Dear CCIM Institute members,

Welcome to the second-quarter 2015 edition of CCIM Institute’s Quarterly Market Trends. The report provides timely insight into major commercial real estate indicators for core income-producing properties. It is produced by the National Association of Realtors® for members of the CCIM Institute, the commercial real estate industry’s global standard for professional achievement.

The second-quarter 2015 report features commentary from Lawrence Yun, Ph.D., NAR chief economist, and George Ratiu, director of NAR’s quantitative and commercial research. I hope that the information provided in CCIM’s Quarterly Market Trends report provides both economic and commercial real estate market information that will assist you in your business strategies in 2015 and beyond.

Sincerely,

Mark Macek, CCIM
2015 CCIM Institute President
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CCIM Transaction Survey HIGHLIGHTS

With rising deals and investor confidence, CCIM members provided insights into their markets in a May 2015 survey focused on commercial real estate practices in first quarter 2015.

TRANSACTIONS 1Q15

51% of CCIM members indicated more deals completed compared to same period the year before.

72% of CCIM members closed sales transactions.

The average value of CCIM investment deals was $3.6 million.

62% of CCIM members indicated more inquiries related to buying, while only 7% said more inquiries about owners wanting to sell.

Property prices rose in 49% of CCIM markets, with an additional 38% recording prices similar to last year.

CAP RATES 1Q15

Investment capitalization rates were flat in 48% of transactions and lower for 44%.

The average national cap rate for CCIM member deals was 8.5% during 1Q15. This compares to a cap rate of 7.8 percent in markets with properties under $2.5 million.

45% of CCIM members reported a gap in cap rate perception between buyers and sellers.

LEASING 1Q15

71% of CCIM members closed a lease agreement.

Rental rates were higher in 65% of CCIM markets.

25% of CCIM members expect rents to lag behind price growth in the next 2 to 3 years; another 25% said rent growth will outpace price growth, while 50% indicated that rents and prices will move roughly the same.

CAPITAL MARKETS 1Q15

Expectation of interest rate increases abated—47% of CCIM members expect Treasury yields to remain the same; 20% said Treasury yields would rise, but only minimally affect cap rates due to the current spreads; 9% said Treasury yields will rise and force cap rates upward.

CREDIT AVAILABILITY IMPROVED, with 36% of CCIM members reporting meaningful improvement in credit availability compared with last year.
Commercial Property SECTOR ANALYSIS

NATIONAL OFFICE MARKETS

- Deal flow was higher for 56% of CCIM members.
- Closing rates for office sales transaction reached 95%.
- Property prices were higher for 53 percent of CCIM members, while 32% found them to be flat.
- Cap rates were even for 54% of CCIM members, and lower for 32%.
- 73% of CCIM members had more serious buying inquiries.
- The rate of closing for lease agreements was 91%.
- Rents were higher in 59% of CCIM markets.
- Average investment prices:
  Class A $274 psf
  Class B/C $168 psf

FINANCE OUTLOOK / Office Properties %

- The current tight conditions will be the new normal because of many new financial market regulations
- Credit will be more readily accessible over time
- Credit will become even more difficult to access over time

FINANCE TRENDS (YoY) / Office Properties %

- Credit availability has meaningfully improved from last year
- Credit availability has only marginally improved
- Credit availability is just as tight as last year with no improvement
- Credit availability has turned for the worse
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Commercial Property Sector Analysis

National Industrial Markets

- Industrial deal flow was higher year-over-year for 54% of CCIM members.
- The closing rate for industrial sales was 98% during the quarter.
- Prices were even for 46% of CCIM members, and higher for 46%.
- Cap rates were flat for 54% of CCIM members, while 39% reported lower cap rates.
- CCIM members reported 56% higher buying inquiries during the quarter.
- Industrial leases closed at a rate of 86% during the quarter.
- Rents for industrial properties were higher in 68% of CCIM markets.
- Average investment prices:
  - Class A $137 psf
  - Class B/C $54 psf

Finance Trends (YoY)/Industrial Properties %

- Credit availability has meaningfully improved from last year
- Credit availability has only marginally improved
- Credit availability is just as tight as last year with no improvement
- Credit availability has turned for the worse

Finance Outlook/Industrial Properties %

- The current tight conditions will be the new normal because of many new financial market regulations
- Credit will be more readily accessible over time
- Credit will become even more difficult to access over time
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Commercial Property SECTOR ANALYSIS

NATIONAL RETAIL MARKETS

- Retail deals increased for 55% of CCIM members.
- The retail sales transaction closing rate was 94% this quarter.
- Prices were higher for 45% of CCIM members, and flat for 44%.
- Cap rates were the same for 38% of CCIM members, and lower for 55%.
- CCIM members reported 52% higher buying inquiries during the quarter.
- The closing rate for retail leases was 90%.
- Retail rents were reported higher by 73% of CCIMs.
- Average investment prices:
  - Class A: $191 psf
  - Class B/C: $126 psf

FINANCE TRENDS (YoY) / Retail %

- Credit availability has meaningfully improved from last year
- Credit availability has only marginally improved
- Credit availability is just as tight as last year with no improvement
- Credit availability has turned for the worse

FINANCE OUTLOOK / Retail %

- The current tight conditions will be the new normal because of many new financial market regulations
- Credit will be more readily accessible over time
- Credit will become even more difficult to access over time
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Commercial Property Sector Analysis

NATIONAL MULTIFAMILY MARKETS

- 56% of CCIM members reported more deals year over year.
- CCIM members reported that the apartment sales closing rate was 94%.
- Prices were higher for 59% of CCIM members.
- Cap rates were flat for 31% of CCIM members and lower for 56%.
- 72% of CCIM members had more serious buying inquiries.
- 59% of CCIM members indicated they closed an apartment lease.
- Apartment rents were higher for 53% of CCIM markets.
- Average investment prices:
  - Class A: $95,393 per unit
  - Class B/C: $61,591 per unit

FINANCE OUTLOOK / Multifamily %

The current tight conditions will be the new normal because of many new financial market regulations.

Credit will become even more difficult to access over time.

FINANCE TRENDS (YoY) / Multifamily %

Credit availability has meaningfully improved from last year.

Credit availability has only marginally improved.

Credit availability is just as tight as last year with no improvement.

Credit availability has turned for the worse.

Copyright ©2015 The CCIM Institute, National Association of Realtors.®
INVESTMENT SALES
The Urban Land Institute reported a favorable outlook for commercial real estate in its April 2015 Consensus Forecast. Following yearly sales of $424 million in 2014, sales are projected to rise to $470 million in 2015 and $500 million in 2016 and 2017. The projections are consistent with the National Association of Realtors’ economic forecast. If the economy’s performance increases beyond current projections, one might expect even higher sales. In perspective, sales over the 2003 to 2014 timeframe averaged $258 million.

Focusing on first quarter 2015, commercial sales volume for properties selling above $2.5 million totaled $129 billion, a 45 percent year-over-year increase, according to Real Capital Analytics. While individual transactions remained the dominant force, portfolio and entity-level deals gained market share, comprising almost 37 percent of total. Office and apartment properties made up a little over half of all transactions, totaling $33.5 billion and $33.0 billion, respectively. Industrial property sales registered the strongest advance with a 95 percent yearly gain.

Prices for commercial properties increased along with sales volume advancing 13 percent year-over-year during the first quarter of this year, according to RCA. Hotel pricing gained the most ground, with a noticeable 36 percent increase, placing hotel prices within 4 percent of their prior peak in 2007. In absolute terms, CBD office and apartments reached values that exceeded prior peaks, rising 22 percent and 25 percent respectively above 2007 levels. Pricing recovery for most assets is getting closer to the previous highs, but the pace varies.

CRE VOLUME

Source: Real Capital Analytics
Suburban office buildings are the farthest away from their prior peaks at a negative 12.5 percent.

Cap rates for commercial real estate assets continued their decline during 1Q15. At the national level, rates across all property types dropped 34 basis points compared with 1Q14. The largest decline came from suburban office transactions, which declined by 55 basis points. CBD office transactions posted the lowest cap rates, at 5.7 percent, followed by apartments, at 5.9 percent.

In a comparison based on NAR’s 1Q15 commercial market data — generally for sales under $2.5 million in contrast to the previously mentioned national sales data — the volume of sales transactions rose 11 percent on a yearly basis (compared to 45 percent for larger properties), an acceleration from the previous quarter’s pace. Prices reported by Realtors also accelerated, rising 4 percent year-over-year (compared to 13 percent for larger properties). NAR commercial practitioners indicated that their markets were facing noticeable shortages of inventory, believed to be a major reason for upward price pressures. Cap rates declined, averaging 7.8 percent in the first quarter (compared to 6.6 percent for larger properties), a 45 basis point drop year-over-year.
Commercial Real Estate Market UPDATE

FUNDAMENTALS

Commercial leasing remained on an upward trend in 1Q15, but the pace moderated. Net absorption rose across core property types, nudging rents higher. With employment expected to continue rising through the remainder of 2015, demand for commercial space is expected to advance.

OFFICE

Office absorption is projected to total 51.8 million square feet in 2015, leading vacancy rates on a gradual decline to 15.5 percent by the end of the year. Office vacancies continue to be elevated due to employers extracting space-utilization efficiencies. Office rents are forecast to rise 3.4 percent in 2015.

INDUSTRIAL

Operators of ports and intermodal distribution centers have been positioning for the forthcoming increased capacity of the Panama Canal, pouring investments into infrastructure and dredging. Competition for the expected increases in business is brisk and should have an upward impact on the demand for industrial space. Industrial demand is expected to total 108.8 million square feet in 2015. With new supply projected to reach 87.4 million square feet, availability rates will likely decline to 8.2 percent by the fourth quarter. Industrial rents should experience a 3.1 percent gain for the year.
Commercial Real Estate Market UPDATE

RETAIL

With rising consumer confidence and continued gains in employment and wages, the outlook for retail markets is looking up. Coastal markets remain top performers, displaying low vacancies and rising rents. Absorption is expected to reach 15.7 million square feet nationally in 2015, lowering vacancies to 9.5 percent by the fourth quarter. Rents are projected to rise 2.6 percent this year.

ABSORPTION IS EXPECTED TO REACH 15.7 MILLION SQUARE FEET NATIONALLY IN 2015, LOWERING VACANCIES TO 9.5 PERCENT BY THE FOURTH QUARTER.

MULTIFAMILY

The demand for multifamily properties is expected to remain strong, benefitting from growing household formation. However, this year’s supply of new space is projected to exceed demand. Apartment net absorption is estimated to reach a little over 172,500 units in 2015, while new apartment completions will add 230,200 units on the market. In turn, apartment vacancies are expected to rise throughout the year, and close the fourth quarter at 4.4 percent. Rent growth is projected to slow from above 4.0 percent over the past few years to 3.6 percent in 2015.
## Commercial Real Estate / FORECAST Q215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Absorption ('000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>14,220</td>
<td>15,565</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>15,133</td>
<td>16,490</td>
<td>51,772</td>
<td>60,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions ('000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>10,257</td>
<td>8,762</td>
<td>9,311</td>
<td>12,185</td>
<td>12,614</td>
<td>11,908</td>
<td>12,319</td>
<td>37,713</td>
<td>49,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory ('000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>4,206</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>4,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Growth</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Absorption ('000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>27,205</td>
<td>32,646</td>
<td>29,382</td>
<td>18,885</td>
<td>26,229</td>
<td>31,474</td>
<td>28,327</td>
<td>108,821</td>
<td>104,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions ('000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>27,099</td>
<td>25,350</td>
<td>15,397</td>
<td>16,090</td>
<td>22,728</td>
<td>21,262</td>
<td>13,930</td>
<td>87,415</td>
<td>73,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory ('000,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>8,552</td>
<td>8,567</td>
<td>8,590</td>
<td>8,611</td>
<td>8,625</td>
<td>8,552</td>
<td>8,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Growth</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RETAIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Absorption ('000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>2,841</td>
<td>5,028</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>6,732</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>21,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions ('000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>8,924</td>
<td>12,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory ('000,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>2,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Growth</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIFAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Absorption (Units)</td>
<td>40,147</td>
<td>37,248</td>
<td>50,673</td>
<td>39,616</td>
<td>35,778</td>
<td>33,195</td>
<td>45,158</td>
<td>172,524</td>
<td>153,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions (Units)</td>
<td>60,745</td>
<td>61,906</td>
<td>62,520</td>
<td>58,526</td>
<td>51,944</td>
<td>52,937</td>
<td>53,462</td>
<td>230,224</td>
<td>196,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory (Units in millions)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Growth</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: National Association of Realtors® / Reis, Inc.

Copyright ©2015 National Association of Realtors®. Reproduction, reprinting or retransmission in any form is prohibited without written permission. For questions regarding this matter please e-mail eresearch@realtors.org.
CCIM Survey REGIONAL TRENDS

SURVEY DEMOGRAPHICS

PROPERTY TYPE

- 29.8% Office
- 16.2% Multifamily
- 20.7% Industrial
- 32.1% Retail
- 1.1% Hospitality

REGION

- 30.3% West
- 15.7% Midwest
- 26.5% South
- 16.6% East
- 1.2% Canada & Mexico
- 9.6% Other

BUSINESS SPECIALTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Specialty</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brokerage</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset/Portfolio Management</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/Lending</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Real Estate</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing/Lending</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasing</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Real Estate</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POPULATION SIZE OF MARKET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size of Market</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 249,999</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 999,999</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Million - 5 Million</td>
<td>142%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 5 Million</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: CCIM Institute / National Association of Realtors®

Source: CCIM Institute / National Association of Realtors®
### CCIM Survey REGIONAL TRENDS

#### REGIONAL PRICE BREAKDOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>MIDWEST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>CANADA &amp; MEXICO</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Transaction Value</td>
<td>$2,748,618</td>
<td>$8,533,549</td>
<td>$2,918,937</td>
<td>$1,547,559</td>
<td>$4,450,000</td>
<td>$1,943,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Office Class A ($/SF)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Office Class B/C ($/SF)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Industrial Class A ($/SF)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Industrial Class B/C ($/SF)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Retail Class A ($/SF)</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Retail Class B/C ($/SF)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Apartment Class A ($/Unit)</td>
<td>127,789</td>
<td>29,660</td>
<td>75,716</td>
<td>128,770</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>61,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing: Apartment Class B/C ($/Unit)</td>
<td>93,413</td>
<td>22,020</td>
<td>49,215</td>
<td>64,035</td>
<td>128,750</td>
<td>17,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

©2015 CCIM Institute, National Association of Realtors.

#### REGIONAL LEASING TRENDS (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>MIDWEST</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>CANADA &amp; MEXICO</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DID YOU CLOSE A LEASE AGREEMENT?</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN NET RENTAL INCOME (Y/OY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents are higher by more than 5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents are higher by 1% to 5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents are about the same as last year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents are lower by 1% to 5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents are lower by more than 5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know because it is difficult to compare, there are no tenants, or had no transaction in specified time frame</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTLOOK (2-3 years) OF RENT GROWTH VS. PROPERTY PRICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent growth will outpace price growth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent growth will lag behind price growth</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both rent growth and price growth will move roughly the same amount</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CCIM Survey REGIONAL TRENDS

#### REGIONAL TRANSACTION TRENDS (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEAL FLOW CHANGE (YOY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More deals than this time last year</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same as this time last year</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer deals than this time last year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DID YOU COMPLETE A SALE THIS QUARTER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PRICING CHANGE (YOY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The property price was higher</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property price was about the same</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property price was lower</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know because it is difficult to compare, or had no transaction in specified time frame</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CAP RATE CHANGE (YOY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher cap rate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same cap rate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower cap rate</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BUYER INTEREST CHANGE (YOY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More serious inquiries related to buying</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer serious inquiries related to buying</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More serious inquiries related to selling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer serious inquiries related to selling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same number of serious inquiries about buying or selling as last year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DID YOU NOTICE A GAP IN CAP RATE EXPECTATIONS BETWEEN BUYERS & SELLERS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IF YES, HOW DID CAP RATE GAP CHANGE (YOY)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The gap is narrowing with a better chance of completing a deal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gap is about the same</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gap is widening with less chance of completing a deal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CCIM Survey REGIONAL TRENDS

#### REGIONAL FINANCING TRENDS (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Financing Conditions (Yoy)</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit availability has meaningfully improved from last year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit availability has only marginally improved</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit availability is just as tight as last year with no improvement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit availability has turned for the worse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expectations about Financing Over Next 2-3 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations about Financing Over Next 2-3 Years</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current tight conditions will be the new normal because of many new financial market regulation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit will be more readily accessible over time</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit will become even more difficult to access over time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outlook (2-3 years) Regarding Cap Rates Relative to Treasury Yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outlook (2-3 years) Regarding Cap Rates Relative to Treasury Yields</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Canada &amp; Mexico</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasury yields will quickly rise and thereby force cap rates upward by roughly the same magnitude</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury yields will quickly rise, but it will only minimally impact cap rates because of the current wide buffer zone</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury yields will remain about the same for an extended period and cap rates will also remain about the same as now</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury yields will remain low for an extended period and cap rates will fall closer to historical spreads (from the current wide gap)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap rates will fall, independent of how Treasury yields move</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Treasury yields and cap rates will fall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**U.S. Economic OVERVIEW**

**SLOW IMPROVEMENTS**

The economy continues its slow expansion six years after the end of the Great Recession. The outlook for 2015 is an overall increase of 2.3 percent in real gross domestic product based on a mediocre first half of the year coupled with an improving second half. The projected 2.3 percent real growth rate is consistent with economic performance over the past several years as the U.S. economy continues to underperform relative to a 3 percent real growth rate that one would expect.

The negative economic growth experienced in the first quarter does not appear to be a harbinger of recession. A number of long run trends support the current — although slow — economic expansion:

- Consumer balance sheets and consumer confidence have improved relative to a few years ago.
- Employment gains and GDP growth are starting to provide a base for wage gains. Given that the economy is based on a circular flow of expenditures, wage gains subsequently translate into increased consumer expenditures and subsequently higher GDP.
- Concurrent with wage gains, declining oil prices have had a favorable impact on consumer disposable income.
- The recovery in real estate continues to be slow but improving. Housing starts increased by approximately 8 percent in 2014 and are projected to increase by 13 percent in 2015. New construction is essentially 100 percent value added, providing impetus to the GDP level. At a time when the focus is on job additions, it is useful to note that new home construction can add two to three jobs per additional house built. Existing home sales are projected to be up 7 percent in 2015, with prices rising in the neighborhood of 6 percent. The sale of two existing homes generates economic activity equivalent to an additional job.

### INVESTMENT CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on May 2015 CCIM transaction survey*

### INVESTMENT VALUE VS. PRICE RATIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on May 2015 CCIM transaction survey*

### REGIONAL ECONOMIC CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL Average</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL Average</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**U.S. Economic OVERVIEW**

However, there are some risk factors and negative economic conditions tending to hold back the economic expansion; the negative factors have slowed down economic growth but are unlikely to cause a recession:

- Major foreign economies continue to face challenges. Depending on the country, Europe has been experiencing recessionary or slow growth conditions. As a result, there has been a downward push on the U.S. economy as imports continue to rise and exports decline. In addition, the flight to quality in international reserves has caused some appreciation of the U.S. dollar. Appreciation of the dollar also has a negative impact on U.S. exports.

- Although consumer confidence has increased relative to a few years ago, the Great Recession appears to have left a collective economic apprehension in the public’s memory. Therefore, any type of adverse although transitory economic news seems to create significant ripples in equity markets and apprehensive chatter in the press.

- No new, major drivers of additional economic activity appear to be on the horizon. For example, technological breakthroughs likely to create waves of additional investment have not been identified. The press is filled with reports of computer wizards creating billion dollar companies; however, very little additional employment is apparently generated.

- Major demographic changes appear unlikely. Millennials are increasingly participating in the economy, but not to the extent of causing a dramatic increase in GDP.

- Changes in employment and housing starts — two major economic drivers — are steady, but not spectacular.

Accordingly, on balance it appears that the economy is facing moderately slow but improving economic growth, possibly reaching a 3 percent annual increase in real GDP by 2016. However, even for that time frame housing starts are likely to be in the 1.4 million range rather than the 1.5 to 1.6 million range one would normally expect.
U.S. Economic OVERVIEW

WHY HAS THE ECONOMY BEEN SO SLOW?

The U.S. economy has developed a GDP gap, a constant dollar difference of more than $2 trillion between current economic performance and what the economy would have achieved without the Great Recession, based on trends in previous years. The impact of the Great Recession was substantial, with major negative impacts on employment, consumer confidence, household wealth, and incomes. As a result of a variety of negative economic conditions, the subsequent recovery has been slower than would have been expected: Real GDP growth has been approximately 2.2 percent in recent years, rather than the 3 percent or better rate one would expect after a recession.

Wage increases have been slow, and job growth was disappointing for an extended period of time, although job growth now appears to be picking up. The economy has increasingly been characterized by the growth of a part-time workforce, slow wage growth, deferred business investment, and lower than expected gains in productivity.

A variety of factors has set the stage for substandard economic performance in the past few years:

- Home prices and stock prices that had declined significantly from their peaks had major negative impacts on consumer balance sheets. Based on annual data, from 2006 to 2011, the median price of a home fell from $222,000 to $166,000. The major asset for the middle class is the value of the home, so the decline in home prices had an impact on consumer spending.
- Reductions in government spending, business investment, and residential and commercial construction further negatively impacted the economy during the Great Recession.
- The focus on financial engineering, short-term business/economic decision making, possibly unwise educational choices with accompanying increases in student debt, and increasing financial regulation have also been mentioned as having had a cumulative, negative impact on economic growth.

In short, a variety of negative economic factors during the Great Recession put a substantial dent in the economy — one that has required time to cure.

TIME FOR CONTINUED EXPANSION?

A variety of positive factors now appear to be in place to provide...
U.S. Economic OVERVIEW

Upscale potential to the economy: reasonable oil prices; the recovery and growth of household wealth; lower consumer debt levels; higher consumer confidence; the millennial generation reaching a point at which household formation should increase; pent-up demands for housing based on under production in recent years; U.S. businesses with high profits, in a position to invest; pent-up demand for increase in infrastructure — highways, bridges, transportation opportunities; and rising wages as the economy expands.

The negative factors, however, include worldwide economic and political uncertainties; the Federal Reserve’s prospects for getting the economy off of an “IV of Federal Reserve administered liquidity”; and wage, productivity, and employment issues. On balance, the positives appear to outweigh the negatives.

Real GDP growth in the neighborhood of 2.3 percent is forecast for 2015, rising to 3 percent in 2016:

- First quarter annualized GDP growth appears to have been near a negative 1 percent: falling exports, rising imports, slower inventory growth, weak corporate spending, and lagging spending on durable goods. This generally appears to have been weather induced and, therefore, largely irrelevant to longer run trends.

- For the second quarter, growth could be in the neighborhood of 1 to 2 percent, rising to 3 percent or higher during the second half of the year.

- Millennials and their actions may be a wild card. Up to this point, their family formation, home buying, and job prospects have been below expectations. As the...
expansion of the economy accelerates, millennials may provide somewhat higher than expected economic impetus.

**IMPACT ON REAL ESTATE MARKETS**

The impact of an expanding economy should be favorable for both residential and commercial real estate markets.

Residential sales demand — both for existing and new home sales — should be favorably affected by job growth and improved credit availability, expected even though accompanied by rising interest rates. Anticipated increases in interest rates should not, however, have a major negative impact on the demand for homes, for even within projected increase rates will continue to be well within normal historical ranges. Home inventories are tight, and multifamily rents are expected to continue to increase.

Currently new home construction is running in the neighborhood of 1 million units per year; however, the demand for homes to meet family formation, second homes demand, people moving out of rental units, and home demolitions of the existing housing stock is approximately 1.5 to 1.6 million units per year. The U.S. has a housing shortage, for housing starts have been well under 1.5 million units per year. There is a need for builders to increase supply to reach the needed additional 1.5 million units per year. Builders are expected to continue to ramp up production, and an increase in home construction should provide additional impetus to the economy.

As a result of an expanding economy, sales and construction of commercial real estate should continue to increase, both in volumes and in price. Vacancy rates are projected to decrease along with rent increases, depending on type of property. Industrial properties — warehouses and flex space — should be helped by increases in freight shipments as the economy expands and by demands for flexible and moderate cost office space. The millennial generation is expected to provide a continuing demand for the apartment markets; the generation is actually larger than the baby boom generation but, in many cases, has not yet moved into an apartment or house due to previously unfavorable economic conditions. Accordingly, the millennial generation is expected to have a continuing impact on housing demand, which will help the economy. Finally, economic expansion and continued job additions should help both retail and office space.

Overall, the outlook is favorable for the economy and real estate:

- The unemployment rate is expected to continue to decline.
- Employment growth will continue, although the overall labor participation rate continues to be below what it has traditionally been.
- Although inflation may pick up, inflation and interest rates are projected to remain relatively low, even though increasing.
- Therefore, the projection of 2.3 percent real GDP growth in 2015 — although somewhat lower than would be expected — appears to be reasonable, and could be higher if some of the unexpected possibilities mentioned happen.
The leading market index uses an array of factors to assess the relative health of an individual market. The factors include job creation, unemployment claims, bankruptcy filings, and permits for construction. The first two factors provide an indication of potential business expansion/contraction as well as of labor market health and a leading indicator of multifamily rental growth. Bankruptcy filings allude to the health of the business environment, while the permits data point to business plans and have an indirect impact on inventories.

The leading indicator is weighted based on both the current measure as well as its recent trend or lagged measures. These weighted measures are then added to create a score. This score is then ranked relative to a fixed scale where a measure of 85 or better indicates a robust market, 75 to 85 a strong market, 65 to 75 an average market, and a score below 65 coincides with a weak market.

|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------
| Phoenix                     | AZ    | B     | 84.38             | -17%                               | -9%                                 | 4.9%                             | 2.8%                            | 3%                              |
| Tucson                      | AZ    | B     | 79.69             | -17%                               | -9%                                 | 5.1%                             | 1.1%                            | 4%                              |
| Los Angeles                 | CA    | C     | 73.44             | -23%                               | -13%                                | 6.4%                             | 2.8%                            | 0%                              |
| San Bernardino/Riverside    | CA    | B     | 76.56             | -23%                               | -13%                                | 6.2%                             | 4.1%                            | 57%                             |
| Sacramento                  | CA    | C     | 73.44             | -23%                               | -13%                                | 5.6%                             | 2.4%                            | 49%                             |
| San Diego                   | CA    | B     | 79.69             | -23%                               | -13%                                | 4.8%                             | 3.1%                            | -20%                            |
| San Francisco               | CA    | A     | 92.19             | -23%                               | -13%                                | 4.0%                             | 3.4%                            | 4%                              |
| San Jose                    | CA    | A     | 85.94             | -23%                               | -13%                                | 4.0%                             | 6.0%                            | 20%                             |
| Colorado Springs            | CO    | B     | 81.25             | -22%                               | -11%                                | 5.2%                             | 2.1%                            | -9%                             |
| Denver                      | CO    | A     | 93.75             | -22%                               | -11%                                | 4.2%                             | 3.1%                            | 4%                              |
| Hartford                    | CT    | C     | 73.44             | -6%                                | -10%                                | 5.8%                             | 1.5%                            | 9%                              |
| Washington                  | DC    | B     | 78.13             | -5%                                | -15%                                | 4.3%                             | 2.1%                            | -3%                             |
| Jacksonville                | FL    | B     | 82.81             | -13%                               | -20%                                | 5.1%                             | 2.7%                            | 1%                              |
| Miami                       | FL    | C     | 73.44             | -13%                               | -20%                                | 5.4%                             | 3.4%                            | -1%                             |
| Orlando                     | FL    | B     | 82.81             | -13%                               | -20%                                | 4.9%                             | 4.3%                            | 20%                             |
| Tampa-St. Petersburg         | FL    | B     | 82.81             | -13%                               | -20%                                | 5.0%                             | 3.2%                            | 9%                              |
| Atlanta                     | GA    | B     | 78.13             | -9%                                | -15%                                | 5.6%                             | 3.4%                            | 10%                             |
| Chicago                     | IL    | C     | 65.63             | -5%                                | -13%                                | 5.9%                             | 1.4%                            | 11%                             |
| Indianapolis                | IN    | B     | 82.81             | -12%                               | -19%                                | 4.3%                             | 2.9%                            | 6%                              |
| Lexington                   | KY    | A     | 85.94             | -10%                               | -18%                                | 3.8%                             | 1.7%                            | -32%                            |
| Louisville                  | KY    | B     | 82.81             | -10%                               | -18%                                | 4.4%                             | 3.0%                            | -12%                            |

* October 2013 through September 2014 vs. October 2012 through September 2013
**December 2013 through November 2014 vs December 2012 through November 2013
### LEADING INDICATOR INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>65.63</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>76.66</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro/Winston-Salem</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Durham</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>71.88</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>84.38</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>84.38</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.31</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* April 2014 through March 2015 vs. April 2013 through March 2014
** May 2014 through April 2015 vs. May 2013 through April 2014
## LEADING INDICATOR INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>90.63</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>71.88</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>78.13</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk/Hampton Roads</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield County</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.31</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern New Jersey</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>70.31</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland-East Bay</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Maryland</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Virginia</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Cary</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central New Jersey</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* April 2014 through March 2015 vs. April 2013 through March 2014
** May 2014 through April 2015 vs. May 2013 through April 2014
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CONTRIBUTORS

Jim Baker
Baker Commercial Real Estate
Jeffersonville IN

Young Ja Kim
Kim Commercial
Duluth GA

Rogers C. Smith
TCHEHR Corporation, Realtors
McMinnville OR

Ned Madonia
Engel & Völkers
Las Vegas NV

Lowrey Burnett
Avison Young
Denver CO

Josh Randolph
Colliers International
Birmingham AL

Matthew Farrell
CORE Partners
Birmingham MI

Jasper Tramonte
Tramonte Commercial Brokerage, LLC
League City TX

Tom Crompton
Commercial Experts, Inc.
Canton GA

Ted Dang
Commonwealth Real Estate
Oakland CA

Felicia Studstill
Silas Real Estate Advisory LLC
Detroit MI

Chris Jacobson
CBRE
Minneapolis MN

James A. Barnett
J A Barnett Realty Group, Inc.
Tampa FL

Moe Lessan
DTZ Nanaimo Real Estate Ltd.
Nanaimo

Mike Stuhlmiller
Stuhlmiller Realty
Hayden ID

Nancy Fish
Park Place Real Estate
Kalamazoo MI

Hank Futch
Hank Futch Real Estate
Charleston SC

Richard Harris
Richard Harris & Associates, Inc.
Palm Harbor FL

Gary Hunter
Westlake Associates, Inc.
Seattle WA

Ryan Haedrich
Haedrich & Co., Inc.
Redding CA

Tom Davies
Norris & Stevens, Inc.
Portland OR

Amy Mills
Steve Fineberg & Associates, Inc.
Bentonville AR

Lloyd Miller
Morris Realty Group
Memphis TN

Jay Taylor
Sperry Van Ness
Raleigh NC

Warren Marr
PwC
Philadelphia PA

Daren Hebold
LUX Realty Group
Portland ME

Theodore Deuel
Deuel International Group, Inc.
San Diego CA

Richard Czoski
Santa Fe Rajayrd Community Corp
Santa Fe NM

Randall Hall
BrokerOne Real Estate
Casper WY

Patrick D. Gallagher
Siegel-Gallagher, Inc.
Milwaukee WI

Dale Dockins
North Bay Commercial Real Estate
Santa Rosa CA

Lily Seymour
Gershman commercial
St. Louis MO

Tom Larson
RE/MAX Commercial Property Solutions
La Porte IN

Frank Weiskopf
Realty Executives
Maryville TN

Janet Wilkerson
INVEST Commercial Real Estate
Leawood KS

Sharon Carz
Income Property Specialists
Los Angeles CA

Ryan Lasiter
Doyle Rogers Company
Little Rock AR

Warren Strietzel
Stochast Brothers and Company
Livonia MI

Jeffrey Eales
Bitcher Anderson Realty
San Juan Capistrano CA

James Yates
Red Realty, LLC
Murphysboro TN

Scot E Hall
Wolf Realty Inc.
Glendale AZ

Jacque Haynes
Cassidy Turley
Indianapolis IN

Dewey Struble
Dewey Struble CCIM
Reno NV

Michael Grazier
Trimmont Real Estate Advisors
Atlanta GA

James Robertson
Real Estate Executives Tucson Elite
Tucson AZ

Robert Powell
Powell Realty Advisors
Dallas TX

Rob Lukemeyer III
Baseline, Inc
Indianapolis IN

Edward Wilson
Newmark Grubb Wilson/Kibler
Greenville SC

Corey Schneider
Corey J Schneider, CCIM
Passaic NJ

Blake Lacy
Broadway Bank
San Antonio TX

Tommy Gleason
NAI Mobile
Mobile AL

Brian Rosteck
NorthPoint Development
Keller Williams
Jupiter FL

Russell Hur
RMH
Austin TX

Olga Hallstedt
Results Commercial Real Estate
Grand Rapids MI
CONTRIBUTORS

Phillip Greenberg
Brand Name Real Estate
Charleston SC

Matt Boehlke
Regus
Minneapolis MN

Thomas Knaub
Colliers International
Phoenix AZ

Craig G. Johnson
Maylar LP
Dallas TX

Nicole Willoughby
Associated Bank
Milwaukee WI

Peter Rasmussen
Lee & Associates
Elmwood Park NJ

Hubert King
Treeline Realty and Investment Co.
Temple City CA

Amy Silvey
Clay & Company
Houston TX

Ron Opfer
Coldwell Banker
Las Vegas NV

Evans Hammer
Stanley Hammer Co.
San Antonio TX

Drew Augustin
Alliance Commercial Group
Indianapolis IN

Joe Milkes
Milkes Realty Valuation
Plano TX

Amy Lerseth
The Buzz Oates Group of Companies
Sacramento CA

Steve Jacquemin
S.J. Financial Group, Inc.
St. Louis MO

Andie Edmonds
NAI ARIS
Bend OR

Ira Korn
Coldwell Banker Commercial
Meridian
Rochester NY

Brad Welborn
iCOREglobal - Ft. Myers
Fort Myers FL

John Levinsohn
Levi Investment Realty, Inc.
Indianapolis IN

Dan Mincher
The Vollman Company, Inc.
Sacramento CA

Nick Miner
ORION Investment Real Estate
Scottsdale AZ

Aziz Khatri
KW Commercial
Fremont CA

Becky Leebens
LR Real Estate
Apple Valley MN

David P. Reule
Reule Corporation
Charlotte NC

Michael Carr
Coldwell Banker Commercial
NRT
Naples FL

Wayne Kurchina
ILrealty, Inc.
McHenry IL

Michael C. DiBella
Coldwell Banker
Island Properties
Wailea HI

Dan Naylor
Mericle Commercial Real Estate
Wilkes-Barre PA

Ross Thomas
Coldwell Companies
Houston TX

Nathan Hughes
Bandazian & Hughes, Inc.
Richmond VA

David Monroe
Bellator Real Estate & Development
Mobile AL

David Aikens
KW Commercial
Louisville KY

Gary Hunter
Westlake Associates, Inc.
Seattle WA

Beau Beary
Coldwell Banker Commercial
M.M. Parrish
Gainesville FL

Gary Cornelissen
Marcor Investment Properties, Inc.
San Diego CA

N. Fish
Park Place Real Estate
Kalamazoo MI

Tony M. Amato
Avison Young
Las Vegas NV

Mary Martin Miller
Miller Consulting Group, LLC
Newberg OR

Roxana Baker
Ritchie Commercial
San Jose CA

Mike Armanious
KW Commercial
Tacoma WA

Bob Hansen
Hansen Real Estate & Investment Service, LLC
Ellensburg WA

Skip Weber
NAI/Latter & Blum
New Orleans LA

Jeff Wilke
Graham & Company
Huntsville AL

Ghassan Jadoun
Ace Commercial Real Estate
New Port Richey FL

David Roth
REMAX Alliance Group
Sarasota FL

Patrick Ley
ECR
Austin TX

Brian Wolford
Paradigm Tax Group
Houston TX

Joel Miller
Sperry Van Ness / Landmark
Geneva IL

Brad Vander Linden
VlRE, Inc.
Indianola IA

Kyle Gill
Faithbridge Property Company
Aledo TX

Jeff Castell
Cassidy Turley
Indianapolis IN

David Williamson
BancorpSouth
Birmingham AL

James Roberson
NAI Knoxville
Knoxville TN

Deb Stevens
The Stevens Group
Boston MA

Craig Evans
Cassidy Turley
New York NY

Louise Frazier
Blue Ridge Realty, Inc.
Knoxville TN

Michael Manning
Main Place Liberty Group
Buffalo NY

Ross Hedlund
Frauenshuh Commercial Real Estate
Indianapolis IN

Jim Resha
Sperry Commercial
Irvine CA
Visit [www.ccim.com/resources](http://www.ccim.com/resources) to learn more about CCIM’s Quarterly Market Trends report.