Eagle Suites Portfolio SWOT

Owner-level strategic review using the weekly room-count truth, latest Cloudbeds occupancy archive, and current QRIDit pattern signals.

Preview date: 14/04/2026

PORTFOLIO SNAPSHOT

93.0%

1776 occupied rooms across 1910 available rooms, plus 321 rooms in reno and 2231 max capacity

CORE STRENGTH

Demand Is Not Broken

This now reads like an optimization and control story, not a rescue story

CORE WEAKNESS

Execution + Reconciliation Gaps

Field discipline and inventory truth are stronger, but not yet fully unified

CORE OPPORTUNITY

Return-to-Service + Underperformer Lift

Biggest upside is likely from BRG, OTM, BRB and the true underperformers by occupancy rate

Executive Judgment

With the weekly room-count workbook now confirmed as the canonical inventory source, Eagle Suites looks materially stronger than the earlier SWOT implied. The portfolio is running at **93.0% occupancy of available rooms**, which means the strategic story is **not weak demand**. It is a combined **execution, return-to-service, and control-system story**.

The most important change is analytical: the older SWOT over-weighted **raw occupied-room counts**, which made some small but full properties look weak simply because they have fewer rooms. That was the wrong lens. The right lens is now **occupancy of available rooms, reno burden, open available rooms, and room-state reconciliation**.

That said, the portfolio is not fully clean yet. Three properties, **LA - BRG, OK - OTM, and OK - OON**, still show occupied-room counts above currently available-room counts. That is not an occupancy story. It is a **room-state reconciliation exception** between Cloudbeds occupied counts and the weekly room inventory source.

Strengths Internal Advantage

- **Demand is still fundamentally strong.** 1776 occupied rooms across 1910 available rooms indicates the portfolio is carrying real demand, not broad vacancy collapse.
- **Canonical room-count truth is materially better.** Bill confirmed the weekly workbook as the operating truth

Weaknesses Internal Constraint

- **Return-to-service drag is still meaningful.** 321 rooms remain in reno, with the heaviest concentrations at BRG (145), OTM (96), BRB (49), and OON (31).
- **Inventory reconciliation is not fully unified.** BRG, OTM, and OON still produce occupied counts above

for available rooms, reno rooms, and max capacity.

- **Scale creates leverage.** Twenty sites gives leadership enough density to benchmark, rank, standardize, and intervene intelligently.
- **Security/process friction is concentrated.** Current QRIDit signal still clusters around a small set of repeat sites rather than diffusing randomly across the whole portfolio.
- **Leadership is willing to operationalize reporting.** That willingness is a real strategic asset if it keeps turning into owner actions and field deadlines.

currently available rooms, which means room-state truth is improved but not fully harmonized.

- **Execution spread remains real.** The lowest true occupancy-of-available sites are BRA (68.6%), BRB (70.0%), NLRG (80.6%), OOA (85.0%), and JS (87.1%).
- **Ledger and churn truth are still missing.** Owners still cannot fully tell whether occupied rooms are collectible, stable, or leaking through nonpayment and turnover.
- **The security sample is still partial.** The latest deep QRIDit read covers a concentrated subset, not a mature full-portfolio security warehouse.

Opportunities Strategic Upside

- **Reframe the owner conversation around the right denominator.** Manage by occupancy of available rooms, reno burden, and max capacity, not by raw occupied-room counts alone.
- **Recover high-reno assets first.** BRG, OTM, BRB, and OON represent the largest immediate return-to-service leverage if room-state truth and unblock sequencing are tightened.
- **Lift the real underperformers.** BRA and BRB are the clearest true underperformers on available-room occupancy and deserve explicit recovery plans.
- **Turn owner visibility into money control.** Guest ledger, collections risk, churn, and move-in / move-out reporting would convert occupancy visibility into earnings visibility.
- **Create a portfolio operating edge.** If Eagle Suites gets room-state truth, occupancy truth, security truth, and cash-risk truth into one operating view, that becomes a real internal advantage.

Threats Compounding Risk

- **Wrong KPI selection can misdirect owner attention.** Ranking weak properties by raw occupied rooms punishes small assets and hides large underperformers.
- **Reno-heavy assets can quietly suppress earnings.** BRG and OTM in particular can look active operationally while still leaving major usable inventory offline.
- **Data mismatch can undermine credibility.** If occupied counts and available-room counts are not reconciled at the property level, otherwise good decisions remain numerically vulnerable.
- **Security/process friction can stay expensive.** Airline Hwy, Boardwalk, Gray Rd, and 4300 SW 3rd still suggest repeat operating-discipline failures, not one-off noise.
- **Occupancy alone can overstate health.** Without ledger and churn truth, the portfolio can look full while still carrying hidden nonpayment or unstable guest mix.

Most Important Signals Right Now

True Underperformers by Occupancy of Available Rooms

Inventory / Reconciliation Exceptions

- **LA - BRA** — 70 occupied of 102 available, 68.6% occupancy
- **LA - BRB** — 42 occupied of 60 available, 70.0% occupancy, plus 49 rooms in reno
- **AR - NLRG** — 166 occupied of 206 available, 80.6% occupancy
- **OK - OOA** — 170 occupied of 200 available, 85.0% occupancy
- **AR - JS** — 101 occupied of 116 available, 87.1% occupancy

- **LA - BRG** — 54 occupied vs 20 available and 145 in reno, showing 270.0% occupancy of available
- **OK - OTM** — 44 occupied vs 35 available and 96 in reno, showing 125.7% occupancy of available
- **OK - OON** — 102 occupied vs 80 available and 31 in reno, showing 127.5% occupancy of available
- **Interpretation** — these are control / room-state exceptions, not properties to rank as weak demand sites

Highest Security / Process Friction Sites

- **7682 Airline Hwy** — risk score 12, driven by management handoff failures, guest/non-guest activity, and key-assist events
- **11314 Boardwalk Dr** — risk score 12, driven by guest/non-guest activity and lighting issues
- **1 Gray Rd** — risk score 10, driven by lighting issues, guest/non-guest activity, and management concern
- **4300 SW 3rd St.** — risk score 9, dense narrative incident concentration

Largest Return-to-Service Levers

- **LA - BRG** — 145 rooms in reno
- **OK - OTM** — 96 rooms in reno
- **LA - BRB** — 49 rooms in reno
- **OK - OON** — 31 rooms in reno

Important interpretation: the biggest strategic distinction is now between true low-occupancy underperformers and inventory-reconciliation exceptions. They are not the same problem and should not be managed as if they are.

What Is Still Missing Before Bill Review

- **Collections / ledger risk layer.** The SWOT still lacks who owes, who is near departure, and where occupancy may not convert to cash.
- **Churn / move-in / move-out explanation.** We still cannot separate stable occupancy from replacement occupancy, nonpayment pressure, or preventable leakage.
- **Portfolio-wide security maturity.** Current QRIDit insight is good but still based on a partial deep sample, not a full long-history operating warehouse.
- **Property-level reconciliation rule.** We need one rule explaining how Cloudbeds occupied rooms and the weekly available / reno counts should resolve when they disagree.
- **Return-to-service dates.** High-reno properties need explicit unblock dates and room-by-room recovery sequencing before the SWOT can become an owner action document instead of a strategic memo.

Owner-Level Actions I Would Recommend

- **1. Correct the KPI framework permanently.** Use occupancy of available rooms, reno burden, and max capacity in all owner-facing strategy work.
- **2. Split the problem set.** Treat BRA / BRB / NLRG / OOA / JS as performance problems, and BRG / OTM / OON as reconciliation and return-to-service problems.
- **3. Require room-state reconciliation at the exception assets.** Each over-100%-of-available site should show why the occupied count exceeds the current available-room count.
- **4. Build ledger / collections and churn next.** Those are the two biggest missing lenses before this becomes a fully owner-grade control document.
- **5. Keep the SWOT strategic.** Bill should get a document that distinguishes demand, execution, inventory, and security rather than blending them into one vague weakness bucket.

Bottom Line

This revised SWOT is materially better than the earlier version because it now uses the **weekly room-count truth** and a much better occupancy denominator. The portfolio looks stronger on demand and clearer on where the real problems sit.

The biggest remaining gap is not strategy. It is **reconciliation and cash-quality visibility**. Until ledger, churn, and room-state exceptions are fully unified, the SWOT is strong enough for Bill review as a **draft strategic readout**, but not yet strong enough to be treated as the final owner-control truth.

This draft corrects the prior analytical error of treating small properties with fewer occupied rooms as automatically weak occupancy performers.