development at $22,550,000 all-in — appears only in Chapter 13. The anchors are **teaching devices, not benchmarks**: your market, your contracts and your cost basis will move every figure, which is why each exhibit prints its inputs beside its outputs.

Reading conventions

Statements of consequence carry a tag, so you can always tell what kind of sentence you are being asked to accept. `Reported` marks a figure quoted from an outside source, cited in place with publisher, edition or section, and date; the principal sources are consolidated in *Sources and method* at the back, which also names the few claims whose page-level cites still await the purchased editions. (Working drafts carried gold braces around unresolved sources; this edition's citations are resolved as of August 2026.) `Computed` marks a number this manual derives itself, from inputs printed on the same page. `Inference` marks a judgment drawn from those numbers — reasonable, arguable, and labeled so you can argue with it. `Recommendation` marks a proposed action. Untagged prose is exposition. Estimated figures carry a trailing "+".

Three further conventions. Every bottom line states what it includes — "after a 4% reserve," "federal income tax only," "before management fees" — on the line itself, not in a distant footnote. Monetary examples are in United States dollars purely for arithmetic convenience; the method is currency-neutral. And cross-references use section numbers — §14.4 is Chapter 14, fourth section — so every claim can name exactly where its support lives.

This manual explains arithmetic and industry practice; it does not know your facts. Nothing in it is legal, tax, investment or accounting advice, and the tax chapters in particular assume United States federal rules as of this edition's date — engage licensed counsel and a hospitality-literate CPA before acting on any of it.

PART I

Foundations

What a hotel actually is — an operating business wearing a building — the five numbers that govern every decision about one, the accounting language the industry keeps its books in, and the vocabulary that separates a good outcome from an expensive education.

MOST SEARCHED *"should I buy a hotel" · "are hotels a good investment" · "hotel vs rental property"* RANK 4 CLUSTER · CPC $8–$35

PART I · FOUNDATIONS · CHAPTER 01

A business wearing a building

01

THE SHORT ANSWER

A hotel is an operating business collateralized by real estate; every consequence in this book — value, tax, debt, staffing, exit — follows from that split. The building is the smaller part of what you are buying, and treating the purchase as a real-estate deal with a lobby is the first expensive mistake this manual prices.

Most real estate earns rent for existing. A hotel earns nothing for existing: it earns for what happens inside it tonight, staffed by people, priced by the hour of booking, and sold one night at a time to customers who owe it no loyalty tomorrow. That is not a defect. It is the asset class — and it is purchasable, measurable, and governable, provided you name it correctly on day one.

1.1 What you actually bought: the going concern

Close on an apartment building and you have bought real property. Close on Hotel A and you have bought three things at once: the land and building; the furniture, fixtures and equipment that make it rentable tonight (the industry says **FF&E**); and an operating business — the flag relationship, the booking pipeline, the trained staff, the operating licenses, the guest data. Appraisers call the bundle a **going concern**, and the allocation among its parts is not bookkeeping trivia. It decides four separate bills.

WORKED EXAMPLE — STATED ALLOCATION, HOTEL A

What $14,720,000 actually buys — a going-concern allocation

Real property — land and improvements, 78% of price	$11,481,600
FF&E — case goods, soft goods, systems, 12%	$1,766,400
Operating business — contracts, workforce in place, pipeline, 10%	$1,472,000
The going concern, as one price	**$14,720,000**

Computed The percentages above are this manual's stated allocation for Hotel A, in the range appraisals commonly produce for select-service assets; your appraisal will differ, and §10.3 shows how the allocation is actually derived. What matters here is that the split exists and that four consequences hang from it.

First, **property tax**: many jurisdictions tax real property but not business value, so an assessment on the full $14,720,000 rather than the $11,481,600 of realty overtaxes you by design — the appeal arithmetic is §20.3. Second, **depreciation**: FF&E lives a five-to-seven-year tax life while the building lives thirty-nine, which is why hotels are the natural habitat of cost segregation (§23.2). Third, **debt**: lenders collateralize the realty and discount the rest, one reason hotel leverage runs lower than apartment leverage at the same price (§11.3).

Fourth, the **exit**: a hotel sells as a going concern with employees, licenses and contracts in motion — a transfer Chapter 30 walks hour by hour.

The allocation also has four readers, and they sit on four different sides of the table. The county assessor prefers the realty number large, because it is what he may tax; the lender sizes against the realty and discounts the rest, because a foreclosure sells a building, not a workforce; the IRS reads the same exhibit for depreciation lives and audits enthusiasm in either direction; and the buyer of your eventual exit will commission an appraisal arguing the mirror image of whatever yours argued. One number, four adversarial readings — which is why the split is set by supportable method (§10.3 derives it from the P&L itself) and written into the purchase agreement as negotiated language rather than a closing formality. At the inn's scale the same allocation carries a humbling corollary: much of the "operating business" *is* the innkeeper, which is why §3.5 prices the owner's labor onto the P&L before any value is claimed for what surrounds it.

1.2 Leases that reprice nightly

The defining economics of the asset class fit in one sentence: **a hotel is real estate whose every lease expires every morning.** An apartment owner reprices a unit once a year; an office owner once a decade. Hotel A reprices 92 units every night — 33,580 separate leases a year, each one a fresh negotiation with a market that owes it nothing. Everything people love and fear about hotels is this fact wearing different clothes.

	APARTMENT BUILDING	HOTEL
Lease term	12 months	One night
Pricing power	Annual, capped by comps and statute	Nightly, in both directions — the only real asset that captures inflation weekly, and recession weekly too
Expense ratio	35–45% of revenue	Hotel A runs 58.6% of revenue before fixed charges — most of it people (§18)
Staff per unit of revenue	Minimal; largely outsourced	The largest line on the P&L; a labor business at its core
Revenue in a bad year	Dips; leases cushion the fall	Falls the same week demand does — the 2020 record is §7.1
Where the return comes from	Mostly the building	Mostly the operation; the building is the ticket to run it

Owning speed is not the same as exercising it. The market reprices nightly whether or not the property does; a rate sheet reviewed monthly in a market that moves weekly is a standing donation to the comp set, collected one underpriced compression night at a time. So the nightly lease is a capability to be staffed — Chapter 17's revenue hour exists because speed unmanaged runs mostly one way — and an asymmetry to be respected: rate taken in strong weeks compounds quietly through the index, while rate surrendered in a panic takes quarters to rebuild, because the cheapest guest a hotel ever buys re-anchors what the next guest expects to pay (§17.2 builds the floor that stops the slide). Speed, staffed, is the asset class's gift; speed, unstaffed, is volatility with a franchise fee.

Inference Read the right-hand column twice and notice it is neither better nor worse — it is *faster*. The nightly lease is why hotel owners kept pace with the 2021–22 inflation while apartment owners waited for renewals, and why the same owners gave revenue back within days in the spring of 2020. Speed is the asset class. You are choosing whether to own speed.

1.3 The four roles a hotel can play

Before any underwriting, name the role the property is supposed to play, because each role has a different honest test and a different characteristic failure.

A cash-flow business. The test is Chapter 2's five numbers and the failure is buying the real estate story while ignoring the operation — Hotel A earns $884,236 after its reserve (6.0% on price) only if somebody runs it to a 41.4% GOP margin, and margins are made, not included in the deed. **An appreciation vehicle.** The test is basis versus replacement cost and the failure is paying an operating multiple for a real-estate thesis. **A development canvas.** The test is Chapter 13's spread over buying stabilized; the failure is counting the ramp-up as if it were year one. **A legacy and a life.** The inn is this manual's standing example — a legitimate role with one non-negotiable rule: the owner's labor goes on the P&L at a market salary (§3.5), because a business that only profits when you work free is a job with a deed attached.

Roles also drift, and drift is expensive in a specific way: a property justified as "a bit of everything" gets priced at the most expensive of its stories. The buyer who defends a cash-flow price with an appreciation argument and a development footnote has run three half-tests and passed none of them — each role's test exists precisely to say no on its own terms. The discipline is annual as well as initial: the January review of Chapter 29 begins by re-reading the role sentence, because a hotel bought as a cash-flow business that has quietly become a legacy is not wrong, but it is a different deal, and it deserves the different arithmetic this book runs for it.

Recommendation Write the role down before the first tour, in one sentence, and hand it to whoever will argue with you later. Every subsequent chapter asks "does this decision serve the stated role?" — and the properties that go wrong are almost always serving a role nobody ever stated.

1.4 Three parties, one P&L

One more naming exercise, because it shapes everything in Part IV. A branded, managed hotel has three principals: the **owner**, who holds title, signs the debt and keeps what is left; the **brand**, paid a share of revenue for demand and standards; and the **manager**, paid a share of revenue (and a promote on profit) to run the building. Only one of the three has capital at risk in this deal — and it is the one reading this book. The other two are paid substantially on the top line, which makes them structurally more enthusiastic about revenue than about profit. That is not villainy; it is a contract shape, and contracts can be governed. Chapter 14 prices the brand, Chapter 15 the manager, Chapter 16 the governance.

Two more chairs complete the table. The lender has no upside, only return *of* capital plus a spread, which is why covenants read like smoke detectors (§11.5) and why the lender is the one party whose enthusiasm never needs governing. And the guest — the only participant who reprices the asset daily — sits invisibly at the head. The P&L seats them all in payout order: the brand collects inside the marketing and program lines, the manager on its own line at the operation's edge, the lender at debt service, and the owner keeps whatever survives the procession — which is Part III's entire argument compressed to a seating chart. Learn the order once and every fee negotiation in Part IV becomes a question of moving your chair.

The table metaphor earns one caution before the book uses it for twenty-nine more chapters: alignment is a spectrum, not a verdict, and the parties are adversaries about surplus while being genuine partners about the enterprise. The brand truly wants your property to thrive — thriving units grow systems; the manager truly wants the GOP to compound — careers are built on it; the lender truly wants your survival — workouts are expensive. What each also wants is a slightly larger slice of the outcome than the last negotiation gave them, and mistaking the second fact for enmity is as costly as mistaking the first for charity. The posture the whole book models: cooperate on the enterprise loudly, negotiate the surplus precisely, and never let either conversation borrow the other's tone.

1.5 The owner's year, before the owner's deal

Because the purchase gets all the attention, it is worth saying now what owning actually feels like once the wire clears. The work arrives on four clocks. **Weekly**, a fifteen-minute read of the STAR report and the pickup — not to manage the managers but to know the property's pulse before anyone summarizes it for you. **Monthly**, the ninety-minute owner's review of Chapter 16: the five numbers of §2.3 against budget, the reserve funded, the exceptions explained by the people who own them. **Quarterly**, capital: the reserve schedule of §21.1 against what the building is actually telling the engineers, and the tax estimates of Chapter 22 paid before penalties price them. **Annually**, the three heavyweight sessions — budget season in the fall, insurance renewal with §7.4's program sheet on the table, and the January hour in which Chapter 29's four doors get run on fresh facts even when the answer is obviously "hold." The full calendar, month by month, is Appendix F; the point here is its shape: ownership done well is a small number of unmissable meetings, not a second career — and ownership done badly is usually just the same meetings, skipped.

- ▢ **The deed file.** Title policy, survey, zoning letter, certificates of occupancy — the papers that prove the building may be what it is.
- ▢ **The contract stack.** Franchise agreement, HMA, equipment leases, service contracts with terms past one year — everything §4.3 says does not transfer by itself.
- ▢ **The people file.** Org chart, wage schedule, handbook, union agreements if any — the workforce in place you paid for in §1.1's allocation.
- ▢ **The numbers file.** Three years of monthly P&Ls, the trailing twelve, the last two STAR reports, the reserve ledger — the raw material of Part III.
- ▢ **The licenses.** Liquor, food service, pool, elevator, fire inspections — each with its renewal date on the Appendix F calendar.
- ▢ **The insurance program.** The policy schedule of §7.4 — carriers, limits, deductibles, and the named-storm arithmetic nobody reads until the storm is named.

Recommendation Build the six-folder file above during diligence and hand it to yourself at closing. Every document in it is one you will need at speed within the first year — at the insurance renewal, the tax appeal, the first lender site visit — and the owners who assemble it under deadline pressure pay for the delay in worse answers.

1.6 Reading a hotel the first time you walk one

Everything in this book eventually becomes numbers, but the numbers begin as a building, and owners who can read a building catch what the P&L launders. The first walk has a method, and it starts where the tour does not. **The back of house first.** Ask to enter through the loading dock. The housekeeping corridor tells you the operation's truth in ninety seconds: carts stocked and staged mean a functioning staffing model (§18.2); a linen room that smells like mildew means the laundry's exhaust — and the §21.3 calendar — gave up years ago; the engineer's shop, tidy or chaotic, is the POM line (§3.7) wearing overalls. **The roof and the mechanical rooms second.** You are not inspecting — that is the §12 engineer's job — you are dating: equipment nameplates carry manufacture years, and a roofline of fifteen-year-old package units is the §21.5 component ledger announcing its next decade out loud. **The lobby last, at the wrong hour.** Every lobby works at 3 p.m.; walk it at 7 a.m. when the breakfast is at capture (§19.4) and at 11 p.m. when one agent runs the desk. Watch the line, not the finishes — queue length at breakfast and check-in is service capacity (§18.4's relief factor) made visible. **Then the block.** Walk the comp set's lobbies the same day: the index (§8.3) is an abstraction until you have stood in the five buildings it averages, at which point a 96 becomes a diagnosis you can see — theirs newer, yours better located, the story §8.5 will price. None of this replaces a single exhibit in Part III; it is what makes the exhibits mean something, and it costs one afternoon. The industry's oldest hands underwrite with their feet first and their spreadsheets second — not because the walk outranks the model, but because the walk decides which model deserves building.

Recommendation Take the walk before the first serious conversation about price, and write one page the same evening: five observations, each with the section of this book it points to. That page — not the offering memorandum — is the honest start of your underwriting file, and §12.5's calendar will thank you for the head start.

The walk also calibrates the single most useful instinct in hotel diligence: the gap test. Every property presents two versions of itself — the one in the photographs and the one at the loading dock — and the *size of the gap* between them predicts more than either version alone. A modest lobby above an immaculate linen room is an operation run from the inside out: buy the story. A renovated lobby above a chaotic back-of-house is capital spent where buyers look instead of where guests sleep — the §8.2 bridge's deferred-maintenance line, previewed in ninety seconds. Sellers stage what they know you will see; buildings confess in the rooms nobody staged, and the whole craft of the first walk is knowing which rooms those are.

1.7 How the industry got this shape: a paragraph of history per layer

The three-party structure of §1.4 was built, not decreed, and each layer's origin explains its behavior. **The uniform accounts came first**: New York's hoteliers published a common system in 1926 so that owners, operators and the era's new hotel lenders could read one another's books — a century later that system is the USALI of Chapter 3, and its age is why hotels are the best-measured operating real estate on earth (*Uniform System of Accounts for the Lodging Industry*, first published by the Hotel Association of New York City, 1926; 12th Revised Edition, HFTP/AHLA, 2024, adopted 1 January 2026). **The brands came next, roadside**: postwar highways created demand for a promise — a known standard at an unknown exit — and franchising let local capital build what national names sold; the §14.1 fee stack is that bargain's modern descendant, still priced as a percentage of the demand the promise delivers. **The management split came last**: from the 1970s onward, brands and operators discovered they could grow faster selling services than owning buildings — capital-light fees beat capital-heavy ownership in every equity market — and the modern "asset-light" industry emerged: brands own standards, managers own process, and owners own everything with a roof, a debt service and a bad year attached. Read once, the history is trivia; read twice, it is the negotiation map of Part IV — every counterparty across the table is optimizing the position a century of structure assigned it, fees on revenue, growth in units, risk with you — and none of it is personal. The owner's compensating advantage is the same age: the accounts are uniform, the benchmarks are weekly, and everything in this book is computable precisely because the industry spent a hundred years making itself legible to the people who sign for it.

A closing word on what the century's structure means for the reader's own decade. Because the industry made itself legible, the owner's advantage has never been information — the STAR subscriber in the next town reads the same numbers — it is *metabolism*: how quickly a property converts what the numbers say into what the building does. Every chapter ahead is built on that conviction. The uniform accounts, the weekly benchmarks, the priced vocabulary are the shared endowment; the compounding difference is the owner who holds the monthly ninety minutes, funds the calendar, asks the governed question — while the identically-informed neighbor files the same reports unread. Legibility is the industry's gift; attention is the owner's only private asset.

And a word on scale, since the two anchors will walk every chapter together. Nothing in the going-concern logic changes between twelve rooms and ninety-two — the allocation, the nightly lease, the stated role, the three parties all scale — but the *ratios of attention* invert: the inn is operations-heavy and structure-light, the anchor structure-heavy and operations-delegated, and most errors of small-hotel literature come from handing one scale the other's emphasis. Where a chapter's advice bends at one anchor, the text says so at the bend; where it is silent, the principle carries across unmodified, and that silence is deliberate.

> CHAPTER 01 IN ONE LINE
>
> A hotel is an operating business that comes with a building — allocate the price, respect the nightly lease, state the property's role, and never forget you are the only party at the table whose money is in it.

MOST SEARCHED *"what is RevPAR" · "RevPAR vs ADR" · "how much profit does a hotel make"* RANK 3 CLUSTER · CPC $4–$18

PART I · FOUNDATIONS · CHAPTER 02

The metrics ladder

02

THE SHORT ANSWER

Five numbers govern every hotel decision — RevPAR index, GOP margin, NOI after a stated reserve, DSCR, and cash-on-cash. Everything else the industry quotes is either an ingredient of one of the five or commentary on it, and this chapter builds the ladder that connects them, rung by rung, on both anchors.

The industry drowns its owners in metrics precisely because most of them are harmless to quote. Occupancy flatters the discounter. ADR flatters the empty luxury property. Revenue flatters everyone. The ladder below exists so that every number you hear can be placed — an ingredient, a checkpoint, or one of the five that actually move money.

2.1 From tonight's rate to the owner's pocket

Every hotel metric is a stop on one ladder that runs from a single night's pricing down to what ownership can spend. Here is the whole ladder on Hotel A, each rung computed from the one above it:

WORKED EXAMPLE — THE LADDER

Hotel A — the ladder, top to bottom, year one

Occupancy — 23,842 of 33,580 available room-nights	71.0%
ADR — average daily rate on occupied rooms	$138.00
RevPAR — occupancy × ADR: revenue per *available* room-night	**$97.98**
TRevPAR — total revenue (rooms + other) per available room-night	$101.90
GOPPAR — gross operating profit per available room-night (41.4% margin)	**$42.19**
… GOP in dollars, the operator's line (§3.2)	$1,416,758
less management fees, fixed charges, and the 4% reserve (§3.4)	-$532,522
EBITDA less replacement reserve — what the year actually left	**$884,236**

Computed Each rung is the rung above it multiplied by a discipline: RevPAR is pricing discipline, GOPPAR is operating discipline, the bottom line is contract-and-capital discipline. A hotel can win any single rung and still lose the ladder — which is why no single quoted metric, however flattering, is ever an answer.

Vocabulary worth fixing now: **RevPAR** divides rooms revenue by *available* rooms, so it cannot be flattered by closing floors; **ADR** divides by *occupied* rooms, so it can. **TRevPAR** adds the other departments; **GOPPAR** is the profit version and the fairest single test of an operator. All four are defined, with their USALI references, in Appendix A.

One convention beneath the vocabulary deserves its own sentence: the denominator is where ladders get quietly bent. "Available rooms" means every key the building holds, less only rooms out of order for renovation under an approved capital plan — not rooms closed because demand was soft, a maneuver that flatters occupancy, RevPAR and housekeeping productivity in one stroke and appears in exactly this form in more than one distressed property's final good year. The owner's defense is dull and total: the room count is stated once, in the management agreement's reporting exhibit, and every per-available metric in every report uses it until a capital project says otherwise in writing (§16.2 makes the denominator one of the operator's standing representations).

The ladder also settles a vocabulary dispute that wastes real meeting time: which single metric "matters most." The honest answer is positional — each rung matters most *to the decision that lives on it*. Pricing decisions live on RevPAR and its index; operating grades live on GOPPAR and flow-through; valuation and debt live on earnings after reserve; the family's own solvency lives on cash after service. A metric promoted outside its rung stops informing and starts distorting — the property managed "to RevPAR" buys occupancy with margin (§2.2's asymmetry, ignored), and the one managed "to cash" starves the reserve the building will invoice later. The ladder is not a ranking; it is an address system, and the chapter's real teaching is knowing which floor every argument belongs on.

2.2 A rate dollar is worth more than an occupancy dollar

Two roads raise RevPAR: sell more rooms, or sell the same rooms for more. They are not worth the same. An occupied room costs money to serve — housekeeping, supplies, commissions, laundry — while a rate increase on a room you were selling anyway costs nothing to deliver. Using Hotel A's stated 25% variable rooms cost:

WORKED CALCULATION — RATE VERSUS VOLUME

The same RevPAR gain, two ways — Hotel A

Road one: occupancy 71% → 76% at the same $138.00 ADR	RevPAR $104.88
Added profit — each added room-night keeps 75% after variable cost	+$173,756
Road two: ADR +$9.72 at the same 71% occupancy	RevPAR $104.88
Added profit — a rate dollar on an already-sold room keeps ~100%	+$231,674
Rate road advantage, identical RevPAR	**+$57,919**

Inference This asymmetry runs the whole book. It is why revenue managers defend rate integrity (§17.4), why discount-led occupancy can grow revenue while shrinking profit, and why the two flags in §14.4 are compared on profit delivered, never on RevPAR alone. Before commissions the asymmetry above is understated, not over- stated: the occupancy road usually arrives through paid channels (§17.3).

Two honest limits keep the asymmetry from becoming a slogan. Rate has a ceiling the market sets, not the spreadsheet: pushed past the comp set's tolerance, the rate road converts quietly into an occupancy problem wearing a better ADR — which is why §17.2 reads rate and index as two lenses of one instrument and never celebrates either alone. And the occupancy dollar, worth less at the margin, buys two things the rate dollar cannot: bodies in the building who spend in §19's departments, and the base of sold nights that lets the property hold rate through the next compression (§17.1's pickup discipline). The asymmetry decides *which road to prefer when both are open*; it does not excuse abandoning either.

2.3 The five numbers, on both anchors

Of everything the ladder produces, five numbers — and only five — appear in every major decision this manual works: one for the market's verdict, one for the operation, one for the property's earning power, and two for the capital structure. Both anchors, side by side:

THE NUMBER	HOTEL A	THE INN	WHAT IT ANSWERS, AND WHERE
RevPAR index vs comp set	96.0%	127.7%	Is the market choosing you? Below ~95 there is a story to fix — §8.2, §17.2
GOP margin	41.4%	31.6%	Is the operation converting revenue to profit? Segment context in §8.2
EBITDA less reserve	$884,236	$100,529	What the property truly earns — the valuation and lending basis, §10.2
DSCR	1.40×	no debt	Can the earnings carry the debt? The lender's floor sizes the loan — §11.2
Cash-on-cash	3.5%	4.3%	What equity earns in cash this year — and the patience test, §2.4

Inference Read the two columns as diagnoses, not grades. Hotel A indexes at 96.0% — the market is choosing the comp set slightly over us, which is either the previous owner's neglect or the buyer's upside thesis, and Chapter 8 shows how to tell which. The inn indexes at 127.7% on rate and runs 58% occupancy — a rate crown on an occupancy problem, the classic seasonal-market signature (§9.3). Same five numbers, opposite prescriptions.

The five earn one more duty: they are the property's shared language with its capital. The lender's annual review (§11.7 scripts it) reads DSCR and earnings after reserve; a partner's quarterly pack reads all five in a fixed order; and the discipline that makes both meetings short is refusing to let any other number chair them. When a counterparty leads with a metric not on the ladder — enthusiasm's favorites are revenue growth and "index momentum" — the owner's question is always the same: which of the five does it move, in which direction, by when? A claim that cannot answer is commentary; a claim that can has just converted itself into underwriting.

2.4 What the five numbers are not

Three honest cautions before the ladder gets used. **Year one is not the investment.** Hotel A's cash-on-cash of 3.5% — $252,639 on $7,205,413 of equity — looks unglamorous beside the syndication decks of Chapter 5, and it is the honest number: fairly-bought hotels pay their owners in the ramp, the amortization and the exit, not in year one. **The reserve is not optional.** Every figure in this book that says "after reserve" means cash actually set aside; Chapter 21 shows what happens to owners who treat the 4% as decoration. **Averages are not your hotel.** The five numbers exist precisely so that when a broker, a brand or a benchmark quotes you an average, you can ask which of the five it moves, by how much, on your property.

A fourth caution earns its place after the first year: **the five are levels; management lives in velocities.** A 96 index is a fact; three consecutive months of 99–97–96 is a diagnosis. The monthly page of §2.6 therefore carries trend beside level for every line, and the owner's standing rule — three months moving the wrong way is a conversation, whatever the absolute number — is what keeps good properties from coasting on last year's rungs and bad months from being explained one at a time until the year is gone (§27.3 turns the rule into thresholds with names attached).

2.5 Flow-through: the operator's report card

One derived metric earns a place beside the five because it is how owners grade operators between years. **Flow-through** asks: of each additional revenue dollar, how much reached GOP? Its mirror, **retention**, asks how much GOP survived each lost dollar. Hotel A, flexed 5% in each direction at the stated §7.2 conventions:

WORKED CALCULATION — FLOW-THROUGH AND RETENTION

Hotel A — a 5% revenue move, both directions

Revenue up 5%	+$171,090
GOP up — the flow-through	+$107,175 (63%)
Revenue down 5%	-$171,090
GOP down — the giveback	-$107,175 (63%)
The model's symmetric flex, from the stated fixed shares	**63%**

Computed The model flexes symmetrically because its fixed shares are stated constants — traced to source, departmental expense runs 75% variable⁄25% fixed and undistributed 30% variable⁄70% fixed at the stated §7.2 shares, the franchise stack is 100% variable on rooms revenue, fixed charges are 0% variable, and blending those against Hotel A's own department weights is what the 62.6% above falls out of, not a separately chosen number. Real operations are not symmetric — costs climb willingly and descend under protest — so operators are graded against asymmetric standards: rate-led revenue should flow through at 60–75% (a rate dollar arrives nearly clean, §2.2), occupancy-led revenue at 40–55%, and in a downturn a good operator holds the giveback near 50¢ on the dollar for the first 10% of revenue lost. Ask for flow-through on every monthly report; §16.2 turns it into the operator's standing grade.

Flow-through has one failure mode worth naming before it is used in anger: it can be manufactured. An operator who starves the §21.3 maintenance calendar, defers the soft-goods cycle and lets the §18.2 staffing model run hot will post beautiful retention for six or eight quarters — the giveback held near fifty cents while the building quietly converts its future into this year's grade. The antidote is pairing: flow-through is never read without the reserve-funded line and the POM trend beside it (§21's deferral arithmetic prices what the starving costs), and a retention number that outruns its segment's physics invites the §16.4 question asked warmly: *show me what we did not spend.*

2.6 The owner's one page

Everything this chapter built compresses onto a single monthly page — the one exhibit an owner should insist on before any other report is opened. Its shape, with Hotel A's year-one figures standing in for a month's:

LINE	THIS PERIOD	READ IT AGAINST
RevPAR index	96.0%	Trend and 100 — three months below either is a §8.3 conversation, not a memo

GOP margin	41.4%	Budget and last year — with the flow-through of §2.5 explaining the gap
EBITDA less reserve	$884,236	The lender's covenant math of §11.1 — you find a DSCR problem here first
Reserve funded	$136,872	The §21.1 schedule — funded means moved to the escrow, not accrued
Cash after debt service	$252,639	The distribution decision — after the §7.3 war chest is whole
Forward pickup, 90 days	on pace	Same time last year — the only forward-looking line on the page (§17.1)

Recommendation Ask for this page by the tenth of each month, one sheet, figures against budget and last year. Any operator who cannot produce it in a day is telling you the numbers are assembled for presentations rather than kept for management — itself a finding. The monthly meeting that reads it is scripted in §16.1.

2.7 Reading the ladder backwards: three drills

The ladder's daily use runs top-down — price to pocket. Its diagnostic use runs the other way: a bottom-line symptom, traced upward to the rung that caused it and the chapter that owns the cure. Three drills, worth rehearsing now because each will eventually arrive as a real month. **Cash fell; margin held.** If GOP margin is steady but cash after debt service thinned, the problem lives *below* GOP — a fixed charge moved (the insurance renewal of §20.2, a reassessment §20.3 should answer) or the reserve finally got funded honestly. Nobody in operations can fix this month; it belongs to ownership's own calendar. **Margin fell; RevPAR held.** Revenue arrived but kept less — the flex arithmetic of §2.5 names the suspects in order: mix shifted toward costlier occupancy (§2.2's asymmetry running in reverse), a department's CPOR drifted (§18.1's audit), or a "temporary" contract expense became permanent (§20.1's fences). This is the operator's month, and the §16.4 questions four and five are how ownership asks without managing. **RevPAR fell; the index held.** The market fell and you fell with it — which is, counterintuitively, the least alarming case on the list: nothing at the property broke (§8.3's referee says so), and the response is the §25.1 register's market thresholds, not an operations intervention. Reverse the last drill — index fell while the market held — and it is the most alarming case, however good the absolute month looked. The discipline across all three: **name the rung before naming a culprit**. Most bad hotel meetings are two people arguing about different rungs, each correct about their own.

The drills also teach the ladder's etiquette for delivering bad news upward, worth scripting because every operator eventually must. The competent version names the rung first, the number second, the plan third: "index held, margin fell two points, the driver is housekeeping overtime from the turnover spike, the fix is the §18.5 retention move we proposed in March." Three sentences, no adjectives, and ownership can govern. The incompetent version leads with context — the market, the weather, the staffing climate — and arrives at the number last, if at all; it is not dishonesty, merely self-defense, but it inverts the diagnostic order and burns the meeting. Owners get the reporting they train: praise the three-sentence form loudly the first time it appears, and it becomes the house dialect within a quarter.

2.8 The per-key lens: the same hotel, divided by ninety-two

One habit converts every figure in this book into intuition: divide by keys. Per-key numbers are how the industry compares unlike properties, how brokers quote (§4.1), and — the underused part — how an owner develops *feel* for their own P&L. Hotel A per key, top to bottom: the building cost $160,000; it produces $37,194 of annual revenue; it keeps $15,400 at GOP and $9,611 after everything and the reserve; it carries $81,680 of debt costing $6,865 a year to service; and it hands equity $2,746 of year-one cash. Suddenly the scale is human: each room is a small business producing about a hundred dollars of revenue a night sold, keeping perhaps forty of it, owing its bank nineteen every night open or not. The lens earns its keep in three places. **Sanity-checking claims**: a broker's pro forma promising per-key earnings double your market's norm is making an extraordinary claim in ordinary font. **Sizing capital**: the §21.5 component costs are quoted per key because that is how buildings spend — $2,600 of soft goods per room every six years is legible where a lump sum is not. **Talking across scales**: per-key numbers are how the 92-key hotel and the 12-room inn hold one conversation — the inn's $8,377 per key against the anchor's $9,611 is Part I's whole economics lesson in one division. The ladder tells you what is happening; per-key tells you whether to believe it.

The per-key habit has one more payoff worth recording: it is how experienced owners carry the whole industry in their heads. A veteran hears "select-service, hundred-sixty a key, market ADR one-thirty" and has already approximated the revenue, the GOP band, the loan a lender would write and the cash the equity might see — not because they are quick at arithmetic but because they have divided a hundred P&Ls by their key counts and kept the residue. That residue is buildable on purpose: run every deal in this book's per-key terms, your own property's monthly numbers included, for one year, and the intuition arrives on schedule. The five numbers are the instrument panel; per-key is the airframe feel — and owners eventually need both, because instruments fail exactly when feel is all that is left.

CHAPTER 02 IN ONE LINE

Occupancy × ADR starts the ladder; the five numbers finish it — index, margin, earnings after reserve, coverage, and cash-on-cash — and every decision in this book is one of the five moving.

MOST SEARCHED *"USALI 12th edition" · "hotel profit and loss statement" · "what is GOP in hotels"* RANK 5 CLUSTER · CPC $6–$22

PART I · FOUNDATIONS · CHAPTER 03

USALI: the operating language 03

THE SHORT ANSWER

Learn one statement format and every hotel becomes comparable — that is the entire point of the Uniform System of Accounts for the Lodging Industry, and the 12th Revised Edition, mandatory for reporting periods beginning 1 January 2026, is the version this book speaks. Master its one page — the Summary Operating Statement — and you can interrogate any hotel on earth in its own language.

Accounting standards are usually a compliance topic. This one is a power tool. Because nearly every professionally run hotel keeps its books the same way, an owner who can read the format fluently can benchmark any property against any other, catch a seller's statement that has been quietly re-plumbed, and hold an operator to a line no one can argue about. The reading takes one chapter to learn and pays for itself at the first data room.

3.1 A century of speaking the same language

Reported The Uniform System was first published in 1926 by the Hotel Association of New York City — accountants from rival hotels agreeing, remarkably, to keep score identically — and has been maintained since by the industry's own bodies; today that is AHLA and HFTP through the Global Finance Committee, whose 12th Revised Edition (2024) governs reporting periods beginning 1 January 2026 (USALI 12th Revised Edition, front matter — released July 2024, adoption date 1 January 2026; HFTP holds the copyright, acquired 2018).

One hundred years later the payoff is unique among asset classes: the benchmarking surveys, the management contracts, the loan covenants and the brokers' books all speak one dialect. When Chapter 8 normalizes a seller's P&L, when Chapter 15's management agreement defines the incentive fee, when Chapter 27's dashboard sets thresholds — the definitions all resolve to this system. An owner who has not learned it is negotiating in translation, against counterparties who are not.

The uniformity is worth most at the smallest scale, which is the opposite of how owners usually treat it. The 92-key hotel has an operator who keeps USALI books because its management agreement says so; the inn's books are whatever its bookkeeper inherited — and so the inn's owner, who most needs the dialect (no analyst, no asset manager, one banker who reads forty P&Ls a week), is usually the one negotiating without it. An afternoon's restatement (§3.6 is the method) buys the twelve-room property the same three privileges the institutional owner takes for granted: a lender who can size the loan without discounting for confusion, a listing that survives a buyer's §8 normalization intact, and a benchmark conversation in which the inn's numbers can be laid against the surveys' — membership in the century-old club, for the cost of a chart of accounts.

History also explains the system's one structural quirk, worth understanding because counterparties exploit it: USALI is a *management* accounting standard, not a GAAP one, and the two serve different masters. The tax return will not match the summary statement (depreciation, the reserve's treatment, timing differences); the GAAP financials a lender's auditor blesses will classify differently again; and none of the three is "wrong" — they answer different questions on different conventions. The trap is a seller or partner switching frameworks mid-argument — quoting USALI margins in one breath and tax-return income in the next, choosing whichever flatters. The defense is the chapter's standing question, asked of every statement that enters the room: *which system, whose conventions, reconciled to the others where?* The §8.7 triangulation is that question, industrialized.

3.2 The anatomy: departments, undistributed, and the GOP line

The Summary Operating Statement reads top-down in four movements. **Departments earn.** Rooms, food and beverage, and any other operated departments each report their own revenue and their own direct expenses — the cost of the people and supplies that produced that department's revenue, and nothing else. **Undistributed functions spend.** Five service departments that support the whole house but sell nothing: administrative & general; information & telecommunications systems; sales & marketing; property operation & maintenance; and energy, water & waste. **GOP is the verdict.** Departmental profit minus the undistributed block is **gross operating profit** — the cleanest measure of how well the hotel was *operated*, before any cost that belongs to ownership's choices. **Ownership finishes.** Below GOP come the management fees ownership contracted, the fixed charges ownership's jurisdiction and insurance market impose, and the replacement reserve ownership must fund — landing at EBITDA less replacement reserve, the figure this book treats as the hotel's true annual earning power.

Inference The statement's order is an accountability map. Everything above GOP is the operator's to answer for; everything below it belongs to ownership. When a hotel disappoints, the first diagnostic question is which side of the GOP line the miss lives on — and the format answers it before anyone in the room can spin it.

Notice also what the statement refuses to contain. Debt service never appears — two identical operations with different mortgages must read identically, which is what makes the §10 valuation and the §11 sizing possible at all. Depreciation never appears — it is a tax construction the §22 chapters price separately, not an operating fact. Income tax never appears — entity choices belong to Chapter 24, not to the building. The statement stops deliberately at the property line, EBITDA less reserve, because everything below that boundary measures the owner's decisions rather than the hotel's performance — and half the misreadings in circulation are numbers dragged across that line wearing the wrong label.

3.3 What the 12th edition changed

Owners will meet 11th-edition statements in data rooms for years, so the material changes are worth one exhibit. All are Reported from the publishing bodies' own guidance (HFTP, 12th Revised Edition overview presentation and "Deep Dive" series, 2024; USALI 12th Revised Edition, 2024):

CHANGE	WHAT IT MEANS FOR AN OWNER
Utilities → Energy, Water & Waste (Sched. 9)	Four expense groups plus consumption metrics — per square foot, per occupied room, emissions — making utility discipline benchmarkable (§20.1)
Labor detail & FTE reporting (Sched. 15)	

	Salaries, wages, service charges and contracted labor split out, with hours by department — the raw material of Chapter 18's cost-per-occupied-room discipline
`Mandatory brand & operator costs (Sched. 16)`	Every fee the flag and manager charge, consolidated in one table — read it before Chapter 14's breakeven, and at every annual review
`In-room entertainment → IT department`	Bundled tech moves out of Rooms; year-over-year Rooms expense comparisons across the boundary need restating (§8.3)
`Destination, resort & urban fees — net, in Misc. Income`	Fee income is not rooms revenue: it does not raise ADR or RevPAR, and a seller's deck that blends it is re-plumbed (§8.3)

3.4 The year, in the industry's own language

Here is Hotel A's first full year in the format everything else in this book builds on. Read it top-down, watching each movement hand off to the next:

WORKED FILE — USALI SUMMARY OPERATING STATEMENT

Hotel A — 92 keys, year one, stated in 12th-edition format

Rooms revenue — 23,842 occupied nights at $138.00	**$3,290,196**
Other operated departments and miscellaneous income	$131,608
Total operating revenue	**$3,421,804**
Rooms departmental expense, 25% of rooms revenue	-$822,549
Other departmental expense	-$72,384
Total departmental profit	**$2,526,871**
Administrative & general, 8.5% of revenue	-$290,853
Information & telecommunications systems	-$51,327
Sales & marketing — including franchise royalty and program fees of $391,533	-$511,296
Property operation & maintenance	-$136,872
Energy, water & waste (Schedule 9)	-$119,763
Gross operating profit — 41.4% of revenue	**$1,416,758**
Management fees — 3% base plus incentive above the owner's priority	-$123,130
Income before non-operating income and expenses	**$1,293,629**
Property tax $161,920 · insurance $96,600 · owner costs $14,000	-$272,520
EBITDA	**$1,021,109**
Replacement reserve, 4% of total revenue	-$136,872
EBITDA less replacement reserve	**$884,236** (6.0% on price)

REVPAR	GOPPAR	GOP MARGIN	PER KEY, AFTER RESERVE
97.98$	**42.19**$	**41.4%**	**9,611**$
rooms revenue per available room-night, the industry's pulse	gross operating profit per available room — the operator's honest score	after franchise fees, which USALI charges to Sales & Marketing	EBITDA less reserve ÷ 92 keys — the figure a lender sizes against

Computed Every line above derives from the six inputs printed with the anchor's contract in *How to use this manual* — occupancy, rate, four expense ratios — and from nothing else. Change an input and the whole column moves; that is what the statement is for.

Presentation follows the USALI 12th Revised Edition (AHLA/HFTP, effective for periods beginning 1 January 2026): franchise royalty and program fees are charged to Sales & Marketing and therefore reduce GOP, with mandatory brand and operator costs consolidated for visibility in Schedule 16; destination, resort and urban fees are recorded net in Miscellaneous Income. Reserve held at 4% of revenue; income taxes are not deducted at this level. This is a teaching contract, not a benchmark — select-service ranges are Reported, edition-dated, in Sources and method (CBRE Hotels Research, *Trends® in the Hotel Industry* — 2025 edition, 2024 data; 2026 monthly series on the 12th edition).

3.5 The inn, in the same language — with the honest line

The same format scales down to twelve rooms, and doing so exposes the most common lie in small-hotel listings — the owner who works free. The inn's statement, with the line most listings omit shown in bold:

WORKED FILE — THE INN, HONESTLY STATED

Hotel B — 12 rooms, owner-operated, year one

Rooms revenue — 2,540 occupied nights at $210.00	**$533,400**
Breakfast and other income	$42,672
Total operating revenue	**$576,072**
Departmental expenses, rooms and other	-$189,890
Total departmental profit	**$386,182**
A&G, systems, marketing, maintenance, energy-water-waste	-$139,409
Owner-manager salary at market — the line listings omit	-$65,000
Gross operating profit — 31.6% of revenue	**$181,772**
Property tax, insurance, owner costs	-$58,200
EBITDA — no management fee; the owner is the manager, and is now paid	**$123,572**
Replacement reserve, 4% of revenue	-$23,043
EBITDA less replacement reserve	**$100,529** (4.3% on price)

Inference With the owner's labor priced at $65,000, the inn earns $100,529 — a 4.3% yield on its $2,340,000 price. Erase that one line, as most listings do, and the same property advertises a yield near seven percent. Neither the building nor the money changed; only the honesty did. Every inn valuation in this book, and every one you should accept, prices the owner's labor first.

Setting the salary honestly takes ten minutes and a job posting: what would it cost to hire a working general manager for a twelve-room property with breakfast — not the owner's opportunity cost, not minimum wage, the market clearing price for the job actually performed (§6.8 prices the real hire for the day the owner exits the load). Two further honesty lines follow the same logic wherever they apply: family labor — the spouse on the desk, the son on maintenance — priced at role rates before any profit is declared, and the owner's apartment, if the building includes one, charged as the market rent it displaces. The inn's true yield survives all three lines or it was never true.

3.6 A messy P&L, translated

The statement you will actually be handed for a small property is not USALI — it is a bookkeeping export organized for a tax preparer: one payroll line for everyone, utilities in one lump, marketing hiding among supplies. Here is the inn's year restated the way most sellers keep it, with each line's USALI destination on the right — the translation you must perform before any figure from §3.5 can be trusted from someone else's books:

THE SELLER'S LINE	AMOUNT	WHERE USALI PUTS IT
Payroll, taxes & benefits — one line, everyone	$238,686	Split by role: housekeeping and desk to Rooms; office share to A&G; maintenance share to POM — and the owner's draw becomes the §3.5 salary line
Utilities	$25,923	Energy, Water & Waste — its own schedule in the 12th edition (Schedule 9)
Repairs & maintenance	$17,282	POM — but read invoices: capital items expensed here overstate cost and understate the §21.3 reserve need
Supplies, commissions & advertising	$78,709	Rooms (guest supplies), the breakfast's cost, S&M (commissions, ads) and IT — four homes hiding in one line
Office & administrative	$33,700	A&G — bank charges, software, professional fees, the bookkeeper
Property tax, insurance & licenses	$58,200	Below GOP entirely — non-operating; mixing them into operating costs corrupts the margin
Total expenses	$452,500	Ties to the §3.5 statement's expense base of $452,500 exactly — the translation moves lines, never money

Recommendation Do this translation yourself, line by line from the general ledger, for any property under consideration — never accept the seller's own USALI restatement as the starting point. The two most valuable discoveries are always the same: labor that was never paid (the §3.5 line) and capital spending disguised as repairs (the §8.2 bridge's deferred-maintenance line). The full working checklist is Appendix B1.

The request that makes the translation possible is worth scripting, because sellers' brokers will offer summaries first: the general-ledger export for three full years (every account, every month, not the annual roll-up), the December and June bank statements for the same years, the four quarterly payroll filings for the trailing year, and the merchant processor's annual statements. Nothing exotic — every property that files taxes has all four — and the pattern of resistance is itself diligence: a seller who cannot produce a ledger has told you the books are assembled, and a seller who will not has told you what the assembly hides (§8.7 runs the full triangulation when the answers matter).

3.7 Reading the schedules below the summary

The Summary Operating Statement is page one of a book. Below it, USALI prescribes departmental and undistributed schedules, each with its own diagnostics. The ones an owner actually reads, and what to read them for:

SCHEDULE	WHAT IT DETAILS	THE OWNER'S QUESTION
1 · Rooms	Segmented revenue; labor by role; commissions, laundry, supplies	Cost per occupied room, built bottom-up in §18.2 — and whether commissions are eating the rate (§17.3)
2 · F&B	Venue-level revenue and cost; the 12th edition wants outlets visible	Does each outlet clear its own labor? The §19.2 run-or-lease decision starts here
5 · A&G	Payroll, credit-card commissions, professional fees, bad debt	Credit-card fees alone run 2–3% of revenue — the quiet fourth-largest expense in many hotels
6 · IT	Systems, licenses, telecom — split from A&G in the 11th edition	Per-room software spend, and which contracts auto-renew (§20.1's fences)
7 · S&M	Payroll, agency spend — and the entire franchise stack (§3.3)	Separate the contractual (franchise) from the discretionary before judging the marketing budget
8 · POM	Engineering payroll, contracts, R&M by trade	Is maintenance keeping pace with the §21.1 cycle, or is the reserve quietly subsidizing neglect?
9 · EWW	Energy, water, waste — utilities with their own consumption metrics	Cost per occupied room against weather, not just budget — the one line with an engineering answer (§20.4)
15 · Labor	Total labor cost and FTEs across every department, one view	The 12th edition's gift: one page for the largest cost in the building — §18.2 builds the staffing guide against it

Computed Schedule numbering per the 12th Revised Edition's operating schedules; the omitted schedules (other operated departments, minor sources) follow the same pattern. A property that cannot produce schedules is telling you its summary is hand-built — treat every figure on it as §8.3 material.

In a data room, the schedules reward a fixed reading order: the summary first for shape, Schedule 15 second — because labor is the largest number and the fastest lie detector — then the two biggest revenue departments, then POM and EWW together, where deferred maintenance and utility drift record what the summary smoothed. An hour in that order, notes against the §2.3 five, produces better questions than a day of wandering — and the questions, not the reading, are the point: every schedule anomaly becomes a §12.1 diligence item, priced or answered before it becomes a surprise with a closing date.

3.8 The close: how the language stays honest month after month

USALI describes a statement; the **monthly close** is the process that makes the statement true, and weak closes corrupt every discipline built on top — the §2.6 one page, the §16.2 flow-through grade, the §27.2 dashboard all inherit whatever the close leaves wrong. The honest close, five steps on a five-day calendar. **Revenue proof**: the PMS's daily reports tie to the general ledger and the processor's deposits — the §8.7 triangulation run internally, monthly, so it never has to be run externally in shame. **Cutoff**: expenses belong to the month that consumed them — the linen invoice that arrives on the 5th accrues to the month the linen washed — because timing games between months are how a manager manufactures a §16.2 grade and how an owner gets surprised in December. **Balance-sheet hygiene**: the guest and city ledgers aged (§16.4's question ten), advance deposits reconciled to future arrivals, the trust-fund taxes (§22.2) confirmed remitted — the accounts where operating sins hide from the P&L. **The reserve's movement**: the 4% actually transferred, the escrow statement in the package (§21.3's funded-means-moved). **The variance read**: the controller's one paragraph on anything moving beyond threshold — written before the §16.1 meeting so the meeting starts at explanation, not discovery. Small properties run the same five steps smaller — the inn's bookkeeper does them in an afternoon (§6.5's two o'clock hour) — and the test of any close, at any scale, is the auditor's question asked monthly: *could a stranger, from these papers alone, rebuild this month?* Every yes compounds into the §30.7 file that someday prices the exit.

The close's five steps also define the division of labor the small property most often gets wrong: what belongs to the bookkeeper and what belongs to the owner. The bookkeeper owns steps one through four — the proofs, the cutoffs, the reconciliations — as craft; the owner owns exactly two things: reading the variance paragraph (step five) within a day of its arrival, and never, under any pressure, asking the bookkeeper to make a month look different than it was. The second duty sounds theatrical until the first soft season tests it: a bookkeeper asked once to "hold" an expense into next month has learned the books are negotiable, and negotiable books eventually negotiate against their owner — at the audit, at the sale, at the loan renewal — with interest.

3.9 When the statement changes shape: extended-stay, all-inclusive, and the shapes between

The anchors are select-service and independent-inn shapes; two segment variants bend the statement enough to warn about, because buyers who apply Hotel A's ratios to them misread everything downstream. **Extended-stay** compresses the statement's cost side: weekly housekeeping instead of daily collapses the §18.1 CPOR's largest input, breakfast simplifies, the front desk thins — which is why the segment's GOP margins run famously above transient hotels' at similar rates (CBRE Hotels Research, Trends® extended-stay analyses, 2023: labor cost per occupied room at roughly half of comparable limited-service properties in the economy and midscale scales). The trap is symmetric: those margins price the stripped service model, so an extended-stay underwritten with transient staffing assumptions books phantom profit, and a transient hotel "converted" to extended-stay without re-engineering the §18.2 guide converts nothing but its story. **All-inclusive** — Part IV territory for the cross-border family — inverts the revenue architecture: one packaged rate makes "rooms revenue" an allocation exercise, F&B becomes a cost engine at scale rather than §19's modest sideline, and RevPAR loses its cross-segment meaning entirely — the segment's own metrics (package RevPAR, total revenue per guest-night) take over, and the §8.3 index only referees inside the segment. Between the poles, every hybrid — the select-service with a real bar, the boutique with a busy restaurant — should trigger the same discipline: rebuild the expected statement shape from the operating model (§3.2's architecture, re-derived), *then* benchmark, because USALI's gift is comparability within a shape, and the costliest comparisons in hospitality are precise numbers from the wrong silhouette.

A last word for the owner arriving from other asset classes: resist the instinct to translate USALI *into* your familiar statements — the apartment operator's NOI format, the corporate P&L's EBITDA build — because the translation loses exactly what the format was built to show. The departmental structure is not an accounting preference; it is the business's actual anatomy — rooms earning while F&B breaks even while the undistributed lines drift — and owners who insist on reading hotels through borrowed formats reliably misdiagnose them: they see margin problems where mix shifted, cost problems where volume fell, and management problems that are actually market ones. Learn the native statement once, entirely, and every other hotel document — the STAR report, the appraisal, the offering package, the management agreement's fee definitions — resolves into dialects of a language you already read.

> CHAPTER 03 IN ONE LINE
>
> One page — the Summary Operating Statement — makes every hotel comparable and every miss attributable: departments earn, undistributed functions spend, GOP judges the operator, and everything below it belongs to ownership.

MOST SEARCHED *"what does per key mean" · "hotel PIP cost" · "hotel franchise agreement terms"* RANK 4 CLUSTER · CPC $6–$28

PART I · FOUNDATIONS · CHAPTER 04

Reading the deal: terms that change outcomes

04

THE SHORT ANSWER

Hotel deals are quoted in a compressed dialect — per key, RRM, PIP, HMA, key money — and every term in it is a number wearing a nickname. This chapter prices the vocabulary on Hotel A, so that in Part III no broker's shorthand arrives without its dollar figure attached.

Industries compress what they price daily. The danger for a newcomer is not that the dialect is hard — it is that every term sounds like description while working as valuation. "Priced below replacement cost" is an argument. "Light PIP" is a warranty someone else will not honor. Learn what each phrase does to a closing statement and the dialect becomes what it should be: fast, useful, and yours.

4.1 The three price languages

Hotels are priced in three currencies at once, and each one lies in a different direction. Hotel A, quoted all three ways:

WORKED EXAMPLE — PRICE DIALECTS

One hotel, three quotes — Hotel A at $14,720,000

Per key — price ÷ 92 rooms	**$160,000**
Lies when room counts hide quality: a tired 92-key and a renovated one quote alike	
Room-revenue multiplier — price ÷ $3,290,196 rooms revenue	**4.47×**
Lies when margins differ: a multiplier ignores everything below the top line	
Cap rate — EBITDA less reserve ÷ price	**6.0%**
The honest one — if and only if the earnings were normalized first (§8.3) and the reserve is real (§21.4)	

Inference Use the three in sequence: per key to screen, the multiplier to sanity-check a market, the cap rate to decide — computed on your normalized numbers, never the broker's. Chapter 10 runs the full valuation; here the point is that each currency answers a different question, and only one of them is "what is it worth."

A fourth currency circulates among developers and lenders and deserves a seat in the owner's wallet: **replacement cost**, quoted per key like the price itself. It answers neither "what is it worth" nor "what does it earn" but a third question — what would a competitor pay to build against you — and it works as a boundary in both directions. Bought well below replacement cost, a property enjoys a standing moat: new supply cannot underprice you into existence (§9.2's pipeline read prices the threat). Bought above it, the premium is a bet that entitlements, sites or construction appetite stay scarce — sometimes true, never free. Chapter 13 runs the full build-versus-buy spread; here it is enough to always know the number, because the parties across the table always do.

4.2 The alphabet that moves money

Ten terms carry most of the freight in a hotel negotiation. Each is defined here once, with the number it moves and the chapter that prices it:

TERM	WHAT IT IS	THE NUMBER IT MOVES
PIP	Property improvement plan — the renovation the brand requires as its price for transferring or renewing the flag	Often seven figures; it is a price term in disguise and negotiated like one — §12.1
Comp set	The five-to-seven competitors your performance is indexed against	The RevPAR index itself — choose the set wrong and every report flatters or slanders you — §8.3
Chain scale	STR's tiers from economy to luxury, grouping brands by rate positioning	Which benchmarks, cap rates and per-key ranges apply to you at all — §8.3
Flag	The brand licensed onto the building — the noun form of the franchise	An 11.9% stack on rooms revenue at Hotel A, and the breakeven of §14.4
HMA	Hotel management agreement — the operator's contract	$123,130 at Hotel A this year, plus control terms worth more — §15
Key money	Capital a brand or operator contributes to win the contract	Reduces your basis; repayable on early exit — read the burn-off schedule — §15.2
Comfort letter	Lender–brand agreement keeping the flag on the building through a foreclosure	Whether your lender will close at all; a financing condition, not a courtesy — §11.4
SNDA	Subordination and non-disturbance — the same peace treaty for the HMA	Whether the manager survives a lender takeover; managers price its absence — §15.2
STAR report	The subscription benchmark comparing you to your comp set weekly and monthly	Occupancy, ADR and RevPAR indices — the scoreboard the whole industry accepts — §8.3, §21.4
Trailing twelve	The last twelve months of operations, the seller's favorite exhibit	Everything — which is why §8.3 normalizes it before a single multiple is applied

At the inn's scale the same alphabet shrinks but does not vanish. No flag means no PIP and no franchise stack — the twelve-room buyer's versions are the §9.8 market study and the §21.5 component ledger, which together do the PIP's job of pricing the building's next five years. The comp set still exists, informally: the five properties the inn's guests actually cross-shop, and a STAR-style subscription is purchasable even at this scale (§8.3 shows the small operator's route in). And the trailing twelve matters *more*, not less, because a small property's year is a handful of seasons — one resurfaced parking lot or one owner's illness moves the whole statement, and only the monthly ledger says which year you are actually buying.

4.3 What actually transfers at closing

The vocabulary above lives in contracts, and contracts do not follow the deed automatically. The franchise does not transfer — the buyer applies fresh, and the brand prices its consent as a PIP plus fees. The management agreement may or may not survive, depending on termination-on-sale rights someone negotiated years ago. The liquor license transfers on the state's calendar, not yours. Collective bargaining obligations can follow the property as a matter of law. The booking pipeline — the most valuable intangible in the building — transfers only as well as the systems conveying it. None of this is a reason to hesitate; all of it is a reason Chapter 12's diligence checklist exists. What you are buying, concretely, is a stack of contracts with a building attached.

Recommendation At the first serious conversation about any property, ask for four documents before any tour: the franchise agreement, the management agreement, the last two STAR reports, and the current PIP if one exists. Sellers who resist are telling you where the price really lives. The full request list is Appendix B's underwriting checklist.

The transfer question sorts everything in the building into three buckets, each with its own calendar. **Transfers by law**: the deed, recorded easements, and — where statutes say so — collective bargaining and accrued employee obligations; nothing to negotiate, everything to price. **Transfers by consent**: the franchise, the HMA, the ground lease if one exists, most equipment leases — every one a counterparty with its own timeline and its own price for yes, which is why §12.5's calendar starts the consent clocks the week the LOI signs. **Transfers by rebuild**: the liquor license in most states, the operating permits, the merchant accounts, the OTA and GDS connections — items nobody signs over, which the §30.4 cutover plan reconstructs so the first guest after closing never knows. Deals stumble in the second bucket and embarrass themselves in the third; the first one just costs money.

4.4 Four clauses that outprice the price

Finally, the purchase agreement itself has a dialect, and four of its clauses routinely move more money than the last round of price negotiation did. **The earnest-money schedule** — when the deposit "goes hard" (non-refundable) is the real diligence deadline, whatever the diligence period says; going hard before the franchise application resolves (§12.2) is paying for a lottery ticket. **The employee clause** — who terminates, who rehires, and who carries the accrued vacation and the WARN-notice exposure; at closing the workforce walks across the parking lot in one direction or the other, and the side that plans it in the contract pays less for it (§30.2 runs the shift change). **The interim operations covenant** — the seller must run the hotel *as a hotel* between signing and closing: honoring the booking pace, funding the reserve, filling vacancies — because a seller who quietly stops selling the far-out months hands you a soft opening quarter as a closing gift (§12.3's pace check exists for exactly this). **The proration exhibit** — advance deposits, property tax, the closing night's split — small numbers with a defined answer, worked in §12.3; agreeing the method in the contract costs nothing, and improvising it at the closing table costs the tired party.

Inference The pattern across all four: the purchase price is negotiated once, loudly; the contract mechanics are negotiated once, quietly, and then execute themselves at closing whether or not anyone remembers why. Price the clauses with the same seriousness as the headline and Part III's arithmetic arrives at closing intact.

A fifth clause earns its place in hurricane country and deserves it everywhere: **casualty and condemnation**. Between signing and closing the building belongs to the seller and the bargain belongs to both of you — so the contract must say, in advance, what a fire or a named storm does to the deal: below a stated damage threshold the buyer closes with an assignment of insurance proceeds plus the deductible as a credit; above it, the buyer may walk or close, at the buyer's election, on the same proceeds-plus-deductible arithmetic. Sellers resist the election and deductible credit; both are standard for a reason, and §26's claim machinery is miserable enough to run on a building you own without inheriting a half-adjusted claim on one you don't yet.

4.5 The dialect in the wild: one broker call, annotated

Here is how the vocabulary actually arrives — a representative ninety seconds of deal patter, with the translation this chapter built running underneath it. *"Ninety-two keys, strong flag, trading at a seven-and-a-half cap on trailing."* Three claims, one number, zero information yet: the cap is quoted on the seller's own trailing twelve, which §8.2 will haircut — the worked deal's "8.8% cap" became 6.0% on the same asking price once five legal fictions came out. *"Light PIP, maybe a million."* A price term delivered as an adjective: "light" is not a scope, the brand has not issued the letter, and §12.1 prices what happens to buyers who accept the adjective. *"Seller will look at offers with a quick close; there's key money in place with eleven years left."* Two real facts, both cutting against the enthusiasm: a quick close compresses your §12.5 calendar exactly where the franchise application (the schedule's true gate) cannot be compressed, and inherited key money means an unamortized clawback — §15.5's arithmetic — that the closing statement must price. *"Comps are trading at one-eighty a key; this is on the market at one-sixty."* The screening dialect doing its legitimate job — and the moment to ask which comps, in which chain scale, with which PIPs attached, because per-key comparisons across renovation states are the §4.1 lie in its natural habitat. None of this makes the broker an adversary; brokers compress because compression is their job. The owner's job is the decompression this chapter taught — every nickname back into a number, every number into the model, before enthusiasm signs anything.

Run the same decompression on your own speech in the other direction, because buyers leak information in dialect too. The caller who asks a broker for "anything interesting" has announced they are early, unfocused and educable — and will be shown the inventory nobody else wanted. The caller who names a box — "select-service, sixty to a hundred twenty keys, interstate or medical demand, at or under a hundred seventy a key before PIP" — has announced a buyer with criteria, a model and probably a lender, and will be shown deals before they are marketed, because brokers ration their best inventory to the buyers who waste the least of their time. Two sentences of specificity buy a permanently better pipeline; the vagueness that feels open-minded is, in the broker's triage, merely unqualified.

4.6 The letter of intent: the dialect's first document

Between the broker call and the §12 machinery sits the letter of intent — two to four pages, mostly non-binding, and worth more care than its length suggests, because everything the LOI leaves vague gets negotiated later from a worse position. What a hotel LOI should pin, beyond price. **The diligence architecture**: period length, extension rights, and — §4.4's lesson — the go-hard trigger tied to the franchise application's resolution, not to a calendar date the brand's timeline can blow through. **The exclusivity trade**: the seller takes the property off the market; the buyer commits real diligence spend — the LOI states both, with the seller's no-shop explicit, because parallel negotiations discovered in week five kill more deals than any finding. **The information covenant**: the §8.6 document list attached as a schedule with delivery dates — five days for the trailing twelve and STAR reports, ten for the general ledger — so that "we're gathering the documents" has a contractual clock. **The structural skeleton**: asset or entity purchase, what conveys (§4.3's list, decided in principle now), the §12.4 proration conventions named, and any seller financing's outline. **The binding islands**: confidentiality, exclusivity, expense allocation and governing law bind; everything else expressly does not — a sentence both sides' counsel will insist on and both sides' memories will need. What the LOI should *not* do is negotiate the purchase agreement in miniature: over-lawyered LOIs spend the relationship's best week arguing clauses that will be re-argued anyway. The instrument's real product is a fair record of the handshake — price, timeline, process — signed while both sides still mean it, and every term of art it uses is one this chapter already priced.

One LOI line is forgotten so reliably it belongs in the skeleton: **the communication protocol**. Who may be told, when, and by whom — because the moment a diligence team walks a property, the staff knows, and an untended rumor starts the §30.1 transition clock months early: the best housekeepers update their résumés first, the GM starts returning recruiters' calls, and the buyer inherits the attrition the silence caused. One sentence — no property visits without the seller's scheduling, no staff contact until the agreed date, the GM told jointly at the go-hard — costs nothing and preserves the workforce both sides are pricing.

The LOI stage is also where deal momentum first becomes a force of its own, and naming the mechanism is half of governing it. From signature onward, both sides accumulate sunk effort — tours, counsel hours, lender conversations — and every accumulated hour quietly argues for closing; brokers are professionally skilled at converting that accumulation into inevitability ("we're so close"), and buyers report the strange experience of a deal that no longer feels optional weeks before diligence ends. The antidotes are structural, set at the LOI: the §12.5 gates that make continuing a decision rather than a default, the §10.1 walk-away written before the first counter, and the standing rule that any principal may call the §12.7 question at any gate without explanation. Momentum closes good deals faster; ungoverned, it closes bad ones just as efficiently.

4.7 Four terms buyers reliably get backwards

The dialect's last hazard is the terms everyone thinks they know. **"Key money" is not a gift** — it is a loan wearing a handshake: it amortizes against your captivity and claws back on early exit (§15.5's arithmetic), and buyers who model it as free capital discover its lien at their §29 door. **"Cap rate" without a named NOI is not a number** — the same asking price is a 8.8% cap on the seller's earnings and 6.0% on the honest ones (§8.2), so the dialect's most-quoted term is meaningless until someone answers "cap on *what*?" — the one follow-up question that instantly identifies a trained buyer. **"Turnkey" describes the seller's effort, not your capital plan** — it means the property operates today, and says nothing about the §21.5 component ledger's position in its cycles or the §12.1 PIP the brand will issue at transfer; the word has probably deferred more capex diligence than any other in the dialect. **And "the brand" is not your counterparty's name** — you will sign with a franchisor entity, be serviced by a §14.7 field organization, and compete with a system, three different things sharing a logo; knowing which one you are talking to (and which one your §14.4 negotiation actually binds) is the difference between managing a relationship and writing letters to a trademark. The pattern across all four is this chapter's closing rule: every term of art answers a question — who pays, on what base, when, enforceable against whom — and a term whose four answers you cannot give is a term still working for the other side.

The dialect chapter closes with its own etiquette, because fluency is also a negotiating posture. Use the terms precisely and sparingly: the buyer who asks "what does the PIP scope to, per key, and has the letter issued" has said everything a broker needs to hear about their seriousness, while the buyer who over-performs the vocabulary — RevPAR this, chain-scale that, in the first phone call — is advertising recency. And keep the translations running silently both ways: when your own side drafts the offering package someday (§30 coaches it), the same compressed terms will be doing the same valuation work on your behalf, and the owners who compressed honestly — the PIP scoped and priced, the cap rate on stated earnings, the "turnkey" claim backed by the §21.5 ledger — sell faster and cleaner than the ones whose dialect the buyer's diligence has to decompress the hard way. Language is the industry's oldest tool; both sides of every closing are using it on each other.

> CHAPTER 04 IN ONE LINE
>
> Per key screens, the multiplier checks, the cap rate decides — and every nickname in the dialect (PIP, HMA, key money, comfort letter) is a number that belongs in your model before it belongs in your vocabulary.

PART II

Should I own a hotel at all?

Rooms reprice nightly. That single fact is the return, the risk, and the job. This part prices all three — the four ways in and each route's honest net, the operational load nobody advertises, and the allocation a portfolio can defend through the industry's recorded drawdowns.

MOST SEARCHED *"how to invest in hotels" · "hotel REIT vs owning a hotel" · "hotel syndication returns"* RANK 5 CLUSTER · CPC $12–$45

PART II · SHOULD I OWN A HOTEL AT ALL? · CHAPTER 05

The four ways in

05

THE SHORT ANSWER

There are four ways into this asset class — own directly, own with a flag, buy the REIT, or ride a syndication — and the further you sit from the front desk, the more of the return is someone else's fee. None of the four is wrong. What is wrong is choosing by brochure: each route's honest net is computable, and this chapter computes it.

Every route into hotels trades three things against each other: control, liquidity, and fees. You can have any two priced fairly; the marketing of each route consists of talking about the two it offers and not the one it charges for. The arithmetic below is the missing third conversation.

5.1 The spectrum, priced

ROUTE	CONTROL	LIQUIDITY	THE DRAG YOU PAY	REALISTIC CHECK
Direct, unbranded	Total — you are the operator of last resort	Years; a going-concern sale (§30)	Your own time, priced honestly (§3.5, §6.1)	$1M+
Direct, franchised	Operations yes; identity and standards no	Years, plus brand consent	The 11.9% stack and the PIP cycle (§14)	$2M+
Hotel REIT shares	None — you own governance rights, not hotels	Daily, at the market's mood	Corporate G&A and the equity market's repricing of everything you liked about real assets	$100
Syndication LP	None that matters; read the LPA twice	None until the sponsor sells	Computed below: 3.8%+ of IRR on our representative stack	$50k–$100k

Reported One structural note on the REIT route: United States REITs cannot operate their hotels — they lease them to taxable REIT subsidiaries run by eligible independent operators, a structure the tax code requires; you are buying the landlord and a leasing arrangement, not the operation (26 U.S.C. §856(d)(8)–(9): rents from a qualified lodging facility qualify only when it is operated on the taxable REIT subsidiary's behalf by an *eligible independent contractor* — see any lodging REIT's 10-K risk factors, e.g. Host Hotels & Resorts, FY2025). It is a fine route to hotel *exposure*; it is not ownership of a hotel, and its drawdowns arrive at equity-market speed.

Two further seats at the table are capital positions rather than ownership routes, and deserve naming because brokers offer them to frustrated buyers. **Owning the dirt** — ground-leasing the land under someone else's hotel — buys a bond-shaped claim with residual real-estate rights; it is the quietest seat in the industry, and what the leasehold above it surrenders in financeability and exit value is exactly what the ground position collects. **Owning the debt** — the mezzanine and preferred layers of §11's stack — buys a stated return and someone else's problems at a discount; it is a lender's trade wearing equity's clothes, and the discipline it requires is a credit book's, not this one's. Both are legitimate; neither teaches you hotels, and both price best in the hands of people who already learned them from one of the four routes above.

5.2 Direct ownership: the honest arc

Direct ownership is the route the rest of this book serves, so here it needs only its honest shape. Hotel A's year one pays $252,639 of cash on $7,205,413 of equity — 3.5% cash-on-cash — which no brochure would print. The return case is the arc, not the year: the index recovery the buyer underwrote (§8.2), amortization retiring $7,514,587 of debt, the nightly lease capturing whatever pricing the market allows, and an exit priced in Chapter 29 on facts rather than hope. Direct ownership is the only route where every later chapter of this manual is addressed to you; the other three delegate those chapters to someone who charges for them.

Stated as a calendar, the arc pays four times, on four clocks. The **ramp** pays in years one through three, if the §8.2 thesis was real. **Amortization** pays every month the doors stay open, invisible until a refinancing or sale converts it to cash — the forced saving that makes even flat years accretive. The **nightly lease** pays whenever pricing power exists, which is a property of the market and the operator, not the deed. And the **exit** pays once, at a multiple of whatever earning power survived to be sold. The honest caveat belongs beside the promise: in a bad year all four clocks slow together — ramp stalls, coverage tightens, pricing power evaporates, exits reprice — which is why §7 sizes the war chest before Part III sizes anything else.

5.3 The syndication, walked to the dollar

The dominant retail route into hotels is the sponsored deal: a 16% property-level pro forma, a preferred return, a promote. Here is a representative $100,000 subscription, every fee taken on the date it is taken, and the investor's XIRR computed from the dated cash flows — never by subtracting fee rates from the headline:

WORKED CALCULATION — THE WATERFALL, ON DATED CASH FLOWS

$100,000 into a representative hotel syndication — 16% property-level pro forma, five-year hold

Fee 1 · Acquisition fee, 2% of equity, at close	-$2,000
Capital actually working	**$98,000**
Operating distributions, years 1–4, net of the 1.5% asset-management fee	$1,960 · $3,430 · $4,900 · $5,390
Year 5 · property sale solved so the *property* earns 16% — gross proceeds	$168,096
Fee 2 · Disposition fee, 1% of sale	-$1,681
Fee 3 · The promote — 8% simple preference on unreturned capital — interim distributions pay part of it, the accrued balance clears at exit — then 70%/30%; sponsor's share	-$14,392
Year-5 distribution to the investor	**$157,902**
Total received on $100,000	**$173,582** (1.74×)

ADVERTISED	INVESTOR XIRR	THE DRAG	SPONSOR'S SHARE
16% property-level pro forma IRR — before anyone is paid	**12.2%** on the dated cash flows above, after every fee and the promote	**3.8** pts/yr advertised minus received — the cost of the structure	**25.7%** of the $99,006 the deal earned — fees plus promote

Computed Every number above is generated by the waterfall itself: the preference accrues at 8% simple on unreturned capital, early distributions pay accrued preference first, and the promote applies only to cash above preference and returned capital, in year five. Nothing was netted from a rate; rates cannot pay fees — cash flows pay fees.

Inference The drag is not scandal; it is structure, disclosed in every PPM and absent from every pitch deck. A 12.2% net on a passive hotel position can be a perfectly good outcome — it simply has to be compared against the REIT at daily liquidity and against direct ownership at full control, not against the 16% that no investor was ever going to receive.

Recommendation Before subscribing to anything: ask for the net-to-LP IRR at the sponsor's own base case, in writing, and for the same waterfall run at exit prices 10% and 20% lower. A sponsor who will not produce three numbers has produced one answer.

Fairness requires the sponsor's side of the table. The structure exists because the sponsor brings what the LP cannot: the deal flow that found the property, the balance sheet and guarantees the §11.9 lender required, the team that will live §12's ninety days and §16's decade, and the capacity to write the rescue check when the war chest empties. A promote is not a tax on returns; it is the price of that bundle — *when the bundle is real*. The diligence question is therefore never "is there a promote" but "is this sponsor the bundle": principals' capital beside yours, guarantees actually signed, a full-cycle record that survives §5.8's reading. A real sponsor earns the drag; a capital-raiser wearing one merely collects it.

The waterfall's arithmetic also arms the one conversation LPs rarely rehearse: the mid-hold amendment request. Sooner or later a sponsor letter arrives proposing changes — an extended hold, a capital call structured above the pref, a fee "alignment," a refinance whose proceeds pay the promote early — each framed as housekeeping and each, in fact, a reopening of the waterfall this section priced. The response discipline is the purchase discipline replayed: rerun the §5.3 model under the proposed terms, compare the LP's net in both worlds, and price your consent (amendments need votes, and votes are worth something) rather than donating it to the relationship. Sponsors propose amendments to the investors they expect not to model them; being known as the LP who models them is, quietly, the best seat upgrade paper ownership sells.

5.4 Choosing a route

- ☐ **Time.** Fewer than five spare hours a week points away from direct ownership, whatever the spreadsheet says — §6.1 counts the real hours.
- ☐ **Check size.** Direct entry below roughly $1M of equity forces compromised assets; the honest small-check routes are the REIT and the fund.
- ☐ **Control temperament.** If a manager missing budget would keep you awake, own directly; if an operator's texts would annoy you, buy paper.
- ☐ **Liquidity horizon.** Money that could be needed inside five years does not belong in any private hotel position — §7.3 sizes the reserve instead.
- ☐ **Tax appetite.** Cost segregation and the Part VI toolkit reward direct owners; REIT dividends and K-1 passivity reward nobody in particular — §23.
- ☐ **The stated role.** Chapter 1's sentence decides more than any brochure: a legacy role points to the inn, a portfolio role to paper, an operating role to the flag.

The checklist compresses to an exercise worth doing on paper: write the two you need — control, liquidity, fees-avoided — and let the third fall where it must. The pairs map cleanly: control plus fee-efficiency is direct ownership and costs liquidity; liquidity plus fee-efficiency is the REIT and costs control; control plus liquidity is the pair nobody sells, which is why every structure promising both deserves the §5.8 evening. Rerun the exercise at every life change — a sale, an inheritance, a retirement, a health event — because the honest answer moves, and portfolios that never re-ask it end up holding the previous decade's answer at the new decade's prices.

5.5 The REIT, looked through

The listed route deserves the same walk the syndication got. What does $100,000 of hotel-REIT equity actually hold? At this manual's stated sector-shape inputs — 11.8× enterprise value to EBITDA, 34% net debt, 5.9% borrowing cost, corporate overhead at 8% and capital spending at 32% of the EBITDA claim — the look-through is:

WORKED CALCULATION — THE LOOK-THROUGH

$100,000 of hotel-REIT shares — the claim, walked to cash

Enterprise value your equity slice carries (34% of it borrowed)	$151,515
Your look-through share of hotel EBITDA	**$12,840**
Corporate overhead — the G&A hotels never see	-$1,027
Interest on your share of the debt	-$3,039
Capital spending — the REIT's version of the reserve, heavier than 4%	-$4,109
Distributable cash your $100,000 earns	**$4,665**

REIT CASH YIELD	DIRECT, CASH	DIRECT, PLUS AMORTIZATION	THE REAL DIFFERENCE
4.7% distributable on equity at the stated inputs — before the payout-ratio decision	**3.5%** Hotel A's year-one cash-on-cash on the same $100k of equity (§2.4's patience test)	**5.1%** adding the year's principal paydown — wealth accrual the REIT holder cannot see	**daily** the REIT trades at market speed; the §7.1 drawdowns arrive marked-to-market, not appraised

Inference Read honestly, the routes are closer than either camp admits: the REIT's cash yield beats direct ownership's year one, while direct ownership's amortization and control close the gap and the §29 exit decides it. What the REIT truly sells is liquidity; what it truly charges is that everything you liked about real assets gets repriced hourly by people who are not thinking about your hotel (Nareit, *REITWatch*, January 2026: twelve listed lodging REITs, roughly $31.6B of equity market capitalization at year-end 2025 — priced daily, which is precisely the product).

The look-through also owes the REIT its defense. The same $100,000 buys instant diversification across dozens of markets, a professional asset-management bench, audited books, and — no small thing — zero personal guarantees, zero capital calls, and a position an estate can settle with a market order. The tax texture differs too: qualified REIT dividends carry the §199A deduction current law makes permanent, while the direct owner shelters early cash with §23's depreciation machinery — a difference that widens with the owner's bracket and reverses at the §29 exit. The honest comparison is never "which is better" but which failure you can survive: the REIT's is a quotation, marked to market and reversible by patience; the direct owner's is operational, and §25's register exists because patience alone does not fix it.

5.6 The terms that move a syndication — and the one that moves it most

Before signing any subscription, know which knobs matter. Here is the §5.3 waterfall re-run across the terms sponsors actually vary — the preferred rate and the promote split — with everything else held at the stated deal:

PREFERRED RETURN	70/30 PROMOTE	80/20 PROMOTE	READ
6% preference	11.8%	12.6%	The sponsor-friendly corner — common in hot markets
8% preference — the §5.3 deal	12.2%	12.9%	The representative middle of the market
10% preference	12.6%	13.1%	The investor-friendly corner — expect it only when sponsors are hungry

Computed Corner to corner, the terms grid moves the LP's net by 1.3 points — real money, worth negotiating. But hold the comparison against §5.3's tiles: the fee-and-promote structure as a whole moved the same investor about 4 points off the property's own return. The lesson orders the diligence: interrogate the fee stack and the sponsor's track record first, then negotiate the pref — never the reverse.

Recommendation One more term outranks the whole grid: the **preferred-return compounding convention**. This manual's waterfall accrues simple preference; some sponsors compound it, some pay current, and some quietly reset accruals at refinancing. Ask for the convention in writing and for the waterfall spreadsheet itself — a sponsor's refusal to share the model is the §5.3 answer arriving early.

5.7 The routes across a life: sequencing, not choosing

The chapter has priced the routes as alternatives; most owners actually experience them as a *sequence*, and the sequence has a logic worth stating. **The apprenticeship position** comes first for capital that is new to the class: a REIT holding or a carefully-diligenced LP interest — small enough that its §5.3 drag is honest tuition — held while reading exactly the reports this book teaches (the K-1, the quarterly letter, the STAR summary the sponsor attaches). Two cycles of watching professionals navigate a downturn from the passenger seat is the cheapest education hospitality sells. **The shared ownership** comes second: a JV or club position where your capital is significant, your governance rights are real (the Family Office companion volume's Chapter 9 is the full course), and an operating partner carries the §6 load while you attend every §16-style review as the education it is. **Direct ownership** comes when three things are simultaneously true: the check clears the §5.4 size test without breaching any allocation band, the governance hours exist on your actual calendar, and — the test most skipped — you have watched at least one bad year from one of the earlier seats and still want the front one. **The reverse sequence exists too**, and it is not failure: the founder-operator who sells the business and returns as an LP in other people's deals has converted operating knowledge into the best diligence instincts in the room — §9.1's demand generators and §15.2's clause traps read differently to someone who has lived them. What the sequence frame mostly prevents is the classic first-position error: meeting the asset class at the direct-ownership end, capitalized for the purchase but not the education, in the one seat where tuition is billed at leverage.

Inference The sequence also disciplines family conversations about scale: "we should own hotels" and "we should own *a* hotel" are different sentences separated by years of seat time, and the §2.4 patience test applies to owners as much as to deals — the arc, not the year one.

The sequence has one more virtue: it builds the network the direct purchase will someday need, invisibly, while the capital learns. The LP seat introduces sponsors, lenders and the market's deal flow; the JV seat introduces operators, brokers and the §12.9 professional bench; and by the time the family writes its own equity check, the §9.8 market study is being assembled from relationships instead of cold calls. Families who skip to direct ownership buy the network at retail — every introduction made under deal pressure, every adviser hired inside a live transaction — and the network premium, unlike the tuition, never shows up on any closing statement. Seat time compounds twice: once in judgment, once in phone numbers, and the second compounding is the one nobody budgets.

5.8 Reading a private placement in one evening

If the paper routes are in your future, the private placement memorandum is the document standing in front of them, and it reads fast once you know where its hundred pages keep the ten that matter. **The fee table first** — every PPM has one, usually deep in "Compensation of the Sponsor": acquisition, asset-management, disposition, financing, construction-management, property-management fees, each a percentage of a different base. Rebuild §5.3's waterfall from it; the exercise takes twenty minutes and is the evening's entire quantitative work. **"Prior Performance" second** — the track record section, read with §9-grade skepticism from the companion volume's discipline: full-cycle deals only (paper marks are paint), attribution (whose deals, exactly), and the funds that are *missing* from the table. **The conflicts section third** — PPMs disclose conflicts with admirable completeness precisely because disclosure launders them: affiliated property management, fees on deals regardless of outcome, the sponsor's other funds competing for the same properties. Disclosed is not resolved; it is priced-by-you-or- nobody. **"Risk Factors" fourth, selectively** — skip the boilerplate (yes, hotels are risky; this book agrees) for the specific: the paragraphs written for *this* deal — a ground lease, a franchise expiring mid-hold, litigation — are the paragraphs counsel fought over, and they read differently once you know that. **The subscription mechanics last**: transfer restrictions, capital-call powers and default remedies, reporting promises (hold them to §16.1's standard), and the sponsor's removal provisions, which for LPs are usually the honest answer "none." One evening, five sections, and §5.3's three questions asked in writing — a discipline that filters most retail hotel paper before any money is at stake, which is the cheapest diligence in this book.

`getfundamento.com/tools/ways-in` the four routes at your check size, horizon and tax posture — with the syndication waterfall re-run at your own quoted terms FREE

One family of questions cuts across all four routes and deserves the chapter's last page: *who are you when the route is tested?* The REIT holder's test is a quotation forty percent below cost in a crisis whose end nobody has announced — and the route only works for people who can watch that number without selling it. The LP's test is a capital call, contractually enforceable, arriving in the exact quarter everything else is down. The direct owner's test is the §6.5 Tuesday repeated for a decade, and the flagged owner's is the PIP letter that arrives in a year the reserve already spent. None of these tests appears in any route's marketing, all of them are certain to arrive at least once per hold, and the honest self-assessment — which test can this family actually pass — sorts routes faster than any return comparison. The arithmetic in this chapter prices the routes; the tests assign them.

CHAPTER 05 IN ONE LINE

Direct, flagged, listed, or syndicated — pick by which two of control, liquidity and fees you need, and price the third from dated cash flows before anyone's deck prices it for you.

MOST SEARCHED *"is owning a hotel worth it" · "how many hours does a hotel owner work" · "hotel vs airbnb workload"* RANK 3 CLUSTER · CPC $3–$14

PART II · SHOULD I OWN A HOTEL AT ALL? · CHAPTER 06

The honest operational load

06

THE SHORT ANSWER

Apartment leases reprice yearly; hotel rooms reprice nightly — and the nightly lease is not only the return, it is the job. This chapter counts the hours the job actually takes, prices the volatility it carries, and says plainly who should not own one. It is the shortest chapter in the book and the one most buyers needed a year earlier.

Nobody budgets for the second job. The listing shows a building; the P&L shows a business; neither shows a Tuesday — the housekeeper who quit at 8 a.m., the OTA rate that undercut you at noon, the boiler at 11 p.m. The load is manageable, delegable, and priceable. It is only unmanageable when it arrives unpriced.

6.1 What a week actually contains

Start with the inn, because at twelve rooms the load lands on one family. Guest-facing coverage from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. is 98 desk-hours a week before anyone cleans a room, sets a rate, fixes a faucet or closes the books. Stated plainly, with this manual's standing assumptions:

WORKED EXAMPLE — THE SECOND JOB

The inn's week — hours, honestly counted

Front desk & guest response, 7a–9p, 7 days	98 hrs
Housekeeping supervision, laundry, turns	6 hrs
Rates, channels, reviews, marketing	5 hrs
Maintenance and grounds	4 hrs
Bookkeeping, ordering, compliance	3 hrs
Hours the business consumes weekly	**116 hrs**

Computed That total is staffed, not worked alone — the $65,000 owner-manager salary of §3.5 plus the rooms-department payroll cover it. The point of the exhibit is not martyrdom; it is that the hours exist, someone is paid for every one of them, and any pro forma in which they are unpaid is fiction (§3.5).

At Hotel A's scale the load changes shape rather than size: the owner works *on* the hotel, not in it — a monthly owner's review, budget season, capex decisions, lender and brand relations. Chapter 16 turns that into a ninety-minute monthly discipline. It is fewer hours; they are simply hours nobody else can do for you.

Between the anchors lies the shape buyers underestimate most: the thirty-to-fifty-room property, too large for a family to staff by presence, too small to carry professional management without feeling it. Its arithmetic has to clear a manager's salary *and* a real staffing grid on a revenue base that supports neither comfortably — which is why the middle sizes trade at the widest yields in most markets, and why this manual's anchors sit deliberately on either side of the gap. The gap is ownable; it is simply owned best by operators who already run three of them and can spread a regional manager across the set — which is a business, not an investment, and knowing which one you are buying is this Part's whole question.

The distance question belongs here too. Hotel A can be owned from three time zones: the §16 cadence was designed for exactly that, and the operator is paid to be present. The inn cannot — not in year one, whatever the listing promises: the standards of §6.6 are set by presence, the village relationships that fill twelve rooms attach to a face, and remote inn ownership in the first years is a §3.5 salary paid to a manager plus an oversight problem, which is a different and thinner deal than the one the listing priced. After the systems year — the §6.8 binder written, the team stable — distance becomes buyable like everything else on this chapter's menu.

Couples and partnerships carry one more load line the table never shows: the property's tendency to consume the relationship that runs it. At inn scale the business and the household share a roof, a ledger and an argument style, and the failure pattern is well documented in every innkeeper association's folklore — not bankruptcy but burnout's quieter cousin, the couple who cannot remember which conversations are theirs and which are the building's. The disciplines that work are unromantic: roles split by written domain (§6.1's rows assigned by name, including who outranks whom in each), one weekly business meeting so the kitchen table can stop hosting one nightly, real days off staffed like §18.4's relief factor demands, and the §3.5 salary line paid to *both* so the work is visible as work. The load is survivable; the unbounded version of it is not, and the boundary is drawn on purpose or not at all.

6.2 Volatility is the price of the yield

The nightly lease cuts both ways with unequal blades. When RevPAR falls, costs follow only partly — the fixed shares stay — so profit falls faster than revenue. Hotel A at a mild, ordinary 10% revenue dip, using the stated fixed/variable conventions of §7.2:

WORKED CALCULATION — THE FLEX

Hotel A — a 10% revenue year, flexed honestly

Revenue gives back	-$342,180
Expenses give back — only the variable shares	-$127,831
GOP gives back	**-$214,350**
Every lost revenue dollar took this much profit with it	**63¢**

Inference A 10% revenue dip becomes a 15.1% GOP dip — leverage that runs in both directions, which is exactly why Chapter 21 manages flow-through on the way up and flex on the way down as the operator's defining skill, and why Chapter 7 sizes reserves off the recorded worst case rather than the ordinary one.

The volatility also has a household edition, and it is the one that actually breaks owners. A salary is smooth; a hotel's distribution is not — and the family whose mortgage depends on year one's distribution has coupled the flex above directly to its kitchen table. The rule that prevents it is the §7.3 sequencing: the war chest fills first, the household draws only what the *stress* year supports, and any surplus above both is the actual distribution — declared annually, in the §16 review, like the dividend it is. Owners capitalized this way experience a bad year as arithmetic; owners capitalized backwards experience it as the building demanding the grocery money.

6.3 Who should not own one

Said once, without hedging. You should not own a hotel directly if the money is needed within five years; if nobody in the ownership group will do the monthly governance of Chapter 16; if the plan requires the property to fund your salary *and* a manager's (§3.5 shows the twelve rooms cannot pay twice); if a 40% revenue year — which the record says arrives roughly once a generation (§7.1) — would force a sale; or if what you actually want is the yield without the Tuesdays, which is what Chapter 5's paper routes are honestly for.

The mirror list deserves equal print, because the load is a fit, not a curse. You are built for this if the §16 ninety minutes sounds like the good part of the month; if a business where Tuesday's problem is visible by Wednesday suits your temperament better than one that reports quarterly; if the family names on §6.1's hours are people who actually want the second job (asked privately, not at dinner); if the balance sheet can hold the §7.1 generation-year without selling anything that matters; and if some part of the return you want is the unpriceable line — a place, a staff, a town that knows the building by your name. Those owners exist in every market, they outperform the spreadsheet owners in every downturn, and this book was substantially written for them.

6.4 Delegation has a menu, and every item has a price

The load is not a verdict; it is a budget line. Every hour in §6.1's table can be bought, and the book has already priced the main purchases — collected here so the choice is made once, deliberately. **Buy the desk:** the inn's $65,000 owner-manager salary is exactly the market price of not doing §6.1 yourself; pay it to yourself or to a hire, but it appears on the P&L either way (§3.5). **Buy the management:** Hotel A's HMA costs $123,130 this year — base plus incentive (§15.1) — and converts the owner's job into Chapter 16's ninety minutes a month; §15.3 prices the same decision at the inn's scale, where the fee cannot hide. **Buy the revenue function:** a fractional revenue manager for a select-service property runs in the low tens of thousands a year — an expense §17.4's rate-integrity arithmetic usually repays in a single defended season. **Buy everything:** Chapter 5's paper routes are the final rung — full delegation at the price of control, with the fee drag computed rather than guessed. What cannot be bought at any price is the governance itself: someone with capital at risk still reads the one page of §2.6 and sits the ninety minutes of §16.1. Delegate below that line freely; above it, never.

Recommendation Decide the delegation menu before closing, write the chosen items into the year-one budget, and resist the false economy of unbought help: the owner doing a $25-an-hour job at midnight is not saving money — they are declining to price their own hours, which is the §3.5 mistake wearing work clothes.

Once the menu is chosen, audit it quarterly with one question: *what did I do last month that this P&L already pays someone else to do?* Hours spent re-doing the bookkeeper's coding, shadowing the revenue manager's rate moves, or standing a desk that is staffed on paper are not diligence — they are double payment, the delegation bought and then not taken. The answer is either to stop (the usual cure) or to fire and do it yourself at the §3.5 price (the honest alternative); what the audit forbids is the expensive middle, paying for a function while performing it, which is how owner burnout presents on a P&L.

6.5 A Tuesday at the inn, hour by hour

Because §6.1's table is honest but bloodless, here is the same load as a day — an ordinary shoulder-season Tuesday, seven rooms occupied, nobody's crisis. **6:40** — the breakfast setup, because the part-timer called out and the §18.4 relief factor is a person this morning, and the person is you. **8:15** — a guest reports the shower running cold; the mixing valve again, the one the §21.3 calendar has been asked to fund twice. **9:30** — housekeeping walk with the head housekeeper: two turns, five stayovers, and the linen order that must go in by eleven or miss the truck. **11:00** — the OTA extranet: a competitor dropped weekend rate; twenty minutes of §17.3 thinking about whether to follow (no — fence it: the advance-purchase rate moves, the public rate holds, §17.4's discipline in miniature). **12:30** — lunch at the desk; a walk-in books two nights; a review from Saturday needs the §17.7 response, today, by name. **2:00** — the bookkeeper's weekly hour: three invoices coded, the lodging-tax remittance queued (§22.2's trust money, never touched), the §2.6 one page updated by hand. **4:00** — check-ins begin; between them, the insurance renewal's document request (§7.4) gets twenty minutes. **7:30** — the couple in room 9 wants a dinner recommendation and fifteen minutes of conversation, which is not an interruption; it is the product (§1.2's nightly lease, renewed by hospitality itself). **9:00** — desk closes; the night-arrival instructions are taped, the phone forwards, and the owner is off duty in the way a small-hotel owner is ever off duty, which is approximately. Nothing on this list is hard. All of it is *daily*, and the §3.5 salary line exists because every hour above was work someone must be paid to do — including, especially, when the someone is you.

Read the Tuesday a second time and notice what it never contained: a single decision from this book's decision chapters. No valuation, no financing, no flag choice — just execution, repeated. That is the honest ratio of ownership: the decisions this manual works so carefully arrive perhaps a dozen days a year, and the other three hundred and fifty are Tuesdays, which is why the §1.3 role sentence matters more than any single decision — it is the only instrument that governs the Tuesdays. An owner whose stated role fits their actual appetite experiences the repetition as the business; an owner whose role was aspirational experiences it as erosion, and erosion, not error, is how most small hospitality ownerships actually end.

6.6 What cannot be delegated, by month

§6.4 priced the delegation menu; this section marks the residue — the owner's irreducible hours at each scale, laid against the calendar so they can be planned rather than discovered. At Hotel A's scale the residue is governance itself: the monthly ninety minutes (§16.1), the quarterly capital and covenant read (§11.5's distances, §21.5's ledger), budget season's three tests (§16.3), the January four-doors hour (§29), and the renewal seasons — insurance (§7.4), tax calendar (§22.2–22.3), the STAR comp-set review (§8.4). Call it fifty deliberate hours a year, none delegable because each one *is* ownership: the moments where someone with capital at risk reads a number and decides. At the inn's scale the residue is larger and different in kind — the standards themselves (what clean means, what welcome sounds like) cannot be handed to a manual for years, and the community relationships that fill a twelve-room book (§9.1's generators at village scale) attach to a person before they attach to a property. The planning use of the residue list is blunt: put the fifty hours in the calendar *before* the year starts, at full strength, on days without travel. The owners who skip governance never decide to skip it — they schedule it last, and the year eats it.

Recommendation Write your own residue list before buying — the hours only you can do, by month, honestly — and show it to whoever shares your calendar. Spousal diligence on the load has voided more inn purchases than any inspection report, and it is better performed before the letter of intent than after the first missed holiday.

6.7 Exiting the load without exiting the asset

One more honest page: the load changes across a life, and there are three lawful exits that keep the asset. **Hire the management** — the full HMA route (§15), priced at Hotel A as $123,130 a year; at the inn's scale, a working innkeeper-manager whose salary the §3.5 line already carries if the pro forma was honest. The load compresses to §6.6's governance residue. **Lease the operation** — rarer in hotels than restaurants but real for inns: a tenant-operator pays rent, carries the staff, and the family keeps the building — the §19.2 run-or-lease logic applied to the whole property, with the same honesty test (the rent must beat the §3.5-adjusted operating profit, or the lease is a subsidy wearing a simplification). **Sell the operation, keep the real estate** — the going concern of §1.1 split back into its parts, an opco sale with a propco lease, which Part VI's structures already drew. Each exit trades income for hours at a computable rate, and the computation belongs in the §29 annual review the moment the load stops being paid for by the joy of it. What none of the exits require is the fourth, unpriced one — running the property badly while pretending the load is still being carried. Buildings forgive absent owners slowly and reviews never do; the honest menu above exists so that the quiet default never becomes the plan.

6.8 Hiring at twelve rooms: the inn's people problem, solved small

The load's sharpest edge at inn scale is that every hire is a tenth of the workforce. The 92-key hotel absorbs a mediocre hire; the inn wears one. Three practices fit the scale. **Hire for the second job:** a twelve-room property cannot staff specialists, so every role is a pairing — the housekeeper who also preps breakfast, the desk person who also manages the §17.3 channels — and the interview tests the pairing, not the title; the résumé that lists one skill deeply is, at this scale, half a candidate. **Pay above the village market and staff below its count:** the inn's arithmetic (§3.5) supports fewer, better-paid people rather than the big-house roster in miniature — a premium wage against the local alternatives buys the reliability that a two-person schedule cannot survive losing, and §18.5's turnover math runs fiercer when each departure is ten percent of everything. **Write the manual anyway:** the smallest properties resist documentation hardest — everything lives in the owner's head, which is precisely the §10.6 key-person discount compounding daily. One binder — the opening checklist, the closing checklist, the "what to do when" page, the vendor list — converts the inn from a performance into a system, covers the owner's first vacation in years, and quietly begins the §30.4 succession file. The through-line is the chapter's own: at every scale, the load is manageable exactly to the degree it is honestly counted, fairly paid, and written down.

The load also compounds in a direction this chapter has not yet said aloud: it gets lighter with competence, and the lightening is steep. Year one's inn owner works the §6.1 table at its full weight — every decision novel, every vendor unknown, every rate move a deliberation. Year four's owner runs the same property in substantially fewer hours, not by neglect but by accumulation: the §6.8 binder answers what used to require thought, the §18.7-grade team holds what used to require presence, the §20.6 contracts renew on a calendar instead of a crisis, and judgment has become pattern recognition. The practical corollary belongs in every buyer’s model: the first eighteen months are the load’s honest peak, and families should capitalize that peak — more help budgeted, fewer other commitments, no simultaneous renovations — the way §13.3 capitalizes a ramp, because owners who survive the peak almost always keep the property, and owners who priced year one as the steady state almost never do.

> CHAPTER 06 IN ONE LINE
>
> The load is real, countable and delegable at a price — count the hours, pay for all of them, and let the flex arithmetic tell you how much volatility your balance sheet is actually signing for.

MOST SEARCHED *"hotel investment risk" · "hotels in a portfolio" · "RevPAR 2020 decline"* RANK 2 CLUSTER · CPC $2–$9

PART II · SHOULD I OWN A HOTEL AT ALL? · CHAPTER 07

How much belongs in hospitality 07

THE SHORT ANSWER

Hotels earn a minority allocation, sized so the recorded worst year — not the average one — cannot force a sale. The industry's own history says what that worst year looks like; this chapter reprints it, runs it through Hotel A line by line, and turns the result into a reserve figure and an allocation procedure you can defend to anyone, including yourself in the bad April.

Every asset class should be sized by its recorded behavior rather than its brochure. Hotels are unusual only in how good the record is: a century of uniform accounts and decades of weekly benchmarking mean the drawdowns are not folklore — they are numbers, and numbers can be planned for.

7.1 The drawdown record

Three demand shocks in a generation, as recorded for the United States hotel industry — full-year RevPAR declines, each arriving with little warning inside a single season:

EPISODE	US REVPAR, FULL YEAR	WHAT IT TAUGHT
2001 — 9/11 and recession	-6.9%	Demand can vanish by category — group and corporate first — while leisure holds; mix is a risk line (§9.1)
2009 — the financial crisis	-16.7%	Rate breaks in a credit crunch are slow to rebuild; discounting bought occupancy and poisoned ADR for years (§17.4)
2020 — the pandemic year	-47.5%	The nightly lease runs to zero: no other institutional real estate reprices to empty in three weeks

Reported Declines as reported by the industry's standard benchmarking series for the United States, full calendar years (STR/CoStar US full-year results: the 2020 release names it the worst year on record; 2009 was, until then, the worst since the series began in 1987; the 2001 figure is STR's final full-year number, its January 2002 release having stated a preliminary "about 7 percent"). The figures are reprinted here for sizing, not forecasting: the next shock will differ in cause and rhyme in arithmetic.

The tape rewards a second reading for *shape*, because the three episodes differ in exactly the ways a crisis plan cares about. 2001 was category-selective — group and corporate demand vanished while leisure drove on, so mix decided each property's year. 2009 was rate-destructive: the decline was shallower but the rebuild was slow, because discounted rate re-anchored guest expectations for years — the episode behind §17.4's integrity discipline. 2020 was total but fast-recovering in leisure markets — the nightly lease ran to zero and then repriced upward faster than any lease-bound asset class could follow. Sizing uses only the depth; the §25 playbooks use the shapes, and an owner who knows all three tells the difference in the first quarter rather than the third.

7.2 What 2020 does to Hotel A

Run the worst recorded year through the anchor, holding the stated flex conventions — departmental costs 75% variable, undistributed 30% variable, franchise fees riding revenue, fixed charges fixed:

WORKED CALCULATION — THE STRESS YEAR

Hotel A in a 2020-scale year — revenue down 47.5%

Total operating revenue	$1,796,447
Gross operating profit — margin compresses to 22.2%	$398,597
EBITDA less reserve — the year's true earnings	**$326**
Annual debt service on the §11 loan	-$631,597
Cash after debt service	**-$631,271**
Monthly burn while it lasts	**-$52,606**

EARNINGS THAT SURVIVE	MONTHLY BURN	A $500K RESERVE LASTS	12-MONTH WAR CHEST
$326	**$52,606**	**9.5**mo	**$631,271**
EBITDA less reserve in the stress year — effectively zero, and honestly so	after debt service, at the stated flex conventions	against the recorded worst year — not the average one	the reserve that rides out a full 2020-scale year

Computed The flex conventions are stated inputs, printed above, and deliberately unheroic — real 2020 operators cut deeper than this model allows, and real 2020 lenders granted forbearance the model refuses to assume. Plan on the model; gratefully accept the mercies.

Inference Notice what did *not* happen: the hotel did not lose money at the operating line — GOP held at $398,597 because the nightly lease that surrenders revenue also sheds cost. What breaks owners in the stress year is the capital structure, not the operation. Hotels with 2020-scale burn and twelve months of reserves changed nothing but their sleep; hotels without the reserve sold at the bottom to the owners who had it.

The inn's stress year runs the same arithmetic to a different verdict. Unlevered — as this manual's inn deliberately is — the twelve rooms cannot be foreclosed into a bad sale: the stress year compresses the §3.5 salary and the family's distribution, not the title. That is the honest meaning of the debt-free small property: it trades away the §11 amplification in both directions and converts the recorded worst year from an existential event into a thin one. The inn's war chest is therefore sized to a household question — how many months of the salary line can the family bridge — which is §6.2's kitchen-table arithmetic, and it is smaller, but it is not optional: thin years at small properties end ownerships quietly, by exhaustion, a mechanism no lender is needed for.

Where does the war chest actually live? The question sounds administrative and is really behavioral. The money sits in instruments chosen for dullness — Treasuries, insured deposits, nothing with a quotation interesting enough to check — in an account titled to the purpose, outside the operating entity (§24's walls protect it from the property's creditors) and outside the household's checking (distance protects it from the household). What the design is defending against is not theft but redefinition: the reserve that shares an account with anything else gets mentally re-labeled within two years — absorbed into "our savings," borrowed for the kitchen, counted twice in the family's head. A reserve is real when moving it requires a deliberate act that feels like what it is — opening the storm shutters — and every layer of friction between the chest and casual reach is part of its engineering.

7.3 Sizing the allocation: a procedure, not a percentage

No universal percentage survives contact with a real balance sheet, so this manual gives the procedure instead. **One** — compute your property's stress-year burn as above; for Hotel A it is $52,606 a month. **Two** — fund a dedicated reserve of twelve to eighteen months of that burn ($631,271 to $946,907 here), held liquid, outside the property's operating account, and excluded from your return arithmetic. **Three** — the hotel allocation is then whatever equity remains such that a total loss of the position would be survivable and the stress year would be boring: for most private balance sheets that lands hospitality at a minority of investable assets, and the number matters less than the two conditions that produced it.

Recommendation Write the reserve into the operating agreement as a funded requirement — not an intention — with a rule for replenishment after any draw. Partners who resist funding the reserve in the good year are declaring, politely and in advance, that you will be buying their interest in the bad one. The clause belongs beside the four-condition entity test of §24.2.

The replenishment rule deserves its own sentence because it is where funded reserves quietly die. After any draw, distributions stop — all of them, including the "small" ones — until the chest is whole again; the rule is written, signed at formation, and executes without a meeting, because the meeting is precisely where a half-empty reserve gets rationalized into a new normal. The pattern to fear is sequential: a modest draw in year three, distributions resumed "temporarily" in year four, and the recorded worst year arriving in year five against a chest at forty percent — at which point the family is running §7.5's waterfall with two layers missing and calling it bad luck.

7.4 The insurance program: the risk you sold, itemized

Half of risk management is reserves; the other half is the premium. The $1,050.00-per-key insurance line in Hotel A's statement (§3.4) is not one purchase — it is a program, and owners who cannot itemize it renew it badly. The build, at the stated program shape:

WORKED EXAMPLE — THE PROGRAM BUILD

Hotel A's insurance program — the $96,600 line, unpacked

Property — $15,180,000 insurable value at 0.38 per $100	$57,500
General liability — $310.00 per key, guest-injury exposure	$28,520
Umbrella — the layer above the primary limits	$6,900
Flood (zone X) and ancillary lines	$3,680
The program — $1,050.00 per key, the §3.4 line reconciled	**$96,600**

INSURABLE VALUE	NAMED-STORM DEDUCTIBLE	BI WAITING PERIOD	THE RENEWAL LEVER
$15,180,000 replacement cost, not market value — the number the property rate rides on	**$879,790** 5% of full insured values — property plus twelve months of income — in wind zones; a check you must be able to write (§26.2)	**72hrs** business-interruption cover starts after it — the first three days are yours	**valuation** insurers price on their replacement estimate; walking in with your own appraisal is the one negotiation most owners skip

Computed Program shape and rates are stated inputs, representative of a select-service placement in a non-coastal market; coastal wind, quake and conversion-era buildings price differently, and §20.2 tracks what this line has been doing to the whole industry's fixed charges. The exhibit's job is the anatomy: know your insurable value, your deductibles as dollar figures, and your waiting periods before the renewal quote arrives — the claim-day versions of these questions are §26's.

The renewal itself is an annual negotiation with a calendar, and owners who start it at the quote lose it at the quote. Ninety days out: loss runs requested (five years, all lines — your own claims history is the file the market prices), the statement of values refreshed against the §21.5 ledger's actual improvements, and the appraisal argument prepared if the carrier's replacement estimate has drifted. Sixty days: the broker's marketing list agreed in writing — which carriers see the account this year — because a broker who quietly renews with the incumbent is spending your premium on their retention. Every third year the account goes to full market whatever the relationship, not as a threat but as calibration; §20.2 tracks what this line has done across the industry, and the only owners holding it near the exhibit's rates are the ones who run this calendar.

7.5 The liquidity waterfall: what stands before the guarantee

Put the chapter's pieces in the order a crisis consumes them. When the bad year arrives, cash needs meet a defense that is layered — and every layer has a number and an owner:

WORKED EXAMPLE — THE WATERFALL

Hotel A — the defense, in consumption order

Layer one — the operating account's working cash, days deep	first out
Layer two — the §7.3 war chest, funded at close	$500,000
… lasts 9.5 months at the 2020 burn of $631,271/yr	
Layer three — the FF&E escrow, three years in: real cash, lender consent required	$410,616
Layer four — the lender conversation: forbearance, interest-only, the §25.1 register's playbook	priced in basis points
Layer five — the guarantee: the owner's balance sheet behind $7,514,587 of debt	**the last check**

Inference Two readings. First, the layers are only real if they were built in the good year — the escrow accrues, the war chest is funded, the lender relationship exists before it is needed. Second, notice where the guarantee sits: five layers deep. Owners who sign recourse casually are pricing layer five as if it were layer one; lenders price it the other way, which is why §11.2's menu treats recourse as a rate term. A 2009-scale year ($44,848 of annual burn) never reaches layer three; a 2020-scale year reaches layer four by month ten — the waterfall is the §7.3 procedure, drawn as terrain.

Rehearse the waterfall once a year on paper — the §25.5 tabletop is the full drill; this is its five-minute portfolio edition. Name the month each layer opens at the recorded burn rates, who calls the lender and with what package (the §25.2 playbook's first-week file), and which asset outside the deal is sold *last*. Families who have said the sequence aloud once make the real calls in days; families who have not spend the first quarter of the crisis negotiating with each other instead of with the weather.

7.6 What hotels do to the rest of the portfolio

Sizing looked at the hotel position alone; one more honest lens looks at what the position does to everything beside it. **Correlation, in the bad tail:** hotel cash flows ride GDP, travel and credit conditions — the same factors that mark down the equities and private businesses most families hold — so the §7.1 drawdowns tend to arrive *with* everything else's bad year, not against it. A hotel is real assets by legal form and cyclical operating equity by behavior; portfolios that slot it into a "diversifying real estate" bucket built for apartments are mis-shelving the §1.2 nightly lease. The honest classification: hotels diversify *income sources* (an operating yield uncorrelated with your salary or business in ordinary years) while *concentrating* crisis exposure (correlated in the tail) — which is exactly why the war chest lives outside the deal in assets that are boring on purpose. **The liquidity gradient:** a portfolio's crisis behavior depends on what can be sold without loss when everything is down; every dollar moved into a private hotel moves down that gradient, and the §7.3 procedure's third step — the allocation that keeps the stress year boring — is really a rule about preserving the gradient's liquid end. **The attention budget:** the least-modeled portfolio effect. A direct hotel consumes governance hours (§6.6's residue) that were previously spent elsewhere, and concentrated attention quietly degrades the rest of a family's holdings; pricing the hours honestly (§3.5's rule, applied to yourself) sometimes reroutes the whole decision toward §5's paper aisle — a conclusion this manual reports without embarrassment, since the arithmetic, not the enthusiasm, was always meant to decide.

The portfolio lens finishes with the question families ask in the second good year, so it may as well be answered in the first: *when does a second hotel diversify instead of concentrate?* The honest tests are three, and most second deals fail at least two. Different demand weather: a second property riding the same generators, season or metro is the same bet at double size (§30.6 runs the coverage arithmetic). Different capital fate: no shared lender, no cross-default, separate war chests — or the diversification is legal fiction. And surviving governance: the §6.6 residue doubles while the family's hours do not, which is why the second property is really a decision about hiring the platform (§15.8's bench) rather than about real estate. Two hotels held properly are a small portfolio; two hotels held casually are one large mistake with two addresses.

7.7 The 1980s lesson: what happens when capital stops reading operations

One episode belongs in the sizing chapter as a permanent cautionary appendix. Through the early 1980s, United States tax law made real estate losses broadly usable against any income at short depreciable lives — and hospitality, the most depreciation-rich asset class, became the shelter-vehicle of choice: hotels were built because partnerships needed product, underwritten on tax projections in which the operating forecast was nearly decorative (Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, Pub. L. 97–34 — fifteen-year accelerated lives for real property, stretched to eighteen and then nineteen years by mid-decade; Tax Reform Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99–514, §501, enacting the §469 passive-loss wall; Joint Committee on Taxation, *General Explanation*, JCS-10-87). The 1986 reform's passive-loss wall (§23.2's §469, born here) severed the machine — and the industry spent the following half-decade digesting a supply overhang that operations had never justified, a downturn that ran on its own calendar rather than the economy's and helped feed the early-1990s workout era whose survivors still tell the stories. The lesson is not about tax law, which has changed several times since; it is structural, and it is this chapter's thesis wearing period costume: **whenever hotels are being bought or built for a reason whose arithmetic does not run through a defensible operating forecast** — a shelter, a currency haven, a lender's volume target, a fashion — supply decouples from demand, and the correction is paid by whoever is holding operating exposure when the non-operating reason expires. The sizing corollary: your own allocation must survive not only demand shocks (§7.1's tape) but *supply* shocks manufactured by other people's capital — one more reason the war chest sits outside the deal, the §9.3 pipeline gets read quarterly, and the §13.7 gauges treat everyone else's building boom as your weather report.

Sizing's last discipline is remembering what the allocation is *for* when the sizing feels conservative. A hotel position built this chapter's way — minority allocation, funded war chest, unlevered or coverage-sized debt — will be outperformed, loudly, in every good year by neighbors running fuller sail: more leverage, thinner reserves, two properties where prudence held one. The years those neighbors give it all back arrive on the §7.1 tape's schedule, roughly once a decade, and the sized owner's reward is not schadenfreude; it is **capacity at the bottom** — the dry powder and intact credit that buys the neighbor's property at the neighbor's lender's price. Every fortune this asset class has minted quietly was built on that rotation: conservative through the top, acquisitive through the bottom, twice a generation. The war chest is not a drag on returns; it is the option premium on the industry's recurring clearance sale.

> CHAPTER 07 IN ONE LINE
>
> Size the position off the recorded worst year: compute the stress burn, fund twelve-plus months of it outside the deal, and let hospitality be a minority allocation that a 2020 cannot turn into a forced sale.

PART III AND ON

Six more parts. Twenty-three more chapters.

RUN THE ARITHMETIC YOURSELF, FREE

Should I take this flag?
getfundamento.com/tools/brand-math

What are my five numbers?
getfundamento.com/tools/hotel-five

Which way in fits me?
getfundamento.com/tools/ways-in