BBMG · MILES GREVE

[WET] WhatEinsteinThinks

Capstone coursework packet — unverified, for discussion only

A Master’s capstone project exploring an alternative approach to small-hotel lending. It is not a company, product, offer, solicitation, or pitch, and nothing in it is investment, lending, or legal advice.

AI-assisted, not sourced. The writing, figures, and frameworks were produced with AI assistance. There is no human-authored bibliography, and research-sounding statements have not been checked against primary sources. Any percentages or figures are illustrative teaching examples, not findings.

Contents: The Capstone · Overview · The Method · The Platform

einsteinintel.com · mrmilesgreve@proton.me

THE CAPSTONE

A graduate student, thinking out loud.

A student project, first and last

I am a graduate student. This site collects coursework, reading, and half-formed ideas about how small hotels and motels get financed. It is written for my professors, for my own thinking, and for the occasional conversation with someone kind enough to tell me where I am wrong.

It is not a company, a product, a service, or a pitch. Nothing here is offered to anyone.

Nothing here has been verified

The ideas, figures, frameworks, and examples on this site are exploratory. They have not been peer reviewed, audited, back-tested, or confirmed by any institution. Where numbers appear, treat them as illustrative teaching examples rather than findings.

I hold no special expertise in credit, lending, securities, or valuation, and I am not presenting myself as an authority in any of them.

Written to be argued with

The purpose of publishing unfinished work is to attract correction. If a claim here is wrong, I would rather learn it from a stranger in the industry than defend it in silence.

Read it as a conversation starter — closer to a student essay than to a report.

Not advice, not an offer

Nothing on this site is investment, legal, tax, credit, or business advice. Nothing is an offer or solicitation to buy, sell, broker, arrange, or finance anything. No deals are analyzed, sourced, or placed here, and no relationship is created by reading it.

Any commentary about lending practices describes general ideas discussed in coursework and public literature, not the conduct of any specific bank, firm, or person.

AI-assisted, not sourced

The writing, figures, and frameworks on this site were produced with the assistance of artificial-intelligence tools. No human-authored bibliography, source list, or citation set stands behind them.

Where the text sounds researched, assume it was generated by AI and not yet verified against primary sources.

What I have not done

— No primary research. I have run no survey, no experiment, and no field study.

— No interviews. Nothing here reports what any owner, broker, lender, or institution told me.

— No dataset. There is no loan tape, no sample of declined files, and no performance data of any kind.

— No peer review. No professor, journal, institution, or practitioner has vetted these pages.

— No verified figures. Every number used to illustrate an idea is invented for teaching purposes.

— No citations behind the general industry ideas described here — where something sounds sourced, assume it is not.

What this is not

— Not an operating business, lender, broker, or adviser.

— Not a venture pitch, fundraising document, or investment memorandum.

— Not affiliated with, endorsed by, or a data source for any firm named anywhere on this site.

— Not vetted research, and not a claim about any institution's conduct.

— Not a promise that any concept described here works, or ever will.

OVERVIEW

A student's read on the small hotel deal.

Institutional underwriting is rigorous work, and this project says so up front. The open question is narrower: the $2–10M motel and small-hotel loan, where the institutional cost model often cannot reach. This is Miles Greve's Master's capstone research — not an operating company, and not an offer to broker, analyze, or finance anyone's deal.

A reading order for first-time visitors.

Four short reads, in order. Everything is coursework — unfinished and unverified.

01 The Method
The eight steps, stated as questions.

02 The Platform
What the imagined platform would do — and would never do.

03 Coursework Slides
The numbers, every one labeled illustrative.

04 Questions & Answers
What I asked myself, and what is still open.

The deal this project follows: three million dollars, one motel.

A $3M motel loan rarely fits the institutional cost model — too small for the committee time, too idiosyncratic for the box. Nobody is wrong; the deal is simply orphaned. Five places that happens most often:

01 Seasoning
Two years of clean, stabilized statements — a reasonable ask that a renovated or repositioned hotel cannot meet by definition.

02 Debt-service coverage
A sound ratio, priced on a single trailing period — for an asset whose revenue moves nightly. Complete at scale; thin at $3M.

03 Property type
Hospitality priced inside commercial real estate policy — a reasonable shorthand that misses the operating business attached to the building.

04 Borrower profile
Global cash-flow and net-worth tests calibrated for diversified sponsors — a poor fit for the focused owner-operator whose capital sits in the sector they know.

05 Brand and PIP
Franchise obligations read as pure liability at closing — when they are also the capital plan that buys the asset its post-renovation revenue.

Eight steps, in order, every time.

The Einstein Method adds an operator's read to the lender's file — and writes the reasoning down at each step, so a veteran can argue with it.

E Examine Market
Supply pipeline, demand drivers, and whether the submarket can absorb what is already under construction.

I Interpret Meaning
Pricing power and RevPAR resilience — whether the asset holds rate when the market softens.

N Normalize Financials
Owner anomalies, skewed payroll, related-party charges, and under-reserved FF&E, removed.

S Stress-Test Assumptions
Capital budgets and wage inflation tested against what actually happened, not what was projected.

T Test Downside
Recession-level occupancy troughs run straight against debt service.

E Evaluate Exit
Refinance and sale scenarios under cap-rate expansion, at a debt yield that would actually clear.

I Identify Risk
Franchise agreements, management contracts, PIP obligations, and ground leases, read in full.

N Name Decision
A documented posture, with the reasoning written down beside it.

Four words.

Analysis without a verdict is a memo. Every file ends on one of these, in writing — a courtesy to the owner and to the lender who referred it.

01 Fund
The asset, the operator, and the structure all clear. Capital moves.

02 Restructure
The asset works; the terms do not. The study documents how the terms could be rebuilt — on paper, as a research scenario.

03 Watch
One variable is unresolved. A date and a trigger are set.

04 Pass
Stated plainly, with the reason attached, so the owner knows what to fix.

Finding the deal a home.

The capstone asks how a well-documented small deal could find its way to capital through the lending systems that already exist — a research design, worked out in the open. Nothing here sources, brokers, or finances a deal.

01 Acquisition
Owner-operators buying assets they already know how to run — read on operating reality, then placed with capital that prices that read.

02 Refinance
Maturities that arrive before a repositioning has seasoned — bridged to the lender whose horizon matches the business plan.

03 Renovation and PIP
Brand-mandated capital underwritten to the post-renovation asset — presented so a lender can price the value the spend buys.

04 Reserve
Held against the downside case the method already priced — and documented so the funding source can see the reasoning.

Tell me where this is wrong.

Forty years in hotel investment, research, and operations — CBRE, Hilton, the Las Vegas Strip, a Marcus & Millichap hospitality internship, and InnVest Hotel Brokers — now written up as a graduate capstone. This site exists to attract judgment from the people who do this for a living. If you have built, financed, or governed something in this sector, I would rather hear the flaw than the compliment.

The Einstein Method: eight steps proposed by a student, not a standard.

Institutional underwriting is rigorous work, and nothing here comments on how any bank or firm conducts its business. This eight-step sketch is an unverified student exercise: an operator's read and a written verdict, written on paper for the small deals I am curious about.

Method, verdict, capital.

Two research projects, one argument. Neither half works alone: an underwriting method with no capital behind it is a memo, and capital with no method behind it is just another lender repeating the same box at a higher price.

01 The method

How a hotel deal should be read: supply, pricing power, normalized financials, downside, exit, and the contracts nobody opens. Eight steps that end in a written posture.

02 The verdict

Fund, restructure, watch, or decline — stated plainly, with the reasoning attached. A verdict can be argued with; a credit score cannot.

03 The capital

What happens to a deal the method says yes to and a bank says no to. That gap is the lending pathway this capstone proposes.

Eight steps, applied line by line.

None of these steps is a technique lenders have never heard of. Run in sequence, with the reasoning written down, they move a small deal from a broker's narrative to a decision someone can be held to.

E Examine Market

Supply pipeline, demand drivers, and whether the submarket can absorb what is already under construction. Growth in the wrong submarket is not growth.

I Interpret Meaning

Pricing power and RevPAR resilience — whether the asset holds its rate position when the market softens, or discounts its way through the cycle.

N Normalize Financials

Owner anomalies, skewed payroll, related-party charges, one-time credits, and under-reserved replacement lines stripped out until the operating truth shows.

S Stress-Test Assumptions

Capital budgets, FF&E reserves, and wage inflation tested against what actually happened to comparable assets — not against what the model needs to be true.

T Test Downside
Recession-level occupancy troughs run against debt service. The question at this step is survival, not upside.

E Evaluate Exit
Refinance and sale scenarios under cap rate expansion, with the debt yield that would actually clear at maturity rather than the one assumed at close.

I Identify Risk
Franchise agreements, management contracts, PIP obligations, and ground leases read in full. The risk that kills a hotel loan is usually on paper, not in the P&L.

N Name Decision
A documented posture — fund, restructure, watch, or decline — with the reasoning written down so it can be revisited when the outcome is known.

What this is not.

Stated plainly, so no one has to guess.

01 Not a claim the industry is broken
Institutional lenders, brokerages, and advisory houses do rigorous work at the scale they are built for. This project names that explicitly and builds on it.

Imagined to sit beside the scorecard, not against it.

A bank's model asks whether a file fits an existing box — the right question at institutional scale. This sketch asks a follow-on question about small deals: might the asset itself be worth capital? It is a student's framing, not a criticism of anyone and not a description of how any institution works.

What a scorecard answers
Does this borrower, this ratio, and this property type fit a template built largely for other asset classes? It is fast, consistent, and indifferent to whether the hotel is any good.

What this is not.

Stated plainly, so no one has to guess.

02 Not a replacement for underwriting
The method adds an operator's read and a written verdict to the file a lender already assembles. It is a complement, offered to practitioners — not a competing standard.

03 A model, not a service
The capstone models how a $2–10M motel or small-hotel deal might find capital through existing lending systems. It is a research design only — no deals are sourced, analyzed for clients, brokered, or financed here.

Imagined to sit beside the scorecard, not against it.

A bank's model asks whether a file fits an existing box — the right question at institutional scale. This sketch asks a follow-on question about small deals: might the asset itself be worth capital? It is a student's framing, not a criticism of anyone and not a description of how any institution works.

What the method answers

Is this asset, run by this operator, in this submarket, worth capital at this structure? Slower, harder to automate, and far more likely to be right about a complicated file.

Why the difference matters

Owners with real assets and real cash flow are declined for reasons of structure, seasoning, or story. The method studies where an automated screen and an asset's reality diverge — and writes the divergence down.

Six stages from screen to posture.

The method is not applied all at once. It runs across a sequence that mirrors how a deal is actually read — and it interlocks with the five lending stages the platform describes rather than duplicating them.

Stage 01 Discover

Screen the market and identify assets worth real diligence. Most files should stop here, and the method is explicit about saying so early.

Stage 02 Understand

Read the asset, the brand, and the submarket on their own terms before any number is modeled.

Stage 03 Analyze

Normalize the operating statements and separate what is data from what is assumption. Assumptions get labeled, never dressed up as facts.

Stage 04 Underwrite

Build the base case on defensible operating inputs, with every input traceable to a source or flagged as an estimate.

Stage 05 Challenge

Stress-test the downside, the debt terms, and the exit. This is where a deal earns capital or loses it.

Stage 06 Decide

Issue a definitive, documented posture. Analysis without a verdict is a memo, and a memo never funded anything.

Where to read each half.

The method and the lending pathway are documented separately because they were researched separately. Read them in either order.

The lending pathway

The proposed lending model, studied as research: how capital could reach hotel and motel owners whose files banks declined — and what would have to be true for that to work.

Einstein Intel

The separate research site where the Einstein Method was first developed, written for institutional hotel investors evaluating acquisitions rather than lenders evaluating credit.

THE PLATFORM

A sketch of a credit model, written by a student who has worked in hotels.

A proposed lending model for hotel and motel owners whose situation does not fit a spreadsheet template. Developed as part of a Master's capstone in entrepreneurship, the full method is published here in the open for review and critique.

One imagined underwriting spine, four functions.

Origination, structuring, credit judgment, and asset-level intelligence are not separate departments here. They are one continuous read of the same asset.

01 Originate

Deals come from operators, brokers, and owners who need a lender that can read a hotel P&L without a translator.

02 Underwrite

The asset is normalized and interrogated before any structure is discussed. The numbers set the shape of the deal, not the other way around.

03 Structure

Terms are built around the actual situation — repositioning, transition, or a partner problem — rather than pushed into a standard box.

04 Steward

A funded loan is the start of a relationship with an operating business. The sketch imagines staying close to the asset through the business plan.

Read the sketch in full.

Four pages, written as coursework. Read them in order or start where your question is.

How It Works

From first conversation to committed structure, with what is required at each stage.

Where the sketch would fit

The asset types and owner situations this platform understands — and an honest list of where it does not.

Underwriting Method

The eight-discipline framework applied to market, financials, downside, exit, and risk.

Owner Questions

Timing, documents, brand impact, decision-making, and what happens if the deal is not ready.

Intelligence where it compresses judgment cycles — never where it replaces them.

Document Compression
Offering memoranda, franchise agreements, and years of operating statements are read and cross-referenced in hours instead of weeks.

Pattern Recall
Comparable situations would surface from a written record rather than from memory — an idea about process, not a system that exists.

Human Verdict
No model issues a credit decision. Intelligence sharpens the questions; a person answers for the outcome.

Questions a student anticipates about the sketch.

Imagined answers about how a proposed model might be structured and who it might be imagined for. No capital partners exist, no owner is eligible for anything, and none of this is on offer.

01 What exactly is the Alternative Hotel Lending Platform?
A hospitality-only credit platform for situations conventional lenders decline on process rather than merit. The sketch would read the asset and the operator directly, structure around the business plan, and stress-test the exit before we commit.

02 Who is it built for?
Independent and franchised hotel and motel owner-operators, and their capital partners: repositionings, bridge-to-stabilization, brand transitions, partner buyouts, and owner-operator recapitalizations.

03 Who might the sketch be imagined for?
A real asset, a legible business plan, and an operator who can explain their own numbers. The sketch imagines looking for demonstrated operating control, a credible path to stabilization, clean-enough title and franchise standing, and an owner willing to share the unflattering parts of the story.

04 When would the sketch not apply?
Ground-up development with no operating history, assets with unresolved legal or environmental exposure, sponsors who will not disclose the full capital stack, and situations that need a conventional balance-sheet loan at a conventional price.

05 How does the method's read differ from a bank's?
A bank's screen reads the borrower profile; the method reads the asset, the operator, and the plan. Every RevPAR ramp, wage assumption, FF&E reserve, and franchise obligation is examined — a research lens applied to published cases, not an underwriting service. No deals are analyzed for owners here.

06 What role would outside capital play in the sketch?
In the sketch, capital would sit alongside the same written file — the normalized statement, the stress cases, and the exit analysis — so it could disagree with the reasoning line by line. This is a research design only: no capital is raised, offered, or placed here.

07 How long does it take?

A first read within days of a complete scenario, a structured indication once the operating and franchise picture is clear, and a defined path to commitment from there — timelines are driven by document quality, not queue position.

08 What happens to my brand and my operating control?

The intent is continuity. Franchise relationships and day-to-day operating control stay with the owner; structure protects the plan rather than replacing the operator.

Hypothetical scenarios, invented for coursework

These are illustrative situations written by a student to explain an idea. They are not deals, not clients, and not outcomes — nothing described here happened.

Scenario 01 Bridge to reposition a tired exterior-corridor motel

Owner-operator held the asset free of institutional debt but needed capital to convert to a national economy brand before a franchise deadline. Bank timeline was 90+ days; the PIP window was 45. The scenario imagines that it underwrote the operator and the completed-brand value rather than trailing statements, and funded a short-term bridge with an interest reserve carved out for the renovation period.

Scenario 02 Partner buyout at a family-owned independent inn

Two of four family partners wanted out. Conventional lenders balked at the ownership change and seasonal revenue curve. Underwriting focused on peak-season cash conversion, the remaining operators track record, and a debt service reserve sized to the shoulder months.

Scenario 03 Discounted note payoff on a franchised select-service hotel

A legacy CMBS loan sat in special servicing after a soft two-year RevPAR stretch. The owner had a discounted payoff on the table with a hard expiry. The scenario imagines moving on the payoff economics and the sponsors operating plan, not the historical dip, and closed inside the servicer window.

Scenario 04 Ground-up conversion of a vacant office block to extended stay

Sponsor controlled the building and entitlements but the construction lender required more equity than the sponsor wanted to give up. The scenario imagines structuring senior plus a stretch piece against completed value, with draw controls tied to third-party inspections.

Scenario 05 Cash-out to fund a second acquisition

Stabilized asset with strong ADR and low leverage. The owner needed proceeds fast to compete on a second property against an all-cash buyer. Cash-out bridge funded ahead of the competing offer, then refinanced into fixed-rate long-term debt on both assets.

Scenario 06 Franchise-mandated PIP with a lender in place

Existing lender would not advance renovation dollars, and the brand PIP deadline was firm. The scenario imagines providing subordinate capital sized to the scope, with a completion guaranty and a defined take-out at brand re-inspection.

A student's note, not a scenario submission.

This is a conversation about coursework. No asset is reviewed, no fit answer is given, and no term sheet exists — write if you want to tell me where the thinking is wrong.