SUMMER 2010

ASSESSING ACCURACY: HOTEL HORIZONS® FORECASTS

HOTEL HORIZONS®

PKF HOSPITALITY RESEARCH

Headquartered in Atlanta, PKF Hospitality Research is the research affiliate of PKF Consulting, the consulting and real estate firm specializing in the hospitality industry. PKF Consulting is owned by First Service Corporation, and is a subsidiary of Colliers International. The offices of PKF Consulting, and the other PKF subsidiary, Colliers International Hotels, are located in New York, Boston, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, Washington DC, Atlanta, Houston, Dallas, Los Angeles, Bozeman, Miami, Portland, Seattle, Sacramento, and San Francisco.

PKF Hospitality Research's Hotel Horizons® is a series of periodic hotel forecast reports that analyzes the historical and expected performance of the U.S. lodging markets. Driven by an econometric forecasting model developed under the leadership of Dr. Jack Corgel, the Hotel Horizons® reports cover five years of supply, demand, occupancy, ADR, and RevPAR for 50 major U.S. markets, as well as six national chain-scale segments. Within each market forecast, separate estimates are prepared for upper-price and lower-price hotels. Historical lodging data comes from Smith Travel Research (STR); historic and forecast economic data comes from Moody's Economy.com.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The accuracy of an economic forecast is of the foremost importance to users. This is not a qualification lost on the hospitality industry, where investors and managers demand direction for the future of an industry in which leases are rewritten every day and rental rates experience a high level of seasonality and volatility quarter to quarter.

PKF HOSPITALITY RESEARCH

Colliers INTERNATIONAL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY CONT.

A comparison of the budgeted financial results to the actual performance reported by managers of over 500 U.S. hotels during 2008 revealed an average error rate of -11% for revenues and profits for the period with variances ranging from -2.75% in ADR (average daily rate) to -14% in NOI PAR (net operating income per available room).

PKF Hospitality Research's Hotel Horizons® forecasts provide market guidance formed from econometric forecasting knowledge and expert industry insight.

While various methods exist for determining accuracy, we rely on comparisons of the year-over-year change of forecast hotel performance to what actually occurred in the same period as a direct indicator of accuracy. How accurate have Hotel Horizons® forecasts been? To answer this question we analyze two distinct periods in the economic cycle - the period leading up to the cyclical turning point in 2008 Q4 and the period after the turning point.

The small percentage differences shown in the nearby table indicate that the Hotel Horizons® forecasting approach used by PKF Hospitality Research was successful in foreseeing both the directions and magnitudes of change in these performance measures one to three quarters into the future.

The following table shows the average percentage point difference between forecast and actual change of five key hotel performance variables at the national level during the aforementioned periods - demand, supply, average daily rate, occupancy, and revenue per available room. The small percentage differences shown in the table indicate that the Hotel Horizons® forecasting approach used by PKF Hospitality Research was successful in foreseeing both the directions and magnitudes of change in these performance measures one to three quarters into the future.

Hotel Horizons® forecasts closely approximate changes in hotel performance at the national level, and to a slightly lesser extent the MSA level.

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE POINT DIFFERENCE IN ALL VARIABLES - FORECAST VS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE, ALL U.S. HOTELS

Relation to Turning Point	Forecast	1 Quarter Out	2 Quarters Out	3 Quarters Out
Before	2007 Q4	0.4%	1.7%	1.6%
After	2009 Q1	0.7%	2.0%	0.6%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

Different periods in the economic cycle yield different levels of accuracy. The following conclusions come from on our analysis of Hotel Horizons® forecasting accuracy:

1. Hotel Horizons® forecasts closely approximate changes in hotel performance at the national level, and to a slightly lesser extent the MSA level.

2. Hotel Horizons® forecasts are incapable of predicting hotel performance during natural disasters and severe economic shocks; and for the short-term period following these events due to the unique nature of each event.

3. Hotel Horizons® forecasts are very accurate in periods leading up to turning points.

4. The accuracy of Hotel Horizons® forecasts is somewhat inconsistent during periods following a turning point, which are typically unstable periods for the economy.

OBJECTIVE OF THE ACCURACY ASSESSMENT

This report contains an accuracy assessment of PKF Hospitality Research's Hotel Horizons® forecasts developed from comparisons between forecast changes in hotel market performance measures and actual changes at different points during the economic cycle. As part of this assessment, we explain what happens when unforeseeable events occur and the impact of these events on forecasting accuracy. Specifically, the study relies on Hotel Horizons® forecasts released during the period 2007 Q3 through 2009 Q1 that produced forecasts for each quarter from 2007 Q3 through 2009 Q3. The exhibits and tables contained herein display information about forecasting accuracy for all hotels in the United States. An abbreviated accuracy assessment also is provided for hotel chain-scales and Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) markets.

HOTEL HORIZONS® BACKGROUND

The first release of Hotel Horizons® was published in September 2007 using historical data from Moody's Economy.com and Smith Travel Research covering the period 1987 Q1 through 2007 Q2. These releases continue through the present on a quarterly schedule. Exhibit 1 shows the releases and historical data periods used for the production of the hotel market forecasts. Accuracy assessment also is provided for hotel chain-scales and Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) markets.

EXHIBIT 1: HOTEL HORIZONS® FORECAST RELEASES

Horizons Edition	Release Date	Data Period
Volume I, Issue III	Sept-07	87Q1 – 07Q2
Volume I, Issue IV	Dec-07	87Q1 – 07Q3
Volume II, Issue I	Mar-08	87Q1 – 07Q4
Volume II, Issue II	Jun-08	87Q1 – 08Q1
Volume II, Issue III	Sept-08	87Q1 – 08Q2
Special Crisis Update	Oct 27-08	87Q1 – 08Q2
Volume II, Issue IV	Dec-08	87Q1 – 08Q3
Volume III, Issue I	Mar-09	87Q1 - 08Q4
Volume III, Issue II	Jun-09	87Q1 – 09Q1
Volume III, Issue III	Aug-09	87Q1 – 09Q2
Volume III, Issue IV	Dec-09	87Q1 – 09Q3
Volume IV, Issue I	Mar-10	87Q1 - 09Q4
Volume IV, Issue II	May-10	87Q1 - 10Q1

HOTEL HORIZONS® BACKGROUND CONT.

Quarterly Hotel Horizons® reports cover the United States hotel industry at the national, chain scale, and MSA market levels. For each market, forecasts are generated for the following hotel market performance indicators: Supply, Demand, Average Daily Rate, Occupancy, and Revenue per Available Room. Exhibit 2 identifies these indicators in terms of their abbreviations and definitions.

EXHIBIT 2: HOTEL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Variable	Abbreviation	Definition
Rooms Available	Supply	Number of available hotel rooms/ period
Rooms Sold	Demand	Number of rooms sold/period
Average Daily Rate	ADR	Daily Price of an occupied hotel room
Occupancy Percent	Occ	Demand ÷ Supply
Revenue per Available Room	RevPAR	Rooms Revenue ÷ Rooms Available

METHODS FOR ANALYZING ACCURACY

A traditional method for measuring accuracy of an econometric-based forecast involves computing percent variances between forecast and actual levels in a given period. The percent variance is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Percent Variance} = (\text{Forecast} - \text{Actual}) \div \text{Actual}$$

where 'Forecast' is the value of the hotel market indicator for a future period generated by the forecasting process and 'Actual' is the realized value of the market indicator at the end of the period[1].

The percent variance approach to accuracy assessment has the potential drawback of normalizing values for the direction of errors. For example, the ADR forecast is $50 and actual ADR turns out to be $49. The percent variance equals just over 2 percent and it may be concluded that the forecasting accuracy is 98 percent. The percent variance measure unfortunately does not inform as to whether the forecasting method over- or under-predicted market performance.

To avoid this issue, the method utilized to assess Hotel Horizons® forecasting accuracy in this study involves comparisons between forecast and actual period-to-period percentage changes. This difference equation is

$$\text{Difference} = \%\Delta\text{Forecast} - \%\Delta\text{Actual}$$

1The forecasting process for Hotel Horizons® as described in the appendix of each report is a combination of econometric modeling, a process by which to explain future market behavior in an objective manner in line with economic theory, and industry expert judgment, to account for events that could not possibly be predicted by the econometric model (i.e., Hurricane Katrina).

Once turning points occur, forecasting approaches can be quite accurate in lining out the paths either to economic downturns or recoveries.

METHODS FOR ANALYZING ACCURACY CONT.

where %ΔForecast is the percent change from the realized beginning value and future period forecast, and %ΔActual is the percent change from the realized beginning value and the realized ending period value. For example, the next quarter forecast indicates a percentage change in occupied rooms of 2.0 percent while the actual change observed at the end of next quarter for occupied rooms is 4.0 percent. The conclusion would be that the forecasting process underestimated the percent change by 2.0 percentage points.

Throughout this report, we study Hotel Horizons® forecasts from different points in the economic cycle and identify the variations between forecast and actual changes. Several potential reasons may explain differences between forecast and actual hotel performance measures. These include unexplained errors in the macroeconomic forecasts that underlie the hotel market forecasts, unexplained errors in hotel market forecasting processes, unexpected turning points in the business and hotel market cycles, and exogenous shocks, such as hurricanes. This report does not attempt to fully determine the contribution of each potential explanation for discrepancies between forecast and actual results, but instead generally provides perspectives on the differences between forecast and actual performance.

The financial crisis that began in September 2008 highlights an important limitation of forecasting economic activity. Forecasting approaches have yet to solve the problem of predicting turning points in business cycles regardless of whether or not the turning point is triggered by an unexpected event. An article that discusses this issue in some depth as it relates to hotel market cycles appeared in the 2009 edition of PKF's *Trends® in the Hotel Industry*[2]. While forecasting turning points is beyond the capability of contemporary models, once turning points occur forecasting approaches can be quite accurate in lining out the paths either to economic downturns or recoveries. Therefore, our assessment judges Hotel Horizons® forecasting accuracy during periods leading up to the current recession and financial crisis and the periods immediately following.

WHAT TO EXPECT IN THIS REPORT

This report examines the accuracy of the national forecast for two forecasting periods, 2007 Q3 through 2008 Q2 and 2009 Q1 through 2009 Q3. Discussions here center on both the percentage point difference between forecast and actual changes from prior-year values and their relation to general economic behavior at that time. Market performance of hotels in MSA markets also will be evaluated for 2007 Q4 through 2008 Q2 and 2009 Q1 through 2009 Q3. Finally, we provide commentary on forecasting issues during troublesome times, with topics including "forecasting into the wind" and the ability of forecasting to accurately predict performance when upcoming cyclical peaks and troughs have been defined.

2See, Corgel and Woodworth (2009).

FORECASTING IN NORMAL TIMES – 2007 Q4 THROUGH 2008 Q2

During the period 2007 Q4 through 2008 Q2, the economy had made its way over a cyclical peak and was officially in recession. By labeling this period 'normal times', we mean an economic environment in which the forecasting model functions without the presence of shocks and a realized turning point. During a period such as this, we expect the forecasting model to more closely approximate actual market behavior than during turbulent segments in the economic cycle.

Percentage point differences between forecast and actual year-over-year change from the National Hotel Horizons® forecast from 2007 Q4 appear in Exhibit 3. The PKF-HR forecasting approach, utilizing data through 2007 Q3, produced results that average (across the five variables studied) 0.4 percent, 1.7 percent, and 1.6 percent difference between forecast and actual change in performance over three quarters into the future. During this forecasting horizon the PKF-HR method slightly overestimated hotel market performance. Hotel Horizons® forecasts generally predicted the correct direction of performance change, and across all performance measures the forecasts are on average within two percentage points of the actual performance changes.

EXHIBIT 3: DIFFERENCE IN YOY CHANGE: I.IV FORECAST - DATA AS OF 2007 Q3

All U.S. Hotels		2007 Q4		2008 Q1		2008 Q2	
		Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Occ	Values	-0.3%	-0.5%	-2.3%	-2.7%	-0.9%	-2.5%
	Diff.	0.3%		0.4%		1.7%	
Rate	Values	6.1%	6.3%	7.0%	4.7%	5.4%	3.8%
	Diff.	-0.2%		2.3%		1.6%	
RevPAR	Values	5.8%	5.7%	4.6%	1.9%	4.4%	1.2%
	Diff.	0.1%		2.7%		3.3%	
Supply	Values	2.7%	1.8%	3.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%
	Diff.	0.9%		1.4%		-0.1%	
Demand	Values	2.5%	1.3%	1.2%	-0.6%	1.5%	-0.1%
	Diff.	1.2%		1.8%		1.6%	
Average Difference		0.4%		1.7%		1.6%	

PRE-TURNING POINT FORECASTS

Hotel Horizons® forecasts cover 50 of the largest MSA hotel markets in the United States. Exhibit 4.A shows the mean absolute percentage differences between forecast and actual change in performance for hotel performance across the 50 MSA markets. Economic and non-economic events are typically unique to that specific area. Because forecasting

PRE-TURNING POINT FORECASTS CONT.

efforts are incapable of anticipating shocks, there may be considerable variation in hotel market performance across MSA markets that experienced shocks compared to MSAs that did not. In Exhibit 4.B we list the MSAs where forecasts did not capture performance changes as well as in other MSAs. Note that several of the outliers in each period are for the New Orleans MSA. Our forecasts could not accurately foresee the path of the New Orleans recovery following the unique Hurricane Katrina event in 2005 largely because a localized catastrophic event of such magnitude rarely occurs.[3] The Appendix A provides a full set of data on differences between forecast and actual performance for the 50 MSAs, six chain scales, and National levels covered by the Hotel Horizons® forecast during this period.

EXHIBIT 4.A: MEAN ABSOLUTE % POINT DIFFERENCE - I.IV 50 LARGEST MSAS

	2007 Q4	2008 Q1	2008 Q2
Occ	2.5%	3.8%	2.8%
ADR	1.6%	2.6%	2.5%
RevPAR	3.2%	5.9%	4.5%
Supply	0.5%	0.9%	0.9%
Demand	2.5%	4.2%	2.9%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

EXHIBIT 4B: GREATEST DIFFERENCE - FORECAST VS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

	2007 Q4		2008 Q1		2008 Q2	
	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.
Occ	New Orleans	-9.1%	New Orleans	-13.3%	New Orleans	-13.2%
ADR	New Orleans	-9.9%	Chicago	7.7%	Baltimore	6.4%
RevPAR	New Orleans	-19.0%	Chicago	17.3%	New Orleans	-17.8%
Supply	Detroit	-1.6%	Fort Lauderdale	-3.3%	Oahu	3.0%
Demand	New Orleans	-10.6%	New Orleans	-15.1%	New Orleans	-14.9%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

3The terrorist attack on September 11, 2001 had immediate effects on hotel performance New York and secondary effects throughout the nation, but did not result in mass displacement of people and geographic redistribution of meeting business as occurred following Hurricane Katrina.

During periods of normal economic growth, the elasticity between hotel market and economic variables approximately equals 1.2 - meaning that for every one percent increase in employment, hotel room demand increases by 1.2 percent.

EXHIBIT 4C: SMALLEST DIFFERENCE - FORECAST VS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

	2007 Q4		2008 Q1		2008 Q2	
	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.
Occ	Miami	0.10%	Miami	-0.10%	Hartford	0.00%
ADR	Oahu	0.00%	Charlotte	0.10%	Austin	0.10%
RevPAR	Atlanta	0.00%	San Antonio	-0.50%	Long Island	-0.10%
Supply	San Francisco	0.00%	Tampa	0.00%	Newark	0.00%
Demand	Columbus	0.00%	Fort Worth	-0.20%	Los Angeles	0.00%

FORECASTING INTO THE WIND

Hotel Horizons® forecasts are derived from statistical relationships between historical hotel market performance measures and indicators of underlying economic condition, most importantly income and employment.[4] During periods of normal economic growth, the elasticity between hotel market and economic variables approximately equals 1.2 - meaning that for every one percent increase in employment, hotel room demand increases by 1.2 percent. However, during and around cyclical peaks and troughs, these relationships move closer to 1.6. Generating forecasts for future periods during which the elasticity numbers are expected to increase following a prolonged period of consistent growth requires a heightened level of human intervention to judgmentally adjust econometric forecasts. As described in our Hotel Horizons® reports,

"...a committee of hotel experts from PKF Hospitality Research performs a thorough review of each model prediction...this committee modifies predictions from the model when there is compelling evidence that factors have come into play in a market that the model could not possibly foresee."[5]

Our forecasts from 2008 Q4, a period in which the economy reached an inflection point following events in the financial sector that provided clear evidence of recession cannot be evaluated objectively for accuracy. Even with substantial judgmental intervention, the effects of the dramatic cyclical phase change brought on by the financial crisis could not be fully anticipated in the PKF-HR forecast method in the release of early December 2008. The resulting differences between forecast (i.e., overestimation) and actual performance changes are apparent.

FORECASTING THE DOWNWARD PHASE OF THE CYCLE: 2009 Q1 - 2009 Q3

Percentage point differences between forecast and actual values for the Hotel Horizons® National forecast from the 2009 Q1 edition appear in Exhibit 5. This forecast release, the first to

4 For more information about how the forecasts are produced see the Hotel Horizons® Appendix.

5 "The Judgmental Component." Hotel Horizons® Appendix.

include data encompassing the shift in the hotel demand and economic relationships brought on by financial crisis, shows the ability of PKF HR's forecasting approach to track the hotel market fortunes following a reversal in the cycle. Despite the forecast being driven by historical data that includes very little, if any, performance changes of the magnitude observed in late 2008, the forecast changes come within two percentage points on average of the performance changes observed during the first three quarters of 2009.

Just as the PKF HR forecasting method resulted in a slight overestimation of hotel performance prior to the major turning point, the forecasts from the 2009 Q1 release tend to underestimate performance changes as the markets unraveled during 2009. We are in the process of researching these tendencies to determine if corrections can be introduced to the econometric models to avoid such tendencies in the future.

EXHIBIT 5: DIFFERENCE IN YOY CHANGE: III.I FORECAST - DATA AS OF 2008 Q4

All U.S. Hotels		2009 Q1		2009 Q2		2009 Q3	
		Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Occ	Values	-10.0%	-10.9%	-9.3%	-10.5%	-7.3%	-7.9%
	Diff.	0.9%		1.2%		0.6%	
Rate	Values	-7.1%	-7.7%	-6.4%	-10.4%	-8.1%	-9.8%
	Diff.	0.6%		4.0%		1.6%	
RevPAR	Values	-16.4%	-17.7%	-15.1%	-19.8%	-14.9%	-16.9%
	Diff.	1.4%		4.7%		2.1%	
Supply	Values	3.1%	3.2%	2.6%	3.1%	2.1%	3.2%
	Diff.	-0.1%		-0.5%		-1.1%	
Demand	Values	-7.2%	-8.0%	-6.9%	-7.7%	-5.4%	-5.0%
	Diff.	0.8%		0.8%		-0.4%	
Average Difference		0.7%		2.0%		0.6%	

POST-TURNING POINT FORECAST

The 2009 Q1 Hotel Horizons® forecast represents the first effort by PKF-HR to predict hotel market outcomes for the nation, market segments, and MSAs following the unanticipated crisis of late 2008. The data indicate that all MSAs were negatively affected by recession and financial crisis, but the declines and recoveries of each MSA hotel market has proven in the past to be somewhat different. Exhibit 6.A presents the mean absolute percentage point difference between forecast and actual change in MSA performance for the hotel performance measures analyzed in this report. In Exhibit 6.B, we list the MSAs where forecasts did not capture performance changes as well as in other MSAs. Appendix B provides a full set of data on differences between forecast and actual performance for the 50 MSAs, six chain scales, and National levels covered by the Hotel Horizons® forecasts during this period.

EXHIBIT 6.A: MEAN ABSOLUTE % POINT DIFFERENCE - I.IV 50 LARGEST MSAS

	2009 Q1	2009 Q2	2009 Q3
Occ	3.0%	3.9%	3.1%
ADR	2.4%	3.7%	4.9%
RevPAR	4.3%	5.9%	5.5%
Supply	0.6%	0.9%	0.9%
Demand	3.3%	4.3%	3.6%

EXHIBIT 6.B: GREATEST DIFFERENCE - FORECAST VS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

	2009 Q1		2009 Q2		2009 Q3	
	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.
Occ	Kansas City	7.9%	Dallas	9.0%	Houston	14.5%
ADR	West Palm Beach	8.1%	San Francisco	14.3%	San Francisco	12.6%
RevPAR	Baltimore	-12.8%	San Francisco	16.8%	Houston	22.3%
Supply	Fort Worth	2.2%	Newark	4.6%	Newark	4.8%
Demand	Kansas City	8.5%	Fort Worth	11.1%	Houston	15.1%

EXHIBIT 6.C: SMALLEST DIFFERENCE - FORECAST VS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

	2009 Q1		2009 Q2		2009 Q3	
	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.	MSA	Diff.
Occ	Boston	0.1%	Baltimore	0.0%	Raleigh-Durham	0.0%
ADR	Philadel-phia	0.1%	Cincinnati	-0.2%	Hartford	0.0%
RevPAR	Denver	0.1%	Long Island	-0.1%	Tucson	0.0%
Supply	Washing-ton DC	0.0%	Albuquer-que	0.0%	Minne-apolis	0.0%
Demand	Atlanta	0.0%	Philadel-phia	0.1%	San Diego	-0.2%

Regardless of the economic climate, hotel market performance forecasting of single MSAs presents greater challenges than predicting the entire nation. What is apparent from the information contained in Exhibit 6, the series of adjustments made by economists at PKF-HR to the forecasting approach failed to result in accurate forecasts of performance measures for some MSAs in the quarters when the market was rapidly deteriorating. Moreover, these adjustments did not lead to improvements in accuracy from 2009 Q1 through 2009 Q3. The first three quarters of 2009 were truly unique in American economic history. Nevertheless, we will continue to retest our forecasting approach to determine if improvements can be introduced that would have improved MSA forecasting during the period.

CONCLUSION

The PKF Hospitality Research Hotel Horizons® platform regularly provides forecasts of key hotel performance measures to aid in budgeting, investing, and other capital investments in the hotel industry. An important question that we are frequently asked is – How accurate are your forecasts? This is a question that any firm offering forecasting products to the market should be willing to answer. This report attempts to answer accuracy questions regarding national and MSA hotel market forecasts for both stable and unstable periods.

We make the following conclusions from the data presented in the report:

1. Hotel Horizons® forecasts are very accurate for the nation and to a slightly lesser extent for MSAs.
2. Hotel Horizons® forecasts cannot anticipate natural disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, and economic shocks that induce inflection in the cycle. Hotel forecasting also cannot as yet accurately track the recovery of affected markets until after the shock has been fully recognized.
3. Hotel Horizons® forecasts are consistently accurate in periods leading up to cyclical peaks and prior to turning points.
4. Hotel Horizons® forecasts become somewhat less consistent following sharp turning points when economic conditions are quite unstable.

Fortunately for our customers, the periods of growth and relative stability when our forecasts are most accurate far outnumber the periods of instability when accuracy suffers in some, but not all markets. Our commitment continues to be on improving accuracy. Improvement will come from our own efforts in testing alternative approachs and from the stresses placed on our approaches coming from recessions and extraordinary events, such as the financial crisis of late 2008.

REFERENCES

Corgel, Jack and R. Mark Woodworth, "The Next Turning Point Toward Recovery in the Hotel Market Cycle," Trends in the Hotel Industry USA Edition, PKF Hospitality Research, 2009, pp. 7-15.

PKF Hospitality Research. Hotel Horizons® Appendix.

Jack Corgel, Ph. D.
Senior Advisor to PKF Hospitality Research, and
Robert C. Baker Chair of Real Estate, Cornell University School of Hotel Administration

Aaron Walls
Research Analyst
PKF Hospitality Research

Will Woodworth
Intern
PKF Hospitality Research

PKF HOSPITALITY RESEARCH
3475 Lenox Rd
STE 720
Atlanta, GA 30326

TEL +1 404 842 1150
FAX +1 404 842 1165

APPENDIX A.1 - 2007 Q4 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2007 Q4

ALL U.S. HOTELS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
All U.S. Hotels	-0.3%	-0.5%	6.1%	6.3%	5.8%	5.7%	2.7%	1.8%	2.5%	1.3%

NATIONAL CHAIN SCALES

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Economy	0.2%	-1.4%	3.0%	2.9%	3.2%	1.5%	2.4%	2.2%	2.6%	0.8%
Luxury	0.1%	0.3%	6.9%	7.3%	7.1%	7.6%	2.1%	2.1%	2.2%	2.4%
Midscale W/ F&B	-0.3%	-1.3%	4.4%	5.4%	4.0%	4.0%	-2.5%	-3.3%	-2.8%	-4.6%
Midscale w/o F&B	-0.9%	-1.8%	6.8%	7.0%	5.8%	5.1%	4.5%	4.7%	3.5%	2.9%
Upper Upscale	0.1%	0.3%	5.3%	5.7%	5.4%	6.0%	2.3%	2.5%	2.5%	2.8%
Upscale	-0.8%	-1.0%	5.8%	5.7%	5.0%	4.7%	4.2%	5.3%	3.4%	4.3%

50 LARGEST MSAS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Albuquerque	-1.5%	-2.2%	6.9%	5.2%	5.3%	2.9%	1.8%	1.6%	0.3%	-0.6%
Anaheim	-0.2%	-1.2%	8.4%	7.7%	8.2%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	-1.2%
Atlanta	0.1%	-2.6%	4.4%	7.3%	4.5%	4.5%	1.1%	1.4%	1.2%	-1.3%
Austin	2.3%	-0.9%	10.8%	9.1%	13.4%	8.1%	0.8%	0.7%	3.1%	-0.3%
Baltimore	-3.0%	-2.3%	4.8%	4.4%	1.6%	2.1%	6.6%	5.6%	3.4%	3.2%
Boston	1.4%	5.5%	6.3%	11.7%	7.7%	17.7%	0.7%	0.8%	2.1%	6.3%
Charlotte	-0.5%	-2.0%	10.0%	11.0%	9.5%	8.7%	2.5%	2.0%	1.9%	-0.1%
Chicago	0.0%	-1.0%	6.1%	4.2%	6.1%	3.1%	1.7%	1.1%	1.7%	0.1%
Cincinnati	0.1%	-3.4%	5.2%	5.8%	5.3%	2.2%	2.4%	2.7%	2.4%	-0.8%
Cleveland	0.9%	0.3%	3.5%	5.5%	4.5%	5.8%	0.6%	0.6%	1.5%	0.8%
Columbus	0.0%	-3.2%	5.3%	5.6%	5.4%	2.2%	1.8%	1.4%	1.8%	-1.8%
Dallas	-1.8%	-3.3%	7.3%	5.8%	5.4%	2.3%	1.9%	1.9%	0.1%	-1.4%
Denver	2.1%	-0.9%	9.2%	7.2%	11.5%	6.2%	4.2%	4.1%	6.4%	3.2%
Detroit	2.8%	1.3%	-0.1%	3.2%	2.7%	4.6%	1.7%	3.3%	4.5%	4.7%
Fort Lauderdale	-2.8%	0.8%	7.6%	5.9%	4.6%	6.8%	1.3%	2.4%	-1.6%	3.3%
Fort Worth	-0.1%	-0.9%	7.2%	8.2%	7.1%	7.3%	5.8%	6.7%	5.7%	5.7%
Hartford	-2.4%	3.6%	4.8%	6.4%	2.3%	10.3%	2.3%	2.9%	-0.1%	6.7%
Houston	0.6%	-1.4%	7.6%	10.1%	8.2%	8.6%	2.5%	2.6%	3.0%	1.1%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX A.1 CONT. - 2007 Q4 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2007 Q4

50 LARGEST MSAS CONT.

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Indianapolis	1.5%	-0.3%	2.8%	2.9%	4.3%	2.6%	3.1%	2.7%	4.6%	2.3%
Jacksonville	-1.7%	-3.9%	6.0%	5.2%	4.2%	1.1%	3.2%	4.0%	1.4%	-0.1%
Kansas City	-1.0%	0.7%	4.8%	5.2%	3.7%	5.9%	4.2%	3.5%	3.1%	4.3%
Long Island	4.0%	5.6%	2.4%	3.5%	6.5%	9.3%	2.2%	1.3%	6.3%	7.0%
Los Angeles	-0.3%	0.1%	7.4%	8.3%	7.1%	8.5%	1.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%
Memphis	-2.1%	-1.9%	6.6%	6.8%	4.4%	4.8%	4.3%	3.0%	2.1%	1.0%
Miami	1.8%	1.7%	10.6%	11.7%	12.6%	13.6%	1.6%	1.7%	3.4%	3.5%
Minneapolis	0.4%	-1.6%	4.3%	5.5%	4.6%	3.8%	2.8%	3.5%	3.1%	1.8%
Nashville	-0.8%	-4.0%	7.1%	7.6%	6.3%	3.3%	2.3%	2.2%	1.5%	-1.9%
New Orleans	-7.0%	2.0%	-2.4%	7.6%	-9.2%	9.7%	6.3%	7.3%	-1.2%	9.4%
New York	1.4%	1.1%	12.1%	12.8%	13.7%	14.1%	2.9%	3.3%	4.4%	4.5%
Newark	2.8%	3.9%	6.0%	5.5%	9.0%	9.7%	0.5%	0.3%	3.3%	4.3%
Oahu	-5.6%	-5.5%	6.8%	6.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.5%	1.0%	-5.2%	-4.6%
Oakland	5.8%	5.7%	6.3%	5.5%	12.5%	11.5%	0.3%	-0.8%	6.1%	4.9%
Orlando	-0.8%	3.0%	3.9%	4.9%	3.0%	8.1%	1.2%	1.3%	0.4%	4.4%
Philadelphia	0.8%	-4.7%	6.9%	6.5%	7.8%	1.4%	0.8%	2.0%	1.7%	-2.8%
Phoenix	-1.7%	-4.5%	7.1%	4.1%	5.3%	-0.6%	2.6%	2.4%	0.8%	-2.2%
Pittsburgh	2.4%	-0.8%	7.9%	7.1%	10.5%	6.3%	3.2%	3.0%	5.7%	2.2%
Portland	2.1%	2.8%	8.7%	8.0%	10.9%	11.0%	1.5%	1.3%	3.6%	4.1%
Raleigh-Durham	-1.4%	-2.1%	7.5%	7.6%	6.0%	5.4%	3.0%	3.4%	1.5%	1.3%
Richmond	4.0%	-0.2%	5.1%	7.8%	9.2%	7.5%	1.0%	0.2%	5.0%	-0.1%
Sacramento	-4.4%	-3.0%	2.8%	2.2%	-1.8%	-0.9%	4.5%	4.3%	-0.2%	1.2%
Saint Louis	1.9%	-6.8%	5.3%	2.8%	7.3%	-4.1%	1.7%	1.1%	3.6%	-5.7%
Salt Lake City	2.4%	-2.8%	9.3%	6.5%	12.0%	3.5%	1.3%	1.5%	3.7%	-1.3%
San Antonio	-4.1%	-2.8%	5.3%	1.5%	1.0%	-1.4%	5.4%	4.2%	1.1%	1.2%
San Diego	-1.6%	2.8%	5.2%	3.5%	3.5%	6.4%	1.7%	2.7%	0.1%	5.5%
San Francisco	2.2%	3.9%	7.0%	9.0%	9.4%	13.2%	0.8%	0.7%	3.0%	4.7%
Seattle	1.3%	-1.8%	6.1%	6.9%	7.5%	4.9%	2.9%	2.7%	4.3%	0.8%
Tampa	-5.3%	-7.6%	5.1%	5.3%	-0.4%	-2.7%	2.3%	1.8%	-3.1%	-6.0%
Tucson	-1.9%	-7.9%	8.5%	7.4%	6.5%	-1.0%	1.2%	2.0%	-0.7%	-6.1%
Washington DC	0.0%	-0.7%	4.6%	7.9%	4.6%	7.1%	2.4%	2.5%	2.4%	1.7%
West Palm Beach	-4.6%	-6.7%	1.5%	5.0%	-3.2%	-2.0%	5.8%	6.6%	0.9%	-0.5%
Mean Absolute Percent Difference	2.5%		1.6%		3.2%		0.5%		2.5%	

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX A.2 - 2007 Q4 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2008 Q1

ALL U.S. HOTELS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
All U.S. Hotels	-2.3%	-2.7%	7.0%	4.7%	4.6%	1.9%	3.5%	2.1%	1.2%	-0.6%

NATIONAL CHAIN SCALES

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Economy	-1.4%	-3.5%	3.8%	2.3%	2.3%	-1.4%	2.4%	2.2%	0.9%	-1.4%
Luxury	0.4%	-1.9%	6.7%	5.1%	7.1%	3.1%	2.2%	2.4%	2.6%	0.4%
Midscale W/ F&B	-3.9%	-4.1%	6.1%	4.4%	2.0%	0.1%	-1.9%	-2.7%	-5.7%	-6.7%
Midscale w/o F&B	-1.1%	-3.1%	7.2%	5.2%	6.1%	1.9%	4.6%	4.9%	3.5%	1.6%
Upper Upscale	0.7%	-2.4%	5.9%	3.4%	6.7%	0.9%	2.4%	2.8%	3.1%	0.3%
Upscale	0.3%	-3.3%	6.7%	3.7%	7.0%	0.3%	4.7%	5.7%	5.0%	2.3%

50 LARGEST MSAS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Albuquerque	2.8%	4.1%	8.3%	4.6%	11.3%	8.8%	2.7%	2.2%	5.6%	6.4%
Anaheim	-1.6%	-3.2%	12.5%	5.3%	10.6%	2.0%	0.3%	0.1%	-1.3%	-3.0%
Atlanta	-0.1%	-4.5%	6.6%	3.0%	6.5%	-1.6%	1.7%	1.4%	1.6%	-3.2%
Austin	-1.3%	-5.3%	8.1%	6.4%	6.7%	0.8%	1.5%	0.7%	0.1%	-4.6%
Baltimore	-2.3%	-8.3%	3.2%	0.8%	0.9%	-7.6%	6.9%	6.4%	4.5%	-2.4%
Boston	3.9%	1.9%	8.8%	6.2%	13.1%	8.2%	1.7%	1.9%	5.7%	3.8%
Charlotte	0.9%	-2.7%	8.8%	8.7%	9.8%	5.8%	2.6%	1.2%	3.5%	-1.5%
Chicago	3.2%	-5.7%	11.8%	4.1%	15.4%	-1.9%	2.6%	1.9%	5.9%	-3.9%
Cincinnati	-1.0%	-4.3%	4.9%	6.4%	3.8%	1.8%	1.1%	2.2%	0.1%	-2.2%
Cleveland	1.8%	-6.0%	1.7%	2.4%	3.5%	-3.7%	2.1%	1.5%	3.9%	-4.6%
Columbus	-1.6%	-3.6%	4.8%	2.8%	3.1%	-0.9%	2.0%	1.5%	0.4%	-2.2%
Dallas	-2.9%	-4.8%	6.7%	4.1%	3.6%	-0.9%	3.5%	2.8%	0.5%	-2.1%
Denver	5.1%	-3.1%	8.7%	4.4%	14.3%	1.2%	3.0%	2.8%	8.3%	-0.4%
Detroit	1.8%	-4.7%	6.1%	4.5%	7.9%	-0.4%	2.0%	3.9%	3.8%	-1.0%
Fort Lauderdale	-0.2%	0.0%	4.0%	-1.5%	3.9%	-1.5%	0.2%	3.5%	0.0%	3.5%
Fort Worth	-4.7%	-3.9%	3.8%	7.5%	-1.1%	3.2%	8.8%	8.1%	3.6%	3.8%
Hartford	1.5%	2.3%	6.7%	5.2%	8.4%	7.6%	0.6%	1.6%	2.2%	3.9%
Houston	-4.7%	-3.1%	7.3%	9.0%	2.2%	5.6%	3.0%	2.7%	-1.8%	-0.5%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX A.2 CONT. - 2007 Q4 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2008 Q1

50 LARGEST MSAS CONT.

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Indianapolis	1.3%	-2.8%	3.1%	2.1%	4.4%	-0.7%	2.7%	3.0%	4.0%	0.1%
Jacksonville	-0.9%	-5.3%	4.9%	3.0%	3.9%	-2.5%	5.2%	5.5%	4.2%	-0.1%
Kansas City	1.5%	-2.5%	4.8%	4.1%	6.4%	1.5%	4.7%	3.9%	6.3%	1.3%
Long Island	2.2%	-0.6%	1.4%	1.6%	3.7%	1.0%	3.6%	2.5%	5.9%	1.9%
Los Angeles	-0.7%	-3.5%	8.5%	5.7%	7.7%	2.1%	1.8%	0.8%	1.1%	-2.7%
Memphis	-2.4%	-5.2%	6.5%	6.1%	3.9%	0.6%	4.6%	2.9%	2.1%	-2.4%
Miami	0.3%	0.4%	3.6%	0.1%	3.9%	0.6%	1.5%	0.5%	1.8%	0.9%
Minneapolis	2.1%	-4.1%	3.4%	4.0%	5.6%	-0.3%	4.0%	4.4%	6.2%	0.2%
Nashville	-0.6%	-3.4%	5.7%	7.7%	5.0%	4.0%	3.2%	2.7%	2.5%	-0.8%
New Orleans	-7.3%	6.0%	-3.1%	-0.3%	-10.1%	5.6%	3.8%	5.0%	-3.8%	11.4%
New York	1.6%	1.1%	12.4%	8.3%	14.2%	9.5%	3.7%	2.5%	5.4%	3.6%
Newark	5.9%	-2.7%	8.7%	3.3%	15.1%	0.5%	2.0%	2.0%	8.0%	-0.8%
Oahu	0.8%	1.5%	8.8%	4.6%	9.7%	6.2%	1.5%	0.0%	2.3%	1.6%
Oakland	3.6%	-2.6%	7.7%	4.5%	11.5%	1.8%	0.3%	-0.5%	4.0%	-3.1%
Orlando	-3.0%	1.2%	3.3%	2.6%	0.2%	3.9%	1.4%	1.9%	-1.7%	3.2%
Philadelphia	2.4%	-5.8%	7.9%	6.7%	10.4%	0.5%	1.5%	1.8%	3.9%	-4.1%
Phoenix	-3.5%	-8.5%	5.5%	6.4%	1.8%	-2.6%	4.9%	3.7%	1.2%	-5.1%
Pittsburgh	3.1%	-0.7%	4.7%	6.1%	8.0%	5.3%	3.5%	2.1%	6.7%	1.4%
Portland	4.4%	1.2%	8.7%	6.2%	13.5%	7.5%	1.2%	0.2%	5.6%	1.5%
Raleigh-Durham	-0.4%	-3.7%	6.0%	5.2%	5.6%	1.4%	2.0%	3.0%	1.6%	-0.8%
Richmond	-0.6%	-4.8%	7.5%	6.9%	6.9%	1.8%	1.5%	0.5%	1.0%	-4.3%
Sacramento	-4.2%	-4.6%	5.9%	3.9%	1.4%	-0.8%	4.7%	4.1%	0.2%	-0.7%
Saint Louis	-0.9%	-4.7%	5.4%	2.3%	4.4%	-2.5%	4.0%	3.0%	3.0%	-1.8%
Salt Lake City	0.3%	-5.4%	12.2%	6.9%	12.5%	1.1%	1.7%	1.3%	2.0%	-4.2%
San Antonio	-4.6%	-1.6%	5.9%	3.3%	1.1%	1.6%	7.7%	4.8%	2.8%	3.1%
San Diego	0.4%	-2.9%	8.6%	1.5%	9.0%	-1.5%	1.9%	2.7%	2.3%	-0.3%
San Francisco	4.0%	3.3%	9.8%	8.4%	14.2%	12.0%	1.4%	1.7%	5.4%	5.1%
Seattle	2.2%	-2.4%	9.8%	5.4%	12.2%	2.9%	3.5%	2.2%	5.8%	-0.2%
Tampa	-4.4%	-5.4%	5.8%	6.0%	1.1%	0.2%	2.7%	2.7%	-1.8%	-2.9%
Tucson	-1.6%	-7.5%	7.2%	0.7%	5.5%	-6.8%	2.5%	3.3%	0.8%	-4.4%
Washington DC	0.1%	-3.2%	3.7%	2.4%	3.8%	-0.9%	3.3%	2.4%	3.4%	-0.9%
West Palm Beach	-3.2%	-4.4%	2.5%	2.9%	-0.8%	-1.7%	5.1%	4.4%	1.8%	-0.3%
Mean Absolute Percent Difference	3.8%		2.6%		5.9%		0.9%		4.2%	

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX A.3 - 2007 Q4 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2008 Q2

ALL U.S. HOTELS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
All U.S. Hotels	-0.9%	-2.5%	5.4%	3.8%	4.4%	1.2%	2.4%	2.5%	1.5%	-0.1%

NATIONAL CHAIN SCALES

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Economy	0.2%	-3.8%	3.4%	1.8%	3.5%	-2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.2%	-1.9%
Luxury	-0.3%	-2.4%	6.9%	0.8%	6.5%	-1.6%	2.5%	3.5%	2.2%	1.0%
Midscale W/ F&B	0.9%	-3.9%	3.7%	4.0%	4.7%	-0.1%	-2.5%	-2.4%	-1.6%	-6.2%
Midscale w/o F&B	-2.5%	-2.9%	6.1%	4.1%	3.4%	1.0%	4.6%	5.2%	1.9%	2.1%
Upper Upscale	-0.7%	-1.1%	5.0%	2.8%	4.3%	1.6%	1.8%	3.8%	1.1%	2.6%
Upscale	-2.6%	-1.5%	5.6%	2.3%	2.9%	0.8%	5.1%	5.9%	2.4%	4.3%

50 LARGEST MSAS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Albuquerque	0.5%	10.5%	5.4%	2.5%	6.0%	13.3%	3.2%	2.2%	3.8%	13.0%
Anaheim	-2.0%	-3.7%	4.7%	0.4%	2.6%	-3.4%	1.1%	0.2%	-1.0%	-3.5%
Atlanta	-0.5%	-4.9%	3.2%	0.6%	2.7%	-4.3%	1.8%	1.7%	1.2%	-3.3%
Austin	1.4%	-2.1%	7.2%	7.1%	8.7%	4.8%	1.6%	1.2%	3.0%	-0.9%
Baltimore	-2.4%	-3.5%	7.0%	0.6%	4.4%	-2.9%	5.0%	4.6%	2.5%	0.9%
Boston	-3.2%	0.0%	5.5%	5.3%	2.2%	5.4%	3.0%	2.9%	-0.3%	3.0%
Charlotte	-3.2%	-6.1%	7.5%	7.2%	4.1%	0.7%	2.3%	1.0%	-0.9%	-5.2%
Chicago	-2.7%	-2.9%	4.9%	5.3%	2.1%	2.3%	3.9%	2.9%	1.0%	0.0%
Cincinnati	-1.7%	-0.2%	6.8%	6.0%	5.1%	5.8%	1.4%	1.5%	-0.3%	1.4%
Cleveland	-1.3%	-5.3%	4.0%	3.3%	2.6%	-2.2%	1.4%	0.4%	0.0%	-5.0%
Columbus	-0.5%	-1.0%	5.3%	2.6%	4.8%	1.6%	2.4%	2.2%	1.9%	1.2%
Dallas	-1.8%	-1.5%	7.2%	3.8%	5.2%	2.2%	3.6%	3.9%	1.7%	2.3%
Denver	-0.3%	-1.0%	7.1%	5.4%	6.7%	4.3%	3.4%	2.7%	3.0%	1.6%
Detroit	-0.6%	-0.1%	3.4%	4.0%	2.8%	3.9%	2.4%	3.7%	1.8%	3.6%
Fort Lauderdale	1.3%	-1.2%	4.8%	1.4%	6.2%	0.1%	0.6%	3.1%	1.9%	1.8%
Fort Worth	-6.8%	-1.2%	4.7%	5.2%	-2.5%	4.0%	9.8%	8.2%	2.3%	6.9%
Hartford	-1.2%	-1.2%	4.6%	2.9%	3.3%	1.7%	1.5%	2.4%	0.3%	1.2%
Houston	-3.9%	-1.9%	2.9%	8.9%	-1.1%	6.8%	3.4%	3.1%	-0.6%	1.1%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX A.3 CONT. - 2007 Q4 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2008 Q2

50 LARGEST MSAS CONT.

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Indianapolis	-1.3%	-3.7%	3.7%	-1.5%	2.3%	-5.1%	3.1%	3.9%	1.7%	0.1%
Jacksonville	-5.9%	-7.2%	5.1%	1.6%	-1.1%	-5.7%	7.4%	6.4%	1.1%	-1.3%
Kansas City	-1.7%	1.8%	4.4%	2.7%	2.6%	4.6%	3.2%	3.4%	1.4%	5.3%
Long Island	-1.7%	-0.8%	3.8%	3.0%	2.0%	2.1%	3.8%	1.7%	2.0%	0.9%
Los Angeles	-2.3%	-1.6%	7.0%	4.6%	4.5%	2.9%	1.9%	1.2%	-0.4%	-0.4%
Memphis	-3.0%	-7.7%	5.0%	4.2%	1.9%	-3.8%	4.3%	3.9%	1.2%	-4.1%
Miami	-2.9%	-0.4%	10.2%	4.8%	7.0%	4.4%	1.9%	1.2%	-1.1%	0.8%
Minneapolis	-0.3%	-2.2%	4.8%	2.6%	4.5%	0.4%	3.4%	4.3%	3.1%	2.0%
Nashville	-2.7%	-6.8%	5.8%	7.5%	2.9%	0.1%	2.5%	2.2%	-0.3%	-4.8%
New Orleans	4.9%	18.1%	4.0%	7.5%	9.1%	27.0%	1.5%	2.8%	6.5%	21.4%
New York	-1.3%	-0.5%	9.5%	6.7%	8.1%	6.2%	4.5%	2.7%	3.2%	2.2%
Newark	-1.7%	-3.1%	4.7%	2.5%	2.9%	-0.6%	2.6%	2.6%	0.8%	-0.6%
Oahu	-4.2%	-2.6%	6.7%	2.5%	2.2%	-0.1%	1.8%	-1.2%	-2.5%	-3.7%
Oakland	3.2%	-1.3%	5.9%	2.6%	9.2%	1.2%	0.6%	0.2%	3.8%	-1.1%
Orlando	-2.7%	-3.3%	4.8%	2.7%	2.0%	-0.7%	1.1%	2.3%	-1.7%	-1.1%
Philadelphia	-0.2%	-3.8%	6.7%	2.9%	6.4%	-1.0%	1.4%	1.8%	1.2%	-2.0%
Phoenix	-1.8%	-9.0%	5.7%	1.8%	3.8%	-7.4%	6.8%	4.0%	4.9%	-5.4%
Pittsburgh	-4.0%	2.3%	4.7%	-0.4%	0.6%	1.9%	3.6%	1.6%	-0.5%	3.9%
Portland	1.9%	1.8%	5.7%	7.3%	7.8%	9.3%	0.8%	0.5%	2.7%	2.3%
Raleigh-Durham	-3.8%	-3.4%	5.5%	4.5%	1.5%	0.9%	2.7%	3.0%	-1.2%	-0.5%
Richmond	-0.8%	-8.4%	5.3%	3.9%	4.5%	-4.8%	1.2%	3.1%	0.4%	-5.6%
Sacramento	-4.1%	-6.2%	4.5%	1.0%	0.1%	-5.3%	5.1%	4.9%	0.7%	-1.7%
Saint Louis	-2.1%	-3.8%	4.8%	1.9%	2.6%	-1.9%	4.3%	4.6%	2.1%	0.6%
Salt Lake City	1.8%	-1.7%	8.3%	5.8%	10.3%	4.0%	2.0%	1.5%	3.8%	-0.3%
San Antonio	-4.5%	-2.3%	6.6%	6.1%	1.8%	3.7%	9.6%	6.6%	4.7%	4.2%
San Diego	-1.6%	0.5%	5.2%	6.7%	3.5%	7.2%	2.5%	2.7%	0.8%	3.2%
San Francisco	1.0%	1.6%	9.9%	7.8%	11.1%	9.5%	1.3%	1.6%	2.3%	3.2%
Seattle	-0.6%	-2.8%	7.4%	3.9%	6.8%	1.0%	3.3%	2.3%	2.7%	-0.6%
Tampa	-1.9%	-4.9%	4.7%	5.1%	2.8%	-0.1%	2.6%	2.6%	0.7%	-2.4%
Tucson	0.8%	-4.4%	9.2%	5.6%	10.0%	0.9%	3.4%	3.9%	4.3%	-0.7%
Washington DC	-2.9%	-0.9%	2.0%	4.6%	-1.0%	3.6%	5.5%	5.6%	2.5%	4.6%
West Palm Beach	-1.9%	-3.2%	3.0%	-1.8%	1.1%	-4.9%	3.2%	2.3%	1.3%	-1.0%
Mean Absolute Percent Difference	2.8%		2.5%		4.5%		0.9%		2.9%	

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX B.1 - 2009 Q1 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2009 Q1

ALL U.S. HOTELS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
All U.S. Hotels	-10.0%	-10.9%	-7.1%	-7.7%	-16.4%	-17.7%	3.1%	3.2%	-7.2%	-8.0%

NATIONAL CHAIN SCALES

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Economy	-7.8%	-8.9%	-6.3%	-4.4%	-13.6%	-12.9%	1.6%	1.6%	-6.3%	-7.4%
Luxury	-13.6%	-16.3%	-7.9%	-13.2%	-20.4%	-27.3%	8.0%	9.1%	-6.7%	-8.6%
Midscale W/ F&B	-11.4%	-11.5%	-5.7%	-4.5%	-16.4%	-15.5%	-1.0%	-1.6%	-12.3%	-13.0%
Midscale w/o F&B	-7.7%	-11.2%	0.3%	-3.2%	-7.4%	-14.0%	7.5%	6.8%	-0.8%	-5.2%
Upper Upscale	-14.5%	-12.0%	-9.3%	-8.4%	-22.4%	-19.4%	3.6%	5.9%	-11.4%	-6.8%
Upscale	-10.5%	-11.5%	-7.5%	-7.5%	-17.2%	-18.2%	7.5%	7.8%	-3.8%	-4.6%

50 LARGEST MSAS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Albuquerque	-10.3%	-13.2%	-2.5%	-2.2%	-12.5%	-15.0%	3.5%	3.9%	-7.2%	-9.8%
Anaheim	-10.1%	-13.1%	-8.8%	-8.7%	-18.0%	-20.7%	1.7%	1.6%	-8.6%	-11.8%
Atlanta	-15.6%	-15.3%	-7.4%	-6.8%	-21.8%	-21.0%	3.2%	2.8%	-12.9%	-12.9%
Austin	-7.1%	-8.4%	0.3%	-1.3%	-6.8%	-9.6%	4.9%	4.7%	-2.5%	-4.0%
Baltimore	-9.3%	-1.9%	-8.3%	-2.2%	-16.9%	-4.1%	5.2%	4.1%	-4.6%	2.1%
Boston	-13.3%	-13.4%	-10.7%	-8.3%	-22.6%	-20.6%	1.7%	2.1%	-11.8%	-11.6%
Charlotte	-13.3%	-17.0%	-7.6%	-3.8%	-20.0%	-20.2%	3.4%	3.2%	-10.4%	-14.4%
Chicago	-10.8%	-14.4%	-6.5%	-10.4%	-16.6%	-23.3%	5.0%	4.2%	-6.3%	-10.8%
Cincinnati	-8.6%	-10.1%	-1.4%	-2.5%	-9.9%	-12.3%	2.9%	3.3%	-6.0%	-7.1%
Cleveland	-6.5%	-8.6%	-3.7%	-1.1%	-10.0%	-9.6%	1.5%	3.1%	-5.2%	-5.7%
Columbus	-5.8%	-10.1%	-3.2%	-3.7%	-8.8%	-13.4%	2.3%	2.8%	-3.6%	-7.6%
Dallas	-9.3%	-12.9%	-6.2%	-7.3%	-14.9%	-19.3%	3.8%	3.5%	-5.9%	-9.8%
Denver	-9.3%	-11.7%	-7.1%	-4.6%	-15.7%	-15.8%	3.2%	2.4%	-6.5%	-9.6%
Detroit	-15.4%	-18.4%	-9.5%	-9.8%	-23.4%	-26.4%	4.1%	3.6%	-11.9%	-15.5%
Fort Lauderdale	-5.3%	-5.5%	-8.9%	-13.4%	-13.7%	-18.2%	-0.1%	0.1%	-5.4%	-5.4%
Fort Worth	-12.3%	-17.2%	-4.3%	-2.2%	-16.0%	-19.1%	12.5%	10.3%	-1.3%	-8.7%
Hartford	-8.8%	-15.6%	-3.3%	-3.0%	-11.8%	-18.2%	2.8%	2.6%	-6.2%	-13.4%
Houston	0.4%	-5.1%	4.7%	-1.5%	5.1%	-6.5%	4.8%	4.6%	5.2%	-0.7%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX B.1 CONT. - 2009 Q1 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2009 Q1

50 LARGEST MSAS CONT.

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Indianapolis	-6.9%	-8.5%	-0.5%	-3.3%	-7.4%	-11.5%	6.4%	5.9%	-0.9%	-3.1%
Jacksonville	-8.7%	-14.6%	-4.5%	-9.0%	-12.8%	-22.3%	6.0%	5.4%	-3.3%	-10.0%
Kansas City	-5.6%	-13.5%	-3.7%	-4.6%	-9.1%	-17.5%	3.0%	2.6%	-2.8%	-11.3%
Long Island	-7.8%	-13.2%	-7.8%	-5.0%	-15.0%	-17.5%	3.2%	2.8%	-4.9%	-10.8%
Los Angeles	-13.6%	-13.8%	-8.2%	-8.7%	-20.7%	-21.3%	2.4%	2.4%	-11.5%	-11.8%
Memphis	-11.4%	-9.8%	-4.3%	-3.3%	-15.2%	-12.8%	6.8%	6.2%	-5.3%	-4.2%
Miami	-11.6%	-12.3%	-11.1%	-14.7%	-21.4%	-25.2%	10.7%	10.0%	-2.1%	-3.5%
Minneapolis	-10.1%	-14.3%	-5.8%	-5.9%	-15.3%	-19.3%	3.8%	3.6%	-6.7%	-11.2%
Nashville	-11.4%	-12.3%	-3.9%	-4.0%	-14.9%	-15.8%	5.3%	4.0%	-6.7%	-8.8%
New Orleans	-8.9%	-11.0%	-2.2%	-5.9%	-11.0%	-16.2%	2.1%	2.3%	-7.0%	-8.9%
New York	-17.3%	-15.3%	-14.2%	-18.7%	-29.1%	-31.1%	5.1%	4.6%	-13.2%	-11.4%
Newark	-8.5%	-9.9%	-6.2%	-7.8%	-14.2%	-16.9%	2.6%	1.1%	-6.1%	-8.8%
Oahu	-9.5%	-9.2%	-9.7%	-11.2%	-18.2%	-19.4%	-1.7%	0.1%	-11.0%	-9.1%
Oakland	-11.1%	-17.4%	-3.5%	-8.0%	-14.2%	-24.1%	2.3%	2.0%	-9.1%	-15.7%
Orlando	-10.7%	-14.5%	-7.2%	-10.1%	-17.1%	-23.2%	1.9%	1.8%	-9.0%	-13.0%
Philadelphia	-8.7%	-9.5%	-7.6%	-7.7%	-15.6%	-16.5%	2.2%	2.1%	-6.7%	-7.6%
Phoenix	-17.2%	-14.7%	-11.8%	-16.0%	-27.0%	-28.4%	6.5%	6.1%	-11.8%	-9.5%
Pittsburgh	3.4%	-1.1%	3.5%	1.2%	7.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.7%	4.5%	-0.4%
Portland	-12.8%	-13.6%	-5.3%	-3.6%	-17.3%	-16.7%	3.9%	3.2%	-9.3%	-10.8%
Raleigh-Durham	-6.7%	-12.5%	-1.6%	-5.6%	-8.2%	-17.4%	4.2%	3.6%	-2.8%	-9.4%
Richmond	-14.8%	-18.1%	-3.0%	-2.3%	-17.3%	-20.0%	11.5%	10.1%	-4.9%	-9.8%
Sacramento	-8.9%	-12.4%	-5.2%	-7.9%	-13.6%	-19.4%	4.1%	4.1%	-5.2%	-8.8%
Saint Louis	-4.8%	-7.2%	-2.2%	-2.7%	-6.9%	-9.7%	3.1%	3.3%	-1.8%	-4.1%
Salt Lake City	-12.4%	-13.3%	-0.2%	-3.2%	-12.6%	-16.1%	2.6%	2.8%	-10.1%	-10.8%
San Antonio	-9.2%	-14.9%	-2.2%	-7.0%	-11.2%	-20.9%	8.8%	7.7%	-1.2%	-8.4%
San Diego	-11.3%	-13.2%	-8.7%	-9.6%	-19.0%	-21.6%	2.7%	4.2%	-8.9%	-9.6%
San Francisco	-9.1%	-12.2%	-4.6%	-12.0%	-13.2%	-22.7%	0.8%	0.6%	-8.4%	-11.7%
Seattle	-16.5%	-16.3%	-6.9%	-7.0%	-22.3%	-22.1%	3.1%	3.8%	-14.0%	-13.1%
Tampa	-9.5%	-11.0%	-0.4%	-1.8%	-9.9%	-12.6%	4.5%	4.6%	-5.5%	-6.9%
Tucson	-7.8%	-14.8%	-5.6%	-10.0%	-13.0%	-23.3%	1.5%	1.6%	-6.4%	-13.5%
Washington DC	-3.3%	-3.1%	7.3%	6.3%	3.8%	3.0%	5.2%	5.2%	1.8%	2.0%
West Palm Beach	-8.0%	-12.0%	-10.4%	-18.5%	-17.6%	-28.3%	2.4%	3.4%	-5.8%	-9.0%
Mean Absolute Percent Difference	3.0%		2.4%		4.3%		0.6%		3.3%	

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX B.2 - 2009 Q1 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2009 Q2

ALL U.S. HOTELS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
All U.S. Hotels	-9.3%	-10.5%	-6.4%	-10.4%	-15.1%	-19.8%	2.6%	3.1%	-6.9%	-7.7%

NATIONAL CHAIN SCALES

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Economy	-6.9%	-8.8%	-5.7%	-6.3%	-12.1%	-14.6%	1.3%	1.4%	-5.7%	-7.6%
Luxury	-15.2%	-13.6%	-8.0%	-16.9%	-21.9%	-28.2%	7.4%	8.4%	-8.9%	-6.4%
Midscale W/ F&B	-8.9%	-10.2%	-5.9%	-6.8%	-14.3%	-16.2%	-1.8%	-1.1%	-10.6%	-11.1%
Midscale w/o F&B	-6.6%	-11.6%	-5.8%	-5.2%	-11.9%	-16.2%	7.9%	7.0%	0.9%	-5.5%
Upper Upscale	-16.7%	-11.0%	-10.2%	-13.9%	-25.1%	-23.4%	2.0%	4.7%	-15.0%	-6.9%
Upscale	-10.3%	-12.0%	-8.2%	-10.7%	-17.7%	-21.4%	9.0%	8.4%	-2.3%	-4.7%

50 LARGEST MSAS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Albuquerque	-11.1%	-18.2%	-2.2%	-4.9%	-13.0%	-22.2%	3.2%	3.2%	-8.2%	-15.6%
Anaheim	-4.8%	-10.4%	-6.9%	-11.4%	-11.3%	-20.6%	1.9%	1.8%	-3.0%	-8.7%
Atlanta	-11.3%	-14.1%	-7.3%	-7.9%	-17.8%	-20.9%	3.7%	2.7%	-8.0%	-11.7%
Austin	-9.5%	-12.8%	-2.1%	-8.2%	-11.4%	-19.9%	6.1%	5.6%	-4.0%	-7.9%
Baltimore	-7.1%	-7.1%	-9.3%	-9.6%	-15.8%	-16.1%	8.4%	5.5%	0.7%	-2.0%
Boston	-5.5%	-11.6%	-9.3%	-11.0%	-14.2%	-21.3%	1.3%	1.8%	-4.3%	-10.1%
Charlotte	-13.6%	-17.8%	-8.5%	-10.1%	-21.0%	-26.1%	4.6%	4.4%	-9.6%	-14.1%
Chicago	-9.2%	-16.1%	-9.4%	-16.6%	-17.7%	-30.0%	4.6%	3.8%	-5.0%	-12.9%
Cincinnati	-9.0%	-13.6%	-4.6%	-4.5%	-13.2%	-17.4%	2.8%	4.3%	-6.4%	-9.9%
Cleveland	-9.2%	-10.8%	-6.0%	-5.0%	-14.6%	-15.2%	1.1%	3.0%	-8.2%	-8.1%
Columbus	-7.4%	-10.7%	-4.4%	-5.6%	-11.5%	-15.7%	2.1%	2.0%	-5.4%	-8.9%
Dallas	-5.6%	-14.6%	-6.0%	-9.3%	-11.3%	-22.6%	3.8%	3.2%	-2.0%	-11.9%
Denver	-8.5%	-14.8%	-7.4%	-9.7%	-15.3%	-23.1%	3.7%	2.5%	-5.2%	-12.6%
Detroit	-13.6%	-18.5%	-6.0%	-6.6%	-18.8%	-23.9%	4.5%	3.9%	-9.7%	-15.3%
Fort Lauderdale	-10.8%	-6.4%	-8.6%	-13.4%	-18.4%	-18.9%	2.0%	3.9%	-9.0%	-2.8%
Fort Worth	-13.9%	-22.0%	-6.7%	-6.0%	-19.6%	-26.7%	13.6%	11.1%	-2.2%	-13.3%
Hartford	-6.7%	-15.0%	-4.7%	-5.7%	-11.1%	-19.8%	2.8%	3.1%	-4.1%	-12.4%
Houston	-4.6%	-13.4%	0.1%	-5.9%	-4.5%	-18.5%	6.2%	6.1%	1.3%	-8.0%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX B.2 CONT. - 2009 Q1 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2009 Q2

50 LARGEST MSAS CONT.

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Indianapolis	-8.0%	-13.2%	-1.5%	-9.2%	-9.4%	-21.1%	5.3%	4.7%	-3.2%	-9.1%
Jacksonville	-13.0%	-12.7%	-6.8%	-10.8%	-18.9%	-22.2%	6.3%	4.0%	-7.5%	-9.3%
Kansas City	-12.4%	-11.5%	-4.3%	-5.0%	-16.1%	-16.0%	4.5%	2.0%	-8.4%	-9.8%
Long Island	-9.0%	-12.2%	-13.3%	-10.0%	-21.1%	-21.0%	3.8%	3.3%	-5.5%	-9.4%
Los Angeles	-11.5%	-13.9%	-5.8%	-12.5%	-16.6%	-24.6%	2.1%	2.1%	-9.7%	-12.0%
Memphis	-9.3%	-7.5%	-4.7%	-7.2%	-13.6%	-14.1%	5.4%	4.6%	-4.5%	-3.3%
Miami	-9.0%	-13.0%	-14.7%	-12.7%	-22.3%	-24.1%	10.4%	10.0%	0.5%	-4.3%
Minneapolis	-10.9%	-14.1%	-4.7%	-8.4%	-15.1%	-21.3%	4.1%	3.8%	-7.3%	-10.8%
Nashville	-10.4%	-11.7%	-5.3%	-4.4%	-15.2%	-15.6%	6.3%	4.2%	-4.8%	-8.0%
New Orleans	-8.3%	-14.2%	-4.5%	-9.7%	-12.4%	-22.5%	2.8%	3.4%	-5.7%	-11.3%
New York	-13.3%	-7.5%	-15.5%	-26.8%	-26.7%	-32.2%	6.4%	4.3%	-7.8%	-3.5%
Newark	-7.9%	-10.8%	-8.9%	-13.2%	-16.1%	-22.6%	5.8%	1.3%	-2.5%	-9.7%
Oahu	-3.0%	-3.5%	-9.1%	-12.1%	-11.9%	-15.2%	-1.0%	0.0%	-4.0%	-3.5%
Oakland	-12.3%	-14.2%	-4.8%	-11.9%	-16.5%	-24.4%	1.6%	2.2%	-10.9%	-12.2%
Orlando	-8.6%	-8.7%	-9.1%	-9.8%	-16.9%	-17.6%	1.6%	1.4%	-7.1%	-7.4%
Philadelphia	-7.6%	-7.7%	-2.9%	-9.3%	-10.3%	-16.3%	1.9%	1.9%	-5.9%	-6.0%
Phoenix	-15.1%	-12.9%	-8.0%	-16.4%	-21.9%	-27.2%	7.1%	7.2%	-9.0%	-6.6%
Pittsburgh	-7.0%	-9.8%	-1.2%	-3.8%	-8.1%	-13.2%	2.0%	1.4%	-5.1%	-8.6%
Portland	-15.8%	-13.6%	-5.1%	-8.7%	-20.1%	-21.2%	4.4%	3.7%	-12.0%	-10.4%
Raleigh-Durham	-9.6%	-13.4%	-2.4%	-8.2%	-11.8%	-20.5%	5.0%	3.3%	-5.0%	-10.5%
Richmond	-13.2%	-18.3%	-4.5%	-5.0%	-17.1%	-22.4%	10.8%	10.1%	-3.8%	-10.0%
Sacramento	-8.0%	-13.0%	-4.3%	-8.4%	-11.9%	-20.3%	3.4%	3.6%	-4.8%	-9.9%
Saint Louis	-7.4%	-13.8%	-3.5%	-5.3%	-10.6%	-18.4%	3.1%	3.2%	-4.5%	-11.0%
Salt Lake City	-13.2%	-11.6%	-5.4%	-10.2%	-17.9%	-20.6%	3.4%	3.3%	-10.2%	-8.6%
San Antonio	-6.9%	-13.9%	-7.5%	-14.1%	-13.9%	-26.0%	7.6%	5.9%	0.2%	-8.8%
San Diego	-6.9%	-14.1%	-13.8%	-18.0%	-19.7%	-29.5%	2.0%	3.9%	-5.0%	-10.7%
San Francisco	-5.3%	-9.1%	-2.1%	-16.5%	-7.3%	-24.0%	0.5%	0.5%	-4.8%	-8.6%
Seattle	-11.9%	-12.4%	-5.8%	-7.5%	-17.0%	-18.9%	2.6%	3.3%	-9.6%	-9.5%
Tampa	-11.2%	-14.0%	-7.3%	-10.9%	-17.6%	-23.4%	4.5%	4.6%	-7.1%	-10.1%
Tucson	-9.5%	-15.7%	-9.8%	-12.7%	-18.3%	-26.4%	1.2%	1.3%	-8.4%	-14.6%
Washington DC	-8.0%	-6.5%	-6.4%	-8.7%	-13.8%	-14.6%	2.9%	3.6%	-5.3%	-3.1%
West Palm Beach	-11.3%	-11.4%	-12.1%	-16.0%	-22.0%	-25.6%	3.7%	2.8%	-8.0%	-9.0%
Mean Absolute Percent Difference	3.9%		3.7%		5.9%		0.9%		4.3%	

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX B.3 - 2009 Q1 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2009 Q3

ALL U.S. HOTELS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
All U.S. Hotels	-7.3%	-7.9%	-8.1%	-9.8%	-14.9%	-16.9%	2.1%	3.2%	-5.4%	-5.0%

NATIONAL CHAIN SCALES

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Economy	-4.4%	-9.0%	-5.9%	-7.5%	-10.0%	-15.9%	0.9%	1.2%	-3.5%	-7.9%
Luxury	-11.5%	-6.2%	-11.1%	-19.1%	-21.4%	-24.1%	6.9%	8.7%	-5.4%	2.0%
Midscale W/ F&B	-7.5%	-9.8%	-5.3%	-6.8%	-12.5%	-15.9%	-3.0%	-1.2%	-10.3%	-10.9%
Midscale w/o F&B	-6.2%	-9.4%	-5.1%	-6.7%	-11.0%	-15.5%	7.8%	7.5%	1.1%	-2.7%
Upper Upscale	-10.1%	-5.6%	-9.4%	-13.6%	-18.5%	-18.4%	1.4%	4.3%	-8.9%	-1.5%
Upscale	-10.4%	-7.3%	-9.1%	-11.7%	-18.6%	-18.2%	9.1%	10.3%	-2.3%	2.3%

50 LARGEST MSAS

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Albuquerque	-4.0%	-5.4%	-3.0%	-6.0%	-6.9%	-11.1%	2.1%	2.2%	-2.0%	-3.3%
Anaheim	-1.3%	-3.5%	-5.0%	-12.8%	-6.3%	-15.9%	1.1%	1.5%	-0.2%	-2.1%
Atlanta	-9.2%	-8.9%	-5.9%	-9.7%	-14.6%	-17.7%	3.9%	2.8%	-5.6%	-6.4%
Austin	-10.1%	-11.6%	-2.6%	-10.9%	-12.5%	-21.2%	5.8%	5.6%	-5.0%	-6.6%
Baltimore	-5.5%	-5.0%	-8.7%	-10.6%	-13.7%	-15.1%	7.9%	6.7%	2.0%	1.4%
Boston	-7.2%	-3.2%	-6.5%	-13.1%	-13.2%	-15.8%	1.3%	1.4%	-6.0%	-1.8%
Charlotte	-10.9%	-13.8%	-8.7%	-8.9%	-18.7%	-21.5%	5.4%	4.8%	-6.1%	-9.7%
Chicago	-8.8%	-9.0%	-8.3%	-15.9%	-16.3%	-23.5%	4.1%	3.3%	-5.1%	-6.0%
Cincinnati	-10.0%	-6.1%	-5.3%	-5.9%	-14.7%	-11.7%	2.5%	3.3%	-7.7%	-3.0%
Cleveland	-7.0%	-6.1%	-5.9%	-5.6%	-12.5%	-11.4%	1.2%	0.9%	-5.8%	-5.2%
Columbus	-4.1%	-5.8%	-4.2%	-5.1%	-8.1%	-10.6%	1.9%	2.1%	-2.3%	-3.8%
Dallas	-4.1%	-14.9%	-1.2%	-9.3%	-5.3%	-22.8%	4.1%	3.6%	-0.2%	-11.8%
Denver	-8.0%	-9.6%	-14.3%	-21.0%	-21.1%	-28.6%	3.6%	2.4%	-4.6%	-7.4%
Detroit	-9.3%	-15.3%	-4.8%	-12.4%	-13.6%	-25.8%	3.9%	3.8%	-5.7%	-12.1%
Fort Lauderdale	-11.9%	-2.1%	-4.0%	-11.7%	-15.4%	-13.5%	3.8%	3.0%	-8.5%	0.9%
Fort Worth	-9.7%	-14.8%	-5.5%	-3.9%	-14.7%	-18.1%	10.0%	8.9%	-0.6%	-7.2%
Hartford	-6.9%	-11.6%	-6.2%	-6.2%	-12.7%	-17.1%	4.7%	2.2%	-2.5%	-9.6%
Houston	-5.0%	-19.5%	-1.5%	-11.5%	-6.5%	-28.8%	6.9%	7.3%	1.5%	-13.6%

Source: PKF-HR and STR

APPENDIX B.3 CONT. - 2009 Q1 FORECAST FOR THE PERIOD 2009 Q3

50 LARGEST MSAS CONT.

	Occupancy		ADR		RevPAR		Supply		Demand	
	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual	Forecast	Actual
Indianapolis	-9.4%	-9.0%	-3.3%	-10.0%	-12.4%	-18.1%	4.6%	4.4%	-5.2%	-5.0%
Jacksonville	-9.9%	-10.6%	-5.5%	-8.4%	-14.8%	-18.1%	6.7%	5.2%	-3.8%	-6.0%
Kansas City	-10.1%	-9.2%	-7.3%	-9.5%	-16.6%	-17.8%	4.9%	1.7%	-5.6%	-7.7%
Long Island	-9.8%	-9.1%	-12.4%	-10.6%	-21.0%	-18.8%	2.9%	1.8%	-7.2%	-7.4%
Los Angeles	-10.6%	-8.5%	-4.8%	-14.5%	-14.9%	-21.8%	2.1%	2.4%	-8.7%	-6.4%
Memphis	-9.6%	-6.7%	-5.6%	-6.1%	-14.7%	-12.4%	5.3%	5.1%	-4.8%	-2.0%
Miami	-8.1%	-9.9%	-8.9%	-11.6%	-16.3%	-20.3%	10.1%	10.9%	1.2%	-0.1%
Minneapolis	-6.4%	-8.4%	-10.5%	-16.2%	-16.3%	-23.3%	2.4%	2.4%	-4.2%	-6.2%
Nashville	-6.2%	-9.8%	-4.6%	-7.7%	-10.5%	-16.8%	6.3%	5.3%	-0.3%	-5.1%
New Orleans	-5.8%	-11.1%	-6.0%	-7.6%	-11.5%	-17.8%	4.3%	4.2%	-1.7%	-7.4%
New York	-13.7%	-3.5%	-19.7%	-26.0%	-30.7%	-28.6%	7.0%	6.0%	-7.6%	2.2%
Newark	-6.4%	-8.8%	-10.9%	-15.1%	-16.6%	-22.5%	5.4%	0.6%	-1.3%	-8.2%
Oahu	-0.4%	0.7%	-2.3%	-14.0%	-2.8%	-13.4%	0.0%	1.1%	-0.4%	1.8%
Oakland	-10.6%	-10.0%	-5.6%	-14.4%	-15.6%	-23.0%	0.9%	0.7%	-9.8%	-9.4%
Orlando	-4.6%	-6.8%	-7.8%	-11.6%	-12.0%	-17.7%	2.3%	1.3%	-2.4%	-5.6%
Philadelphia	-3.1%	-3.8%	-2.2%	-12.0%	-5.3%	-15.3%	1.8%	1.6%	-1.4%	-2.3%
Phoenix	-12.0%	-12.2%	-1.8%	-14.0%	-13.6%	-24.5%	7.0%	6.0%	-5.8%	-7.0%
Pittsburgh	-7.7%	-4.3%	-5.1%	-2.5%	-12.4%	-6.6%	2.5%	1.1%	-5.4%	-3.3%
Portland	-15.5%	-10.3%	-6.1%	-11.4%	-20.7%	-20.5%	4.2%	4.5%	-12.0%	-6.3%
Raleigh-Durham	-5.0%	-5.0%	-1.6%	-10.4%	-6.5%	-14.9%	4.3%	2.4%	-0.9%	-2.7%
Richmond	-8.9%	-14.7%	-5.7%	-7.9%	-14.1%	-21.4%	10.3%	9.5%	0.5%	-6.5%
Sacramento	-9.4%	-11.7%	-3.2%	-12.8%	-12.3%	-23.0%	5.7%	3.2%	-4.3%	-8.8%
Saint Louis	-8.7%	-7.6%	-4.8%	-6.8%	-13.1%	-13.9%	3.1%	3.6%	-5.9%	-4.3%
Salt Lake City	-14.2%	-11.2%	-6.5%	-10.9%	-19.8%	-20.8%	4.0%	5.1%	-10.8%	-6.7%
San Antonio	-10.9%	-11.8%	-7.9%	-9.3%	-17.9%	-20.1%	9.3%	7.3%	-2.7%	-5.4%
San Diego	-3.4%	-4.8%	-13.4%	-14.7%	-16.4%	-18.8%	2.4%	4.1%	-1.1%	-0.9%
San Francisco	-7.3%	-3.0%	-4.3%	-16.9%	-11.3%	-19.4%	0.3%	0.3%	-7.0%	-2.7%
Seattle	-10.2%	-6.1%	-7.0%	-14.7%	-16.4%	-19.9%	3.5%	2.7%	-7.0%	-3.6%
Tampa	-6.0%	-3.3%	-7.6%	-10.2%	-13.1%	-13.1%	3.6%	4.1%	-2.6%	0.7%
Tucson	-9.9%	-12.0%	-11.5%	-9.3%	-20.2%	-20.2%	1.2%	2.1%	-8.8%	-10.1%
Washington DC	-6.7%	-3.0%	-7.5%	-8.5%	-13.7%	-11.2%	3.1%	3.9%	-3.8%	0.7%
West Palm Beach	-7.7%	-3.5%	-17.1%	-11.5%	-23.5%	-14.6%	3.8%	3.4%	-4.2%	-0.2%
Mean Absolute Percent Difference	3.1%		4.9%		5.5%		0.9%		3.6%	

Source: PKF-HR and STR