

CubeSmart
Form 10-K
February 17, 2017
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, DC 20549

FORM 10-K

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2016

OR

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from to

Commission file number 001-32324 (CubeSmart)

Commission file number 000-54462 (CubeSmart, L.P.)

CUBESMART

CUBESMART, L.P.

(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Its Charter)

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Maryland (CubeSmart)	20-1024732 (CubeSmart)
Delaware (CubeSmart, L.P.)	34-1837021 (CubeSmart, L.P.)
(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation or Organization)	(IRS Employer Identification No.)
5 Old Lancaster Road	19355
Malvern, Pennsylvania	(Zip Code)
(Address of Principal Executive Offices)	

Registrant's telephone number, including area code (610) 535-5000

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of each class	Name of each exchange on which registered
Common Shares, \$0.01 par value per share, of CubeSmart	New York Stock Exchange

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: Units of General Partnership Interest of CubeSmart, L.P.

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act.

CubeSmart	Yes	No
CubeSmart, L.P.	Yes	No

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act.

CubeSmart	Yes	No
CubeSmart, L.P.	Yes	No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant: (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

CubeSmart Yes No
CubeSmart, L.P. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Web site, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files).

CubeSmart Yes No
CubeSmart, L.P. Yes No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

CubeSmart Yes No
CubeSmart, L.P. Yes No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer or a smaller reporting company. See definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer," and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act:

CubeSmart:

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer Non-accelerated filer Smaller reporting company

CubeSmart, L.P.:

Large accelerated filer Accelerated filer Non-accelerated filer Smaller reporting company

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act).

CubeSmart Yes No
CubeSmart, L.P. Yes No

As of June 30, 2016, the last business day of CubeSmart's most recently completed second fiscal quarter, the aggregate market value of common shares held by non-affiliates of CubeSmart was \$5,504,356,819. As of February 15, 2017, the number of common shares of CubeSmart outstanding was 180,171,863.

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

As of June 30, 2016, the last business day of CubeSmart, L.P.'s most recently completed second fiscal quarter, the aggregate market value of the 2,220,874 units of limited partnership (the "OP Units") held by non-affiliates of CubeSmart, L.P. was \$68,580,589 based upon the last reported sale price of \$30.88 per share on the New York Stock Exchange on June 30, 2016 of the common shares of CubeSmart, the sole general partner of CubeSmart, L.P. (For this computation, the market value of all OP Units beneficially owned by CubeSmart has been excluded.)

Documents incorporated by reference: Portions of the Proxy Statement for the 2017 Annual Meeting of Shareholders of CubeSmart to be filed subsequently with the SEC are incorporated by reference into Part III of this report.

Table of Contents

EXPLANATORY NOTE

This report combines the annual reports on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2016 of CubeSmart (the “Parent Company” or “CubeSmart”) and CubeSmart, L.P. (the “Operating Partnership”). The Parent Company is a Maryland real estate investment trust, or REIT, that owns its assets and conducts its operations through the Operating Partnership, a Delaware limited partnership, and subsidiaries of the Operating Partnership. The Parent Company, the Operating Partnership and their consolidated subsidiaries are collectively referred to in this report as the “Company”. In addition, terms such as “we”, “us”, or “our” used in this report may refer to the Company, the Parent Company, and/or the Operating Partnership.

The Parent Company is the sole general partner of the Operating Partnership and, as of December 31, 2016, owned a 98.9% interest in the Operating Partnership. The remaining 1.1% interest consists of common units of limited partnership interest issued by the Operating Partnership to third parties in exchange for contributions of properties to the Operating Partnership. As the sole general partner of the Operating Partnership, the Parent Company has full and complete authority over the Operating Partnership’s day-to-day operations and management.

Management operates the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership as one enterprise. The management teams of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership are identical, and their constituents are officers of both the Parent Company and of the Operating Partnership.

There are a few differences between the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership, which are reflected in the note disclosures in this report. The Company believes it is important to understand the differences between the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership in the context of how these entities operate as a consolidated enterprise. The Parent Company is a REIT, whose only material asset is its ownership of the partnership interests of the Operating Partnership. As a result, the Parent Company does not conduct business itself, other than acting as the sole general partner of the Operating Partnership, issuing public equity from time to time and guaranteeing the debt obligations of the Operating Partnership. The Operating Partnership holds substantially all the assets of the Company and, directly or indirectly, holds the ownership interests in the Company’s real estate ventures. The Operating Partnership conducts the operations of the Company’s business and is structured as a partnership with no publicly traded equity. Except for net proceeds from equity issuances by the Parent Company, which are contributed to the Operating Partnership in exchange for partnership units, the Operating Partnership generates the capital required by the Company’s business through the Operating Partnership’s operations, by the Operating Partnership’s direct or indirect incurrence of indebtedness or through the issuance of partnership units of the Operating Partnership or equity interests in subsidiaries of the Operating Partnership.

The substantive difference between the Parent Company’s and the Operating Partnership’s filings is the fact that the Parent Company is a REIT with public equity, while the Operating Partnership is a partnership with no publicly traded equity. In the financial statements, this difference is primarily reflected in the equity (or capital for Operating Partnership) section of the consolidated balance sheets and in the consolidated statements of equity (or capital). Apart

from the different equity treatment, the consolidated financial statements of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership are nearly identical.

The Company believes that combining the annual reports on Form 10-K of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership into a single report will:

- facilitate a better understanding by the investors of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership by enabling them to view the business as a whole in the same manner as management views and operates the business;
- remove duplicative disclosures and provide a more straightforward presentation in light of the fact that a substantial portion of the disclosure applies to both the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership; and
- create time and cost efficiencies through the preparation of one combined report instead of two separate reports.

In order to highlight the differences between the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership, the separate sections in this report for the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership specifically refer to the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership. In the sections that combine disclosures of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership, this report refers to such disclosures as those of the Company. Although the Operating Partnership is generally the entity that directly or indirectly enters into contracts and real estate ventures and holds assets and debt, reference to the Company is appropriate because the business is one enterprise and the Parent Company operates the business through the Operating Partnership.

As general partner with control of the Operating Partnership, the Parent Company consolidates the Operating Partnership for financial reporting purposes, and the Parent Company does not have significant assets other than its investment in the Operating Partnership. Therefore, the assets and liabilities of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership are the same on their respective financial

Table of Contents

statements. The separate discussions of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership in this report should be read in conjunction with each other to understand the results of the Company's operations on a consolidated basis and how management operates the Company.

This report also includes separate Item 9A - Controls and Procedures sections, signature pages and Exhibit 31 and 32 certifications for each of the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership in order to establish that the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer of the Parent Company and the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Financial Officer of the Operating Partnership have made the requisite certifications and that the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership are compliant with Rule 13a-15 or Rule 15d-15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act") and 18 U.S.C. §1350.

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PART I</u>		5
<u>Item 1.</u>	<u>Business</u>	6
<u>Item 1A.</u>	<u>Risk Factors</u>	12
<u>Item 1B.</u>	<u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	24
<u>Item 2.</u>	<u>Properties</u>	24
<u>Item 3.</u>	<u>Legal Proceedings</u>	36
<u>Item 4.</u>	<u>Mining Safety Disclosures</u>	36
<u>PART II</u>		37
<u>Item 5.</u>	<u>Market for Registrant’s Common Equity, Related Shareholder Matters, and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	37
<u>Item 6.</u>	<u>Selected Financial Data</u>	39
<u>Item 7.</u>	<u>Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	44
<u>Item 7A.</u>	<u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u>	59
<u>Item 8.</u>	<u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u>	59
<u>Item 9.</u>	<u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	59
<u>Item 9A.</u>	<u>Controls and Procedures</u>	60
<u>Item 9B.</u>	<u>Other Information</u>	61
<u>PART III</u>		61
<u>Item 10.</u>	<u>Trustees, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	61
<u>Item 11.</u>	<u>Executive Compensation</u>	61
<u>Item 12.</u>	<u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Shareholder Matters</u>	61
<u>Item 13.</u>	<u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Trustee Independence</u>	61
<u>Item 14.</u>	<u>Principal Accountant Fees and Services</u>	62

<u>PART IV</u>	62
<u>Item 15. Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules</u>	62
<u>Item 16. Form 10-K Summary</u>	67

Table of Contents

PART I

Forward-Looking Statements

This Annual Report on Form 10-K, or this Report, together with other statements and information publicly disseminated by the Parent Company and the Operating Partnership, contain certain forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and Section 21E of the Exchange Act. Forward-looking statements include statements concerning the Company's plans, objectives, goals, strategies, future events, future revenues or performance, capital expenditures, financing needs, plans or intentions relating to acquisitions and other information that is not historical information. In some cases, forward-looking statements can be identified by terminology such as "believes", "expects", "estimates", "may", "will", "should", "anticipates", or "intends" or negative of such terms or other comparable terminology, or by discussions of strategy. Such statements are based on assumptions and expectations that may not be realized and are inherently subject to risks, uncertainties and other factors, many of which cannot be predicted with accuracy and some of which might not even be anticipated. Although we believe the expectations reflected in these forward-looking statements are based on reasonable assumptions, future events and actual results, performance, transactions or achievements, financial and otherwise, may differ materially from the results, performance, transactions or achievements expressed or implied by the forward-looking statements. As a result, you should not rely on or construe any forward-looking statements in this Report, or which management may make orally or in writing from time to time, as predictions of future events or as guarantees of future performance. We caution you not to place undue reliance on forward-looking statements, which speak only as of the date of this Report or as of the dates otherwise indicated in the statements. All of our forward-looking statements, including those in this Report, are qualified in their entirety by this statement.

There are a number of risks and uncertainties that could cause our actual results to differ materially from the forward-looking statements contained in or contemplated by this Report. Any forward-looking statements should be considered in light of the risks and uncertainties referred to in Item 1A. "Risk Factors" in this Report and in our other filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"). These risks include, but are not limited to, the following:

- national and local economic, business, real estate and other market conditions;
- the competitive environment in which we operate, including our ability to maintain or raise occupancy and rental rates;
- the execution of our business plan;
- the availability of external sources of capital;

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

- financing risks, including the risk of over-leverage and the corresponding risk of default on our mortgage and other debt and potential inability to refinance existing indebtedness;
- increases in interest rates and operating costs;
- counterparty non-performance related to the use of derivative financial instruments;
- our ability to maintain our Parent Company's qualification as a REIT for federal income tax purposes;
- acquisition and development risks;
- increases in taxes, fees, and assessments from state and local jurisdictions;
- risks of investing through joint ventures;
- changes in real estate and zoning laws or regulations;
- risks related to natural disasters;
- potential environmental and other liabilities;
- other factors affecting the real estate industry generally or the self-storage industry in particular; and

Table of Contents

- other risks identified in this Report and, from time to time, in other reports that we file with the SEC or in other documents that we publicly disseminate.

Given these uncertainties and the other risks identified elsewhere in this Report, we caution readers not to place undue reliance on forward-looking statements. We undertake no obligation to publicly update or revise these forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise except as may be required by securities laws. Because of the factors referred to above, the future events discussed in or incorporated by reference in this Report may not occur and actual results, performance or achievement could differ materially from that anticipated or implied in the forward-looking statements.

ITEM 1. BUSINESS

Overview

We are a self-administered and self-managed real estate company focused primarily on the ownership, operation, management, acquisition, and development of self-storage properties in the United States.

As of December 31, 2016, we owned 475 self-storage properties located in 23 states and in the District of Columbia containing an aggregate of approximately 32.9 million rentable square feet. As of December 31, 2016, approximately 89.7% of the rentable square footage at our owned stores was leased to approximately 269,000 customers, and no single customer represented a significant concentration of our revenues. As of December 31, 2016, we owned stores in the District of Columbia and the following 23 states: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Virginia. In addition, as of December 31, 2016, we managed 316 stores for third parties (including 116 stores containing an aggregate of approximately 6.8 million rentable square feet as part of three separate unconsolidated real estate ventures) bringing the total number of stores we owned and/or managed to 791. As of December 31, 2016, we managed stores for third parties in the following 26 states: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, and Virginia.

Our self-storage properties are designed to offer affordable and easily-accessible storage space for our residential and commercial customers. Our customers rent storage cubes for their exclusive use, typically on a month-to-month basis. Additionally, some of our stores offer outside storage areas for vehicles and boats. Our stores are designed to accommodate both residential and commercial customers, with features such as wide aisles and load-bearing capabilities for large truck access. All of our stores have a storage associate available to assist our customers during business hours, and 285, or approximately 60.0%, of our owned stores have a manager who resides in an apartment at the store. Our customers can access their storage cubes during business hours, and some of our stores provide

customers with 24-hour access through computer-controlled access systems. Our goal is to provide customers with the highest standard of physical attributes and service in the industry. To that end, 401, or approximately 84.4%, of our owned stores include climate-controlled cubes.

The Parent Company was formed in July 2004 as a Maryland REIT. The Parent Company owns its assets and conducts its business through the Operating Partnership, and its subsidiaries. The Parent Company controls the Operating Partnership as its sole general partner and, as of December 31, 2016, owned an approximately 98.9% interest in the Operating Partnership. The Operating Partnership was formed in July 2004 as a Delaware limited partnership and has been engaged in virtually all aspects of the self-storage business, including the development, acquisition, management, ownership and operation of self-storage properties.

Acquisition and Disposition Activity

As of December 31, 2016 and 2015, we owned 475 and 445 stores, respectively, that contained an aggregate of 32.9 million and 30.4 million rentable square feet with occupancy rates of 89.7% and 90.2%, respectively. A complete listing of, and additional information about, our stores is included in Item 2 of this Report. The following is a summary of our 2016, 2015 and 2014 acquisition and disposition activity:

Table of Contents

Asset/Portfolio	Market	Transaction Date	Number of Stores	Purchase / Sale Price (in thousands)
2016 Acquisitions:				
Metro DC Asset	Baltimore / DC	January 2016	1	\$ 21,000
Texas Assets	Texas Markets - Major	January 2016	2	24,800
New York Asset	New York / Northern NJ	January 2016	1	48,500
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	January 2016	1	11,600
Connecticut Asset	Connecticut	February 2016	1	19,000
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	March 2016	1	11,600
Florida Assets	Florida Markets - Other	March 2016	3	47,925
Colorado Asset	Denver	April 2016	1	11,350
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	April 2016	1	11,600
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	May 2016	1	10,100
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	May 2016	1	10,800
Illinois Asset	Chicago	May 2016	1	12,350
Illinois Asset	Chicago	May 2016	1	16,000
Massachusetts Asset	Massachusetts	June 2016	1	14,300
Nevada Assets	Las Vegas	July 2016	2	23,200
Arizona Asset	Phoenix	August 2016	1	14,525
Minnesota Asset	Minneapolis	August 2016	1	15,150
Colorado Asset	Denver	August 2016	1	15,600
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	September 2016	1	6,100
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	September 2016	1	5,300
Nevada Asset	Las Vegas	October 2016	1	13,250
North Carolina Asset	Charlotte	November 2016	1	10,600
Arizona Asset	Phoenix	November 2016	1	14,000
Nevada Asset	Las Vegas	December 2016	1	14,900
			28	\$ 403,550
2015 Acquisitions:				
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	February 2015	1	\$ 7,295
HSRE Assets	Chicago	March 2015	4	27,500
Arizona Asset	Arizona / Las Vegas	March 2015	1	7,900
Tennessee Asset	Tennessee	March 2015	1	6,575
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	April 2015	1	15,795
Florida Asset	Florida Markets - Other	May 2015	1	7,300
Arizona Asset	Arizona / Las Vegas	June 2015	1	10,100
Florida Asset	Florida Markets - Other	June 2015	1	10,500
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	July 2015	1	14,200
Maryland Asset	Baltimore / DC	July 2015	1	17,000
Maryland Asset	Baltimore / DC	July 2015	1	19,200
New York/New Jersey Assets	New York / Northern NJ	August 2015	2	24,823
New Jersey Asset	New York / Northern NJ	December 2015	1	14,350
PSI Assets	Various (see note 4)	December 2015	12	109,824

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

2015 Dispositions:			29	\$ 292,362
Texas Assets	Texas Markets - Major	October 2015	7	\$ 28,000
Florida Asset	Florida Markets - Other	October 2015	1	9,800
			8	\$ 37,800
2014 Acquisitions:				
Connecticut Asset	Connecticut	January 2014	1	\$ 4,950
Florida Asset	Miami / Ft. Lauderdale	January 2014	1	14,000
Florida Assets	Florida Markets - Other	January 2014	2	14,450
California Asset	Other West	January 2014	1	8,300
Maryland Asset	Baltimore / DC	February 2014	1	15,800
Maryland Asset	Baltimore / DC	February 2014	1	15,500
Arizona Asset	Arizona / Las Vegas	March 2014	1	14,750
	Philadelphia / Southern			
Pennsylvania Asset	NJ	March 2014	1	7,350
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	March 2014	1	8,225
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	April 2014	1	6,450
New York Assets	New York / Northern NJ	April 2014	2	55,000
Florida Asset	Florida Markets - Other	April 2014	1	11,406
Massachusetts Asset	Other Northeast	April 2014	1	11,100
Indiana Asset	Other Midwest	May 2014	1	8,400
Florida Assets	Florida Markets - Other	June 2014	3	35,000
Florida Assets	Florida Markets - Other	July 2014	2	15,800
Massachusetts Asset	Boston	September 2014	1	23,100
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	October 2014	1	7,700
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	October 2014	1	8,500
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	October 2014	1	7,750
HSRE Assets	Various (see note 4)	November 2014	22	195,500
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	December 2014	1	18,650
Florida Assets	Florida Markets - Other	December 2014	3	18,200
New York Asset	New York / Northern NJ	December 2014	1	38,000
Texas Asset	Texas Markets - Major	December 2014	1	4,345
			53	\$ 568,226

Table of Contents

The comparability of our results of operations is affected by the timing of acquisition and disposition activities during the periods reported. As of December 31, 2016, 2015, and 2014, we owned 475, 445, and 421 self-storage properties and related assets, respectively. The following table summarizes the change in number of owned stores from January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2016:

	2016	2015	2014
Balance - January 1	445	421	366
Stores acquired	10	7	10
Stores developed	1	—	2
Balance - March 31	456	428	378
Stores acquired	7	4	9
Stores developed	1	1	—
Balance - June 30	464	433	387
Stores acquired	7	5	3
Balance - September 30	471	438	390
Stores acquired	4	13	31
Stores developed	—	2	—
Stores sold	—	(8)	—
Balance - December 31	475	445	421

Financing and Investing Activities

The following summarizes certain financing and investing activities during the year ended December 31, 2016:

- **Store Acquisitions.** During 2016, we acquired 28 self-storage properties located throughout the United States for an aggregate purchase price of approximately \$403.6 million. In connection with these acquisitions, we allocated a portion of the purchase price paid for each store to the intangible value of in-place leases which aggregated to \$18.8 million.

- **Development Activity.** During 2016, we completed construction and opened for operation two stores developed through two separate joint ventures. Both of the self-storage properties are located in New York. We invested a total of \$64.0 million in the development of these two stores. Subsequent to the opening of the stores, the noncontrolling members put their 49% ownership interest in each venture to us. As of December 31, 2016, we had five joint venture development properties and two wholly-owned development properties under construction. We anticipate investing a total of \$303.5 million related to

these seven projects, and construction for all projects is expected to be completed by the fourth quarter of 2018.

- **Development Commitments.** During 2016, we acquired three self-storage properties in New York (1) and Texas (2) for an aggregate purchase price of \$69.4 million after the completion of construction and the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. During 2016, we also entered into contracts to purchase one store in Florida and one store in Illinois after the completion of construction and the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. As of December 31, 2016, we had four stores under contract, including two stores that went under contract in 2015, for a total acquisition price of \$61.1 million. These four acquisitions are subject to due diligence and other customary closing conditions and no assurance can be provided that these acquisitions will be completed on the terms described, or at all.
- **At-The-Market Equity Program.** During 2016, under our at-the-market equity program, we sold a total of 4.4 million common shares at an average sales price of \$31.25 per share, resulting in net proceeds under the program of \$136.1 million, after deducting offering costs. As of December 31, 2016, 5.8 million common shares remained available for sale under the program. The proceeds from the sales conducted during the year ended December 31, 2016 were used to fund acquisitions of self-storage properties and for general corporate purposes.
- **Preferred Share Redemption.** On November 2, 2016, we completed the redemption of all of our 3,100,000 outstanding shares of 7.75% Series A Cumulative Redeemable Preferred Shares at a cash redemption price of \$25.00 per share plus accumulated and unpaid dividends. The redemption price of \$77.5 million was paid by the Company from available cash balances.
- **Debt Offering.** On August 15, 2016, we completed the issuance and sale of \$300.0 million in aggregate principal amount of unsecured senior notes due September 1, 2026 which bear interest at a rate of 3.125% per annum. Net proceeds from the

Table of Contents

offering were used to repay outstanding indebtedness under our Revolver (defined below) and for general corporate purposes, including acquisitions, investments in joint ventures, and repayment or repurchase of other indebtedness.

- **Mortgage Loans.** During 2016, we repaid five mortgage loans aggregating \$34.9 million and assumed two mortgage loans with a combined outstanding principal balance of \$38.5 million as of December 31, 2016.

Business Strategy

Our business strategy consists of several elements:

- **Maximize cash flow from our stores —** Our operating strategy focuses on maximizing sustainable rents at our stores while achieving and sustaining occupancy targets. We utilize our operating systems and experienced personnel to manage the balance between rental rates, discounts, and physical occupancy with an objective of maximizing our rental revenue.
- **Acquire stores within targeted markets —** During 2017, we intend to pursue selective acquisitions in markets that we believe have high barriers to entry, strong demographic fundamentals, and demand for storage in excess of storage capacity. We believe the self-storage industry will continue to afford us opportunities for growth through acquisitions due to the highly fragmented composition of the industry. In the past, we have formed joint ventures with unaffiliated third parties, and in the future we may form additional joint ventures to facilitate the funding of future developments or acquisitions.
- **Dispose of stores —** During 2017, we intend to continue to evaluate opportunities to reduce exposure in slower growth, lower barrier-to-entry markets. We intend to use proceeds from these transactions to fund acquisitions within targeted markets.
- **Grow our third-party management business —** We intend to pursue additional third-party management opportunities. We intend to leverage our current platform to take advantage of consolidation in the industry. We plan to utilize our relationships with third-party owners to help source future acquisitions.

Investment and Market Selection Process

We maintain a disciplined and focused process in the acquisition and development of self-storage properties. Our investment committee, comprised of five senior officers and led by Christopher P. Marr, our Chief Executive Officer, oversees our investment process. Our investment process involves six stages — identification, initial due diligence, economic assessment, investment committee approval (and when required, the approval of our Board of Trustees (the “Board”)), final due diligence, and documentation. Through our investment committee, we intend to focus on the

following criteria:

- Targeted markets — Our targeted markets include areas where we currently maintain management that can be extended to additional stores, or where we believe that we can acquire a significant number of stores efficiently and within a short period of time. We evaluate both the broader market and the immediate area, typically three miles around the store, for its ability to support above-average demographic growth. We seek to increase our presence primarily in areas that we expect will experience growth, including the Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic areas of the United States and areas within Georgia, Florida, Texas, Illinois, and California, and to enter additional markets should suitable opportunities arise.
- Quality of store — We focus on self-storage properties that have good visibility and are located near retail centers, which typically provide high traffic corridors and are generally located near residential communities and commercial customers.
- Growth potential — We target acquisitions that offer growth potential through increased operating efficiencies and, in some cases, through additional leasing efforts, renovations, or expansions. In addition to acquiring single stores, we seek to invest in portfolio acquisitions, including those offering significant potential for increased operating efficiency and the ability to spread our fixed costs across a large base of stores.

Segment

We have one reportable segment: we own, operate, develop, manage, and acquire self-storage properties.

Table of Contents

Concentration

Our self-storage properties are located in major metropolitan areas as well as suburban areas and have numerous customers per store. No single customer represented a significant concentration of our 2016 revenues. Our stores in Florida, New York, Texas, and California provided approximately 17%, 16%, 10% and 8%, respectively, of our total 2016 revenues and approximately 18%, 16%, 10% and 8%, respectively, of our total 2015 revenues.

Seasonality

We typically experience seasonal fluctuations in occupancy levels at our stores, with the levels generally slightly higher during the summer months due to increased moving activity.

Financing Strategy

We maintain a capital structure that we believe is reasonable and prudent and that will enable us to have ample cash flow to cover debt service and make distributions to our shareholders. As of December 31, 2016, our debt to total capitalization ratio (determined by dividing the carrying value of our total indebtedness by the sum of (a) the market value of the Parent Company's outstanding common shares, preferred shares and units of the Operating Partnership held by third parties and (b) the carrying value of our total indebtedness) was approximately 24.7% compared to approximately 18.5% as of December 31, 2015. Our ratio of debt to the undepreciated cost of our total assets as of December 31, 2016 was approximately 38.5% compared to approximately 33.8% as of December 31, 2015. We expect to finance additional investments in self-storage properties through the most attractive sources of capital available at the time of the transaction, in a manner consistent with maintaining a strong financial position and future financial flexibility, subject to limitations on incurrence of indebtedness in our unsecured credit facilities and the indenture that governs our unsecured notes. These capital sources may include existing cash, borrowings under the Revolver, additional secured or unsecured financings, sales of common or preferred shares of the Parent Company in public offerings or private placements, additional issuances of debt securities, issuances of common or preferred units in our Operating Partnership in exchange for contributed properties, and formations of joint ventures. We also may sell stores that we no longer view as core assets and use the sales proceeds to fund other acquisitions.

Competition

Self-storage properties compete based on a number of factors, including location, rental rates, security, suitability of the store's design to prospective customers' needs, and the manner in which the store is operated and marketed. In particular, the number of competing self-storage properties in a market could have a material effect on our occupancy

levels, rental rates and on the overall operating performance of our stores. We believe that the primary competition for potential customers of any of our self-storage properties comes from other self-storage properties within a three-mile radius of that store. We believe our stores are well-positioned within their respective markets, and we emphasize customer service, convenience, security, professionalism, and cleanliness.

Our key competitors include local and regional operators as well as the other public self-storage REITS, including Public Storage, Extra Space Storage Inc., and Life Storage, Inc. These companies, some of which operate significantly more stores than we do and have greater resources than we have, and other entities may be able to accept more risk than we determine is prudent for us, including risks with respect to the geographic proximity of investments and the payment of higher acquisition prices. This competition may reduce the number of suitable acquisition opportunities available to us, increase the price required to acquire stores, and reduce the demand for self-storage space at our stores. Nevertheless, we believe that our experience in operating, managing, acquiring, developing, and obtaining financing for self-storage properties should enable us to compete effectively.

Government Regulation

We are subject to various laws, ordinances and regulations, including regulations relating to lien sale rights and procedures and various federal, state, and local regulations that apply generally to the ownership of real property and the operation of self-storage properties.

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and applicable state accessibility act laws (collectively, the “ADA”), all places of public accommodation are required to meet federal requirements related to physical access and use by disabled persons. A number of other federal, state, and local laws may also impose access and other similar requirements at our stores. A failure to comply with the ADA or similar state or local requirements could result in the governmental imposition of fines or the award of damages to private litigants affected by the noncompliance. Although we believe that our stores comply in all material respects with these requirements (or would be eligible for applicable exemptions from material requirements because of adaptive assistance provided), a determination that one or more

Table of Contents

of our stores is not in compliance with the ADA or similar state or local requirements would result in the incurrence of additional costs associated with bringing the stores into compliance.

Under various federal, state, and local laws, ordinances and regulations, an owner or operator of real property may become liable for the costs of removal or remediation of hazardous substances released on or in its property. These laws often impose liability without regard to whether the owner or operator knew of, or was responsible for, the release of such hazardous substances. The presence of hazardous substances, or the failure to properly remediate such substances, when released, may adversely affect the property owner's ability to sell the real estate or to borrow using the real estate as collateral, and may cause the property owner to incur substantial remediation costs. In addition to claims for cleanup costs, the presence of hazardous substances on a property could result in a claim by a private party for personal injury or a claim by an adjacent property owner or user for property damage. We may also become liable for the costs of removal or remediation of hazardous substances stored at the properties by a customer even though storage of hazardous substances would be without our knowledge or approval and in violation of the customer's storage lease agreement with us.

Our practice is to conduct or obtain environmental assessments in connection with the acquisition or development of properties. Whenever the environmental assessment for one of our stores indicates that a store is impacted by soil or groundwater contamination from prior owners/operators or other sources, we work with our environmental consultants and, where appropriate, state governmental agencies, to ensure that the store is either cleaned up, that no cleanup is necessary because the low level of contamination poses no significant risk to public health or the environment, or that the responsibility for cleanup rests with a third party. In certain cases, we have purchased environmental liability insurance coverage to indemnify us against claims for contamination or other adverse environmental conditions that may affect a property.

We are not aware of any environmental cleanup liability that we believe will have a material adverse effect on us. We cannot provide assurance, however, that these environmental assessments and investigations have revealed or will reveal all potential environmental liabilities, that no prior owner created any material environmental condition not known to us or the independent consultant or that future events or changes in environmental laws will not result in the imposition of environmental liability on us.

We have not received notice from any governmental authority of any material noncompliance, claim, or liability in connection with any of our stores, nor have we been notified of a claim for personal injury or property damage by a private party in connection with any of our stores relating to environmental conditions.

We are not aware of any environmental condition with respect to any of our stores that could reasonably be expected to have a material adverse effect on our financial condition or results of operations, and we do not expect that the cost of compliance with environmental regulations will have a material adverse effect on our financial condition or results of operations. We cannot provide assurance, however, that this will continue to be the case.

Insurance

We carry comprehensive liability, fire, extended coverage, and rental loss insurance covering all of the properties in our portfolio. We carry environmental insurance coverage on certain stores in our portfolio. We believe the policy specifications and insured limits are appropriate and adequate given the relative risk of loss, the cost of the coverage, and industry practice. We do not carry insurance for losses such as loss from riots, war or acts of God, and, in some cases, flood and environmental hazards, because such coverage is either not available or not available at commercially reasonable rates. Some of our policies, such as those covering losses due to terrorist activities, hurricanes, floods and earthquakes, are insured subject to limitations involving large deductibles or co-payments and policy limits that may not be sufficient to cover losses. We also carry liability insurance to insure against personal injuries that might be sustained at our stores as well as director and officer liability insurance.

Offices

Our principal executive offices are located at 5 Old Lancaster Road, Malvern, PA 19355. Our telephone number is (610) 535-5000.

Employees

As of December 31, 2016, we employed 2,136 employees, of whom 292 were corporate executive and administrative personnel and 1,844 were property-level personnel. We believe that our relations with our employees are good. Our employees are not unionized.

Table of Contents

Available Information

We file registration statements, proxy statements, our annual report on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K, and amendments to those reports, with the SEC. You may obtain copies of these documents by visiting the SEC's Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20549, by calling the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330, or by accessing the SEC's website at www.sec.gov. Our internet website address is www.cubesmart.com. You also can obtain on our website, free of charge, copies of our annual report on Form 10-K, our quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, our current reports on Form 8-K, and any amendments to those reports, after we electronically file such reports or amendments with, or furnish them to, the SEC. Our internet website and the information contained therein or connected thereto are not intended to be incorporated by reference into this Report.

Also available on our website, free of charge, are copies of our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, our Corporate Governance Guidelines, and the charters for each of the committees of our Board — the Audit Committee, the Corporate Governance and Nominating Committee, and the Compensation Committee. Copies of each of these documents are also available in print free of charge, upon request by any shareholder. You can obtain copies of these documents by contacting Investor Relations by mail at 5 Old Lancaster Road, Malvern, PA 19355.

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

Overview

An investment in our securities involves various risks. Investors should carefully consider the risks set forth below together with other information contained in this Report. These risks are not the only ones that we may face. Additional risks not presently known to us, or that we currently consider immaterial, may also impair our business, financial condition, operating results, and ability to make distributions to our shareholders.

Risks Related to our Business and Operations

Adverse macroeconomic and business conditions may significantly and negatively affect our rental rates, occupancy levels and therefore our results of operations.

We are susceptible to the effects of adverse macro-economic events that can result in higher unemployment, shrinking demand for products, large-scale business failures and tight credit markets. Our results of operations are sensitive to

changes in overall economic conditions that impact consumer spending, including discretionary spending, as well as to increased bad debts due to recessionary pressures. Adverse economic conditions affecting disposable consumer income, such as employment levels, business conditions, interest rates, tax rates, and fuel and energy costs, could reduce consumer spending or cause consumers to shift their spending to other products and services. A general reduction in the level of discretionary spending or shifts in consumer discretionary spending could adversely affect our growth and profitability.

It is difficult to determine the breadth and duration of the economic and financial market disruptions and the many ways in which they may affect our customers and our business in general. Nonetheless, continuation or further worsening of these difficult financial and macroeconomic conditions could have a significant adverse effect on our sales, profitability, and results of operations.

Many states and local jurisdictions are facing severe budgetary problems which may have an adverse impact on our business and financial results.

Many states and jurisdictions are facing severe budgetary problems. Action that may be taken in response to these problems, such as increases in property taxes on commercial properties, changes to sales taxes or other governmental efforts, including mandating medical insurance for employees, could adversely impact our business and results of operations.

Our financial performance is dependent upon economic and other conditions of the markets in which our stores are located.

We are susceptible to adverse developments in the markets in which we operate, such as business layoffs or downsizing, industry slowdowns, relocations of businesses, changing demographics, and other factors. Our stores in Florida, New York, Texas, and California accounted for approximately 17%, 16%, 10% and 8%, respectively, of our total 2016 revenues. As a result of this geographic concentration of our stores, we are particularly susceptible to adverse market conditions in these areas. Any adverse economic or real estate developments in these markets, or in any of the other markets in which we operate, or any decrease in demand for self-storage space

Table of Contents

resulting from the local business climate, could adversely affect our rental revenues, which could impair our ability to satisfy our debt service obligations and pay distributions to our shareholders.

We face risks associated with property acquisitions.

We intend to continue to acquire individual and portfolios of self-storage properties. The purchase agreements that we enter into in connection with acquisitions typically contain closing conditions that need to be satisfied before the acquisitions can be consummated. The satisfaction of many of these conditions is outside of our control, and we therefore cannot assure you that any of our pending or future acquisitions will be consummated. These conditions include, among other things, satisfactory examination of the title to the properties, the ability to obtain title insurance and customary closing conditions. Moreover, in the event we are unable to complete pending or future acquisitions, we may have incurred significant legal, accounting, and other transaction costs in connection with such acquisitions without realizing the expected benefits.

Those acquisitions that we do consummate would increase our size and may potentially alter our capital structure. Although we believe that future acquisitions that we complete will enhance our financial performance, the success of acquisitions is subject to the risks that:

- acquisitions may fail to perform as expected;
- the actual costs of repositioning or redeveloping acquired properties may be higher than our estimates;
- we may be unable to obtain acquisition financing on favorable terms;
- acquisitions may be located in new markets where we may have limited knowledge and understanding of the local economy, an absence of business relationships in the area or an unfamiliarity with local governmental and permitting procedures; and
- there is only limited recourse, or no recourse, to the former owners of newly acquired properties for unknown or undisclosed liabilities such as the clean-up of undisclosed environmental contamination; claims by customers, vendors, or other persons arising on account of actions or omissions of the former owners of the properties; and claims by local governments, adjoining property owners, property owner associations, and easement holders for fees, assessments, or taxes on other property-related changes. As a result, if a liability were asserted against us based upon ownership of an acquired property, we might be required to pay significant sums to settle it, which could adversely affect our financial results and cash flow.

In addition, we do not always obtain third-party appraisals of acquired properties (and instead rely on value determinations by our senior management) and the consideration we pay in exchange for those properties may exceed the value determined by third-party appraisals.

We will incur costs and will face integration challenges when we acquire additional stores.

As we acquire or develop additional self-storage properties, we will be subject to risks associated with integrating and managing new stores, including customer retention and mortgage default risks. In the case of a large portfolio purchase, we could experience strains in our existing information management capacity. In addition, acquisitions or developments may cause disruptions in our operations and divert management's attention away from day-to-day operations. Furthermore, our income may decline because we will be required to expense acquisition-related costs and amortize in future periods costs for acquired goodwill and other intangible assets. Our failure to successfully integrate any future acquisitions into our portfolio could have an adverse effect on our operating costs and our ability to make distributions to our shareholders.

The acquisition of new stores that lack operating history with us will make it more difficult to predict revenue potential.

We intend to continue to acquire additional stores. These acquisitions could fail to perform in accordance with expectations. If we fail to accurately estimate occupancy levels, rental rates, operating costs, or costs of improvements to bring an acquired store up to the standards established for our intended market position, the performance of the store may be below expectations. Acquired stores may have characteristics or deficiencies affecting their valuation or revenue potential that we have not yet discovered. We cannot assure that the performance of stores acquired by us will increase or be maintained under our management.

Table of Contents

Our development activities may be more costly or difficult to complete than we anticipate.

We intend to continue to develop self-storage properties where market conditions warrant such investment. Once made, these investments may not produce results in accordance with our expectations. Risks associated with development and construction activities include:

- the unavailability of favorable financing sources in the debt and equity markets;
- construction cost overruns, including on account of rising interest rates, diminished availability of materials and labor, and increases in the costs of materials and labor;
- construction delays and failure to achieve target occupancy levels and rental rates, resulting in a lower than projected return on our investment; and
- complications (including building moratoriums and anti-growth legislation) in obtaining necessary zoning, occupancy, and other governmental permits.

We depend on external sources of capital that are outside of our control; the unavailability of capital from external sources could adversely affect our ability to acquire or develop stores, satisfy our debt obligations, and/or make distributions to shareholders.

We depend on external sources of capital to fund acquisitions and development, to satisfy our debt obligations and to make distributions to our shareholders required to maintain our status as a REIT, and these sources of capital may not be available on favorable terms, if at all. Our access to external sources of capital depends on a number of factors, including the market's perception of our growth potential and our current and potential future earnings and our ability to continue to qualify as a REIT for federal income tax purposes. If we are unable to obtain external sources of capital, we may not be able to acquire or develop properties when strategic opportunities exist, satisfy our debt obligations or make distributions to shareholders that would permit us to qualify as a REIT or avoid paying tax on our REIT taxable income.

Rising operating expenses could reduce our cash flow and funds available for future distributions.

Our stores and any other stores we acquire or develop in the future are and will be subject to operating risks common to real estate in general, any or all of which may negatively affect us. Our stores are subject to increases in operating expenses such as real estate and other taxes, personnel costs including the cost of providing specific medical coverage

to our employees, utilities, insurance, administrative expenses, and costs for repairs and maintenance. If operating expenses increase without a corresponding increase in revenues, our profitability could diminish and limit our ability to make distributions to our shareholders.

We cannot assure our ability to pay dividends in the future.

Historically, we have paid quarterly distributions to our shareholders, and we intend to continue to pay quarterly dividends and to make distributions to our shareholders in amounts such that all or substantially all of our taxable income in each year, subject to certain adjustments, is distributed. This, along with other factors, should enable us to continue to qualify for the tax benefits accorded to a REIT under the Internal Revenue Code. We have not established a minimum dividends payment level, and all future distributions will be made at the discretion of our Board. Our ability to pay dividends will depend upon, among other factors:

- the operational and financial performance of our stores;
- capital expenditures with respect to existing and newly acquired stores;
- general and administrative costs associated with our operation as a publicly-held REIT;
- maintenance of our REIT status;
- the amount of, and the interest rates on, our debt;
- the absence of significant expenditures relating to environmental and other regulatory matters; and
- other risk factors described in this Report.

Table of Contents

Certain of these matters are beyond our control and any significant difference between our expectations and actual results could have a material adverse effect on our cash flow and our ability to make distributions to shareholders.

If we are unable to promptly re-let our cubes or if the rates upon such re-letting are significantly lower than expected, then our business and results of operations would be adversely affected.

We derive revenues principally from rents received from customers who rent cubes at our self-storage properties under month-to-month leases. Any delay in re-letting cubes as vacancies arise would reduce our revenues and harm our operating results. In addition, lower than expected rental rates upon re-letting could adversely affect our revenues and impede our growth.

Store ownership through joint ventures may limit our ability to act exclusively in our interest.

We have in the past co-invested with, and we may continue to co-invest with, third parties through joint ventures. In any such joint venture, we may not be in a position to exercise sole decision-making authority regarding the stores owned through joint ventures. Investments in joint ventures may, under certain circumstances, involve risks not present when a third party is not involved, including the possibility that joint venture partners might become bankrupt or fail to fund their share of required capital contributions. Joint venture partners may have business interests or goals that are inconsistent with our business interests or goals and may be in a position to take actions contrary to our policies or objectives. Such investments also have the potential risk of impasse on strategic decisions, such as a sale, in cases where neither we nor the joint venture partner would have full control over the joint venture. In other circumstances, joint venture partners may have the ability without our agreement to make certain major decisions, including decisions about sales, capital expenditures, and/or financing. Any disputes that may arise between us and our joint venture partners could result in litigation or arbitration that could increase our expenses and distract our officers and/or Trustees from focusing their time and effort on our business. In addition, we might in certain circumstances be liable for the actions of our joint venture partners, and the activities of a joint venture could adversely affect our ability to qualify as a REIT, even though we do not control the joint venture.

We face significant competition for customers and acquisition and development opportunities.

Actions by our competitors may decrease or prevent increases of the occupancy and rental rates of our stores. We compete with numerous developers, owners, and operators of self-storage properties, including other REITs, some of which own or may in the future own stores similar to ours in the same submarkets in which our stores are located and some of which may have greater capital resources. In addition, due to the relatively low cost of each individual self-storage property, other developers, owners, and operators have the capability to build additional stores that may

compete with our stores.

If our competitors build new stores that compete with our stores or offer space at rental rates below the rental rates we currently charge our customers, we may lose potential customers, and we may be pressured to reduce our rental rates below those we currently charge in order to retain customers when our customers' leases expire. As a result, our financial condition, cash flow, cash available for distribution, market price of our shares, and ability to satisfy our debt service obligations could be materially adversely affected. In addition, increased competition for customers may require us to make capital improvements to our stores that we would not have otherwise made. Any unbudgeted capital improvements we undertake may reduce cash available for distributions to our shareholders.

We also face significant competition for acquisitions and development opportunities. Some of our competitors have greater financial resources than we do and a greater ability to borrow funds to acquire stores. These competitors may also be willing to accept more risk than we can prudently manage, including risks with respect to the geographic proximity of investments and the payment of higher acquisition prices. This competition for investments may reduce the number of suitable investment opportunities available to us, may increase acquisition costs and may reduce demand for self-storage space in certain areas where our stores are located and, as a result, adversely affect our operating results.

We may become subject to litigation or threatened litigation which may divert management's time and attention, require us to pay damages and expenses, or restrict the operation of our business.

We may become subject to disputes with commercial parties with whom we maintain relationships or other parties with whom we do business. Any such dispute could result in litigation between us and the other parties. Whether or not any dispute actually proceeds to litigation, we may be required to devote significant management time and attention to its successful resolution (through litigation, settlement, or otherwise), which would detract from our management's ability to focus on our business. Any such resolution could involve the payment of damages or expenses by us, which may be significant. In addition, any such resolution could involve our agreement with terms that restrict the operation of our business.

Table of Contents

There are other commercial parties, at both a local and national level, that may assert that our use of our brand names and other intellectual property conflict with their rights to use brand names, internet domains, and other intellectual property that they consider to be similar to ours. Any such commercial dispute and related resolution would involve all of the risks described above, including, in particular, our agreement to restrict the use of our brand name or other intellectual property.

We also could be sued for personal injuries and/or property damage occurring on our properties. We maintain liability insurance with limits that we believe adequate to provide for the defense and/or payment of any damages arising from such lawsuits. There can be no assurance that such coverage will cover all costs and expenses from such suits.

Potential losses may not be covered by insurance, which could result in the loss of our investment in a property and the future cash flows from the property.

We carry comprehensive liability, fire, extended coverage, and rental loss insurance covering all of the properties in our portfolio. We believe the policy specifications and insured limits are appropriate and adequate given the relative risk of loss, the cost of the coverage and industry practice. We do not carry insurance for losses such as loss from riots, war or acts of God, and, in some cases, flooding and environmental hazards, because such coverage is not available or is not available at commercially reasonable rates. Some of our policies, such as those covering losses due to terrorism, hurricanes, floods, and earthquakes, are insured subject to limitations involving large deductibles or co-payments and policy limits that may not be sufficient to cover losses. If we experience a loss at a store that is uninsured or that exceeds policy limits, we could lose the capital invested in that store as well as the anticipated future cash flows from that store. Inflation, changes in building codes and ordinances, environmental considerations, and other factors also might make it impractical or undesirable to use insurance proceeds to replace a store after it has been damaged or destroyed. In addition, if the damaged stores are subject to recourse indebtedness, we would continue to be liable for the indebtedness, even if these stores were irreparably damaged.

Our insurance coverage may not comply with certain loan requirements.

Certain of our stores serve as collateral for our mortgage-backed debt, some of which we assumed in connection with our acquisition of stores and requires us to maintain insurance at levels and on terms that are not commercially reasonable in the current insurance environment. We may be unable to obtain required insurance coverage if the cost and/or availability make it impractical or impossible to comply with debt covenants. If we cannot comply with a lender's requirements, the lender could declare a default, which could affect our ability to obtain future financing and have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and cash flows and our ability to obtain future financing. In addition, we may be required to self-insure against certain losses or our insurance costs may increase.

Potential liability for environmental contamination could result in substantial costs.

We are subject to federal, state and local environmental regulations that apply generally to the ownership of real property and the operation of self-storage properties. If we fail to comply with those laws, we could be subject to significant fines or other governmental sanctions.

Under various federal, state and local laws, ordinances, and regulations, an owner or operator of real estate may be required to investigate and clean up hazardous or toxic substances or petroleum product releases at a property and may be held liable to a governmental entity or to third parties for property damage and for investigation and clean-up costs incurred by such parties in connection with contamination. Such liability may be imposed whether or not the owner or operator knew of, or was responsible for, the presence of these hazardous or toxic substances. The cost of investigation, remediation or removal of such substances may be substantial, and the presence of such substances, or the failure to properly remediate such substances, may adversely affect our ability to sell or rent such property or to borrow using such property as collateral. In addition, in connection with the ownership, operation, and management of properties, we are potentially liable for property damage or injuries to persons and property.

Our practice is to conduct or obtain environmental assessments in connection with the acquisition or development of additional stores. We carry environmental insurance coverage on certain stores in our portfolio. We obtain or examine environmental assessments from qualified and reputable environmental consulting firms (and intend to conduct such assessments prior to the acquisition or development of additional stores). The environmental assessments received to date have not revealed, nor do we have actual knowledge of, any environmental liability that we believe will have a material adverse effect on us. However, we cannot assure that our environmental assessments have identified or will identify all material environmental conditions, that any prior owner of any property did not create a material environmental condition not actually known to us, or that a material environmental condition does not otherwise exist with respect to any of our properties.

Table of Contents

Americans with Disabilities Act and applicable state accessibility act compliance may require unanticipated expenditures.

Under the ADA, all places of public accommodation are required to meet federal requirements related to physical access and use by disabled persons. A number of other federal, state and local laws may also impose access and other similar requirements at our properties. A failure to comply with the ADA or similar state or local requirements could result in the governmental imposition of fines or the award of damages to private litigants affected by the noncompliance. Although we believe that our properties comply in all material respects with these requirements (or would be eligible for applicable exemptions from material requirements because of adaptive assistance provided), a determination that one or more of our properties is not in compliance with the ADA or similar state or local requirements would result in the incurrence of additional costs associated with bringing the properties into compliance. If we are required to make substantial modifications to comply with the ADA or similar state or local requirements, we may be required to incur significant unanticipated expenditures, which could have an adverse effect on our operating costs and our ability to make distributions to our shareholders.

Privacy concerns could result in regulatory changes that may harm our business.

Personal privacy has become a significant issue in the jurisdictions in which we operate. Many jurisdictions in which we operate have imposed restrictions and requirements on the use of personal information by those collecting such information. Changes to law or regulations affecting privacy, if applicable to our business, could impose additional costs and liability on us and could limit our use and disclosure of such information.

We face system security risks as we depend upon automated processes and the Internet.

We are increasingly dependent upon automated information technology processes and Internet commerce, and many of our new customers come from the telephone or over the Internet. Moreover, the nature of our business involves the receipt and retention of personal information about our customers. We also rely extensively on third-party vendors to retain data, process transactions and provide other systems and services. These systems, and our systems, are subject to damage or interruption from power outages, computer and telecommunications failures, computer viruses, malware, and other destructive or disruptive security breaches and catastrophic events, such as a natural disaster or a terrorist event or cyber-attack. In addition, experienced computer programmers and hackers may be able to penetrate our security systems and misappropriate our confidential information, create system disruptions, or cause shutdowns. Such data security breaches as well as system disruptions and shutdowns could result in additional costs to repair or replace such networks or information systems and possible legal liability, including government enforcement actions and private litigation. In addition, our customers could lose confidence in our ability to protect their personal information, which could cause them to discontinue leasing at our self-storage properties.

If we are unable to attract and retain team members or contract with third parties having the specialized skills or technologies needed to support our systems, implement improvements to our customer-facing technology in a timely manner, allow accurate visibility to product availability when customers are ready to rent, quickly and efficiently fulfill our customers rental and payment methods they demand, or provide a convenient and consistent experience for our customers regardless of the ultimate sales channel, our ability to compete and our results of operations could be adversely affected.

Terrorist attacks and other acts of violence or war may adversely impact our performance and may affect the markets on which our securities are traded.

Terrorist attacks against our stores, the United States or our interests, may negatively impact our operations and the value of our securities. Attacks or armed conflicts could negatively impact the demand for self-storage and increase the cost of insurance coverage for our stores, which could reduce our profitability and cash flow. Furthermore, any terrorist attacks or armed conflicts could result in increased volatility in or damage to the United States and worldwide financial markets and economy.

Table of Contents

Risks Related to the Real Estate Industry

Our performance and the value of our self-storage properties are subject to risks associated with our properties and with the real estate industry.

Our rental revenues and operating costs and the value of our real estate assets, and consequently the value of our securities, are subject to the risk that if our stores do not generate revenues sufficient to meet our operating expenses, including debt service and capital expenditures, our cash flow and ability to pay distributions to our shareholders will be adversely affected. Events or conditions beyond our control that may adversely affect our operations or the value of our properties include but are not limited to:

- downturns in the national, regional, and local economic climate;
- local or regional oversupply, increased competition, or reduction in demand for self-storage space;
- vacancies or changes in market rents for self-storage space;
- inability to collect rent from customers;
- increased operating costs, including maintenance, insurance premiums, and real estate taxes;
- changes in interest rates and availability of financing;
- hurricanes, earthquakes and other natural disasters, civil disturbances, terrorist acts, or acts of war that may result in uninsured or underinsured losses;
- significant expenditures associated with acquisitions and development projects, such as debt service payments, real estate taxes, insurance, and maintenance costs which are generally not reduced when circumstances cause a reduction in revenues from a property;
- costs of complying with changes in laws and governmental regulations, including those governing usage, zoning, the environment, and taxes; and
- the relative illiquidity of real estate investments.

In addition, prolonged periods of economic slowdown or recession, rising interest rates, or declining demand for self-storage, or the public perception that any of these events may occur, could result in a general decline in rental revenues, which could impair our ability to satisfy our debt service obligations and to make distributions to our shareholders.

Rental revenues are significantly influenced by demand for self-storage space generally, and a decrease in such demand would likely have a greater adverse effect on our rental revenues than if we owned a more diversified real estate portfolio.

Because our real estate portfolio consists primarily of self-storage properties, we are subject to risks inherent in investments in a single industry. A decrease in the demand for self-storage space would have a greater adverse effect on our rental revenues than if we owned a more diversified real estate portfolio. Demand for self-storage space could be adversely affected by weakness in the national, regional, and local economies, changes in supply of, or demand for, similar or competing self-storage properties in an area, and the excess amount of self-storage space in a particular market. To the extent that any of these conditions occur, they are likely to affect market rents for self-storage space, which could cause a decrease in our rental revenue. Any such decrease could impair our ability to satisfy debt service obligations and make distributions to our shareholders.

Because real estate is illiquid, we may not be able to sell properties when appropriate.

Real estate property investments generally cannot be sold quickly. Also, the tax laws applicable to REITs require that we hold our properties for investment, rather than for sale in the ordinary course of business, which may cause us to forgo or defer sales of properties that otherwise would be in our best interest. Therefore, we may not be able to dispose of properties promptly, or on favorable terms, in response to economic or other market conditions, which may adversely affect our financial position.

Table of Contents

Risks Related to our Qualification and Operation as a REIT

Failure to qualify as a REIT would subject us to U.S. federal income tax which would reduce the cash available for distribution to our shareholders.

We operate our business to qualify to be taxed as a REIT for federal income tax purposes. We have not requested and do not plan to request a ruling from the IRS that we qualify as a REIT, and the statements in this Report are not binding on the IRS or any court. As a REIT, we generally will not be subject to federal income tax on the income that we distribute currently to our shareholders. Many of the REIT requirements, however, are highly technical and complex. The determination that we are a REIT requires an analysis of various factual matters and circumstances that may not be totally within our control. For example, to qualify as a REIT, at least 95% of our gross income must come from specific passive sources, such as rent, that are itemized in the REIT tax laws. In addition, to qualify as a REIT, we cannot own specified amounts of debt and equity securities of some issuers. We also are required to distribute to our shareholders with respect to each year at least 90% of our REIT taxable income, excluding net capital gains. The fact that we hold substantially all of our assets through the Operating Partnership and its subsidiaries and joint ventures further complicates the application of the REIT requirements for us. Even a technical or inadvertent mistake could jeopardize our REIT status, and, given the highly complex nature of the rules governing REITs and the ongoing importance of factual determinations, we cannot provide any assurance that we will continue to qualify as a REIT. Changes to rules governing REITS were made by the Protecting Americans From Tax Hikes Act of 2015, signed into law on December 18, 2015, and Congress and the IRS might make further changes to the tax laws and regulations, and the courts might issue new rulings that make it more difficult, or impossible, for us to remain qualified as a REIT. If we fail to qualify as a REIT for federal income tax purposes and are able to avail ourselves of one or more of the statutory savings provisions in order to maintain our REIT status, we would nevertheless be required to pay penalty taxes of \$50,000 or more for each such failure.

If we fail to qualify as a REIT for federal income tax purposes, and are unable to avail ourselves of certain savings provisions set forth in the Internal Revenue Code, we would be subject to federal income tax at regular corporate rates on all of our income. As a taxable corporation, we would not be allowed to take a deduction for distributions to shareholders in computing our taxable income or pass through long-term capital gains to individual shareholders at favorable rates. We also could be subject to the federal alternative minimum tax and possibly increased state and local taxes. We would not be able to elect to be taxed as a REIT for four years following the year we first failed to qualify unless the IRS were to grant us relief under certain statutory provisions. If we failed to qualify as a REIT, we would have to pay significant income taxes, which would reduce our net earnings available for investment or distribution to our shareholders. This likely would have a significant adverse effect on our earnings and likely would adversely affect the value of our securities. In addition, we would no longer be required to pay any distributions to shareholders.

Furthermore, as a result of our acquisition of all the issued and outstanding shares of common stock of a privately held self-storage REIT (“PSI”), we now own a subsidiary REIT. PSI is independently subject to, and must comply with, the same REIT requirements that we must satisfy in order to qualify as a REIT, together with all other rules applicable to REITs. If PSI fails to qualify as a REIT and certain statutory relief provisions do not apply, as a result of a protective

election made jointly by PSI and CubeSmart, PSI will be taxed as a taxable REIT subsidiary. See the section entitled “Taxation of CubeSmart—Requirements for Qualification—Taxable REIT Subsidiaries” in Exhibit 99.1 for more information regarding taxable REIT subsidiaries.

Failure of the Operating Partnership (or a subsidiary partnership or joint venture) to be treated as a partnership would have serious adverse consequences to our shareholders.

If the IRS were to successfully challenge the tax status of the Operating Partnership or any of its subsidiary partnerships or joint ventures for federal income tax purposes, the Operating Partnership or the affected subsidiary partnership or joint venture would be taxable as a corporation. In such event we would cease to qualify as a REIT and the imposition of a corporate tax on the Operating Partnership, a subsidiary partnership, or joint venture would reduce the amount of cash available for distribution from the Operating Partnership to us and ultimately to our shareholders.

To maintain our REIT status, we may be forced to borrow funds on a short-term basis during unfavorable market conditions.

As a REIT, we are subject to certain distribution requirements, including the requirement to distribute 90% of our REIT taxable income, excluding net capital gains, which may result in our having to make distributions at a disadvantageous time or to borrow funds at unfavorable rates. Compliance with this requirement may hinder our ability to operate solely on the basis of maximizing profits.

Table of Contents

We will pay some taxes even if we qualify as a REIT, which will reduce the cash available for distribution to our shareholders.

Even if we qualify as a REIT for federal income tax purposes, we will be required to pay certain federal, state and local taxes on our income and property. For example, we will be subject to income tax to the extent we distribute less than 100% of our REIT taxable income, including capital gains. Additionally, we will be subject to a 4% nondeductible excise tax on the amount, if any, by which dividends paid by us in any calendar year are less than the sum of 85% of our ordinary income, 95% of our capital gain net income and 100% of our undistributed income from prior years. Moreover, if we have net income from “prohibited transactions,” that income will be subject to a 100% penalty tax. In general, prohibited transactions are sales or other dispositions of property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business. The determination as to whether a particular sale is a prohibited transaction depends on the facts and circumstances related to that sale. We cannot guarantee that sales of our properties would not be prohibited transactions unless we comply with certain statutory safe-harbor provisions.

In addition, any net taxable income earned directly by our taxable REIT subsidiaries, or through entities that are disregarded for federal income tax purposes as entities separate from our taxable REIT subsidiaries, will be subject to federal and possibly state corporate income tax. We have elected to treat some of our subsidiaries as taxable REIT subsidiaries, and we may elect to treat other subsidiaries as taxable REIT subsidiaries in the future. In this regard, several provisions of the laws applicable to REITs and their subsidiaries ensure that a taxable REIT subsidiary will be subject to an appropriate level of federal income taxation. For example, a taxable REIT subsidiary is limited in its ability to deduct certain interest payments made to an affiliated REIT. In addition, the REIT has to pay a 100% penalty tax on some payments that it receives or on some deductions taken by a taxable REIT subsidiary if the economic arrangements between the REIT, the REIT’s customers, and the taxable REIT subsidiary are not comparable to similar arrangements between unrelated parties. Finally, some state and local jurisdictions may tax some of our income even though as a REIT we are not subject to federal income tax on that income because not all states and localities follow the federal income tax treatment of REITs. To the extent that we and our affiliates are required to pay federal, state, and local taxes, we will have less cash available for distributions to our shareholders.

We face possible federal, state, and local tax audits.

Because we are organized and qualify as a REIT, we are generally not subject to federal income taxes, but are subject to certain state and local taxes. Certain entities through which we own real estate either have undergone, or are currently undergoing, tax audits. Although we believe that we have substantial arguments in favor of our positions in the ongoing audits, in some instances there is no controlling precedent or interpretive guidance on the specific point at issue. Collectively, tax deficiency notices received to date from the jurisdictions conducting the ongoing audits have not been material. However, there can be no assurance that future audits will not occur with increased frequency or that the ultimate result of such audits will not have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

Legislative or regulatory tax changes related to REITs could materially and adversely affect our business.

At any time, the federal income tax laws or regulations governing REITs or the administrative interpretations of those laws or regulations may be changed, possibly with retroactive effect. We cannot predict if or when any new federal income tax law, regulation or administrative interpretation, or any amendment to any existing federal income tax law, regulation or administrative interpretation, will be adopted, promulgated or become effective or whether any such law, regulation or interpretation may take effect retroactively. We and our shareholders could be adversely affected by any such change in, or any new, federal income tax law, regulation or administrative interpretation.

Risks Related to our Debt Financings

We face risks related to current debt maturities, including refinancing risk.

Certain of our mortgages, bank loans, and unsecured debt (including our senior notes) will have significant outstanding balances on their maturity dates, commonly known as “balloon payments.” We may not have the cash resources available to repay those amounts, and we may have to raise funds for such repayment either through the issuance of equity or debt securities, additional bank borrowings (which may include extension of maturity dates), joint ventures, or asset sales. Furthermore, we are restricted from incurring certain additional indebtedness and making certain other changes to our capital and debt structure under the terms of the senior notes and the indenture governing the senior notes.

There can be no assurance that we will be able to refinance our debt on favorable terms or at all. To the extent we cannot refinance debt on favorable terms or at all, we may be forced to dispose of properties on disadvantageous terms or pay higher interest rates, either of which would have an adverse impact on our financial performance and ability to pay dividends to investors

Table of Contents

As a result of our interest rate hedges, swap agreements and other, similar arrangements, we face counterparty risks.

We may be exposed to the potential risk of counterparty default or non-payment with respect to interest rate hedges, swap agreements, floors, caps, and other interest rate hedging contracts that we may enter into from time to time, in which event we could suffer a material loss on the value of those agreements. Although these agreements may lessen the impact of rising interest rates on us, they also expose us to the risk that other parties to the agreements will not perform or that we cannot enforce the agreements. There is no assurance that our potential counterparties on these agreements will perform their obligations under such agreements.

Financing our future growth plan or refinancing existing debt maturities could be impacted by negative capital market conditions.

Recently, domestic financial markets have experienced extreme volatility and uncertainty. At times in recent years liquidity has tightened in the domestic financial markets, including the investment grade debt and equity capital markets for which we historically sought financing. Consequently, there is greater uncertainty regarding our ability to access the credit markets in order to attract financing on reasonable terms; there can be no assurance that we will be able to continue to issue common or preferred equity securities at a reasonable price. Our ability to finance new acquisitions and refinance future debt maturities could be adversely impacted by our inability to secure permanent financing on reasonable terms, if at all.

The terms and covenants relating to our indebtedness could adversely impact our economic performance.

Like other real estate companies that incur debt, we are subject to risks associated with debt financing, such as the insufficiency of cash flow to meet required debt service payment obligations and the inability to refinance outstanding indebtedness at maturity. If our debt cannot be paid, refinanced, or extended at maturity, we may not be able to make distributions to shareholders at expected levels or at all and may not be able to acquire new stores. Failure to make distributions to our shareholders could result in our failure to qualify as a REIT for federal income tax purposes. Furthermore, an increase in our interest expense could adversely affect our cash flow and ability to make distributions to shareholders. If we do not meet our debt service obligations, any stores securing such indebtedness could be foreclosed on, which would have a material adverse effect on our cash flow and ability to make distributions and, depending on the number of stores foreclosed on, could threaten our continued viability.

Our Credit Facility (defined below) contains (and any new or amended facility we may enter into from time to time will likely contain) customary affirmative and negative covenants, including financial covenants that, among other things, require us to comply with certain liquidity and net worth tests. Our ability to borrow under the Credit Facility is (and any new or amended facility we may enter into from time to time will be) subject to compliance with such financial and other covenants. In the event that we fail to satisfy these covenants, we would be in default under the

Credit Facility and may be required to repay such debt with capital from other sources. Under such circumstances, other sources of debt or equity capital may not be available to us, or may be available only on unattractive terms. Moreover, the presence of such covenants in our credit agreements could cause us to operate our business with a view toward compliance with such covenants, which might not produce optimal returns for shareholders. Similarly, the indenture under which we have issued unsecured senior notes contains customary financial covenants, including limitations on incurrence of additional indebtedness.

Increases in interest rates on variable rate indebtedness would increase our interest expense, which could adversely affect our cash flow and ability to make distributions to shareholders. Rising interest rates could also restrict our ability to refinance existing debt when it matures. In addition, an increase in interest rates could decrease the amounts that third parties are willing to pay for our assets, thereby limiting our ability to alter our portfolio promptly in relation to economic or other conditions.

Our organizational documents contain no limitation on the amount of debt we may incur. As a result, we may become highly leveraged in the future.

Our organizational documents do not limit the amount of indebtedness that we may incur. We could alter the balance between our total outstanding indebtedness and the value of our assets at any time. If we become more highly leveraged, then the resulting increase in debt service could adversely affect our ability to make payments on our outstanding indebtedness and to pay our anticipated distributions and/or the distributions required to maintain our REIT status, and could harm our financial condition.

Risks Related to our Organization and Structure

We are dependent upon our senior management team whose continued service is not guaranteed.

Our executive team, including our named executive officers, has extensive self-storage, real estate, and public company experience. Although our named executive officers, effective January 1, 2017, are parties to the Company's executive severance plan, we cannot

Table of Contents

provide assurance that any of them will remain in our employment. The loss of services of one or more members of our senior management team could adversely affect our operations and our future growth.

We are dependent upon our on-site personnel to maximize customer satisfaction; any difficulties we encounter in hiring, training, and retaining skilled field personnel may adversely affect our rental revenues.

As of December 31, 2016, we had 1,844 property-level personnel involved in the management and operation of our stores. The customer service, marketing skills, and knowledge of local market demand and competitive dynamics of our store managers are contributing factors to our ability to maximize our rental income and to achieve the highest sustainable rent levels at each of our stores. We compete with various other companies in attracting and retaining qualified and skilled personnel. Competitive pressures may require that we enhance our pay and benefits package to compete effectively for such personnel. If there is an increase in these costs or if we fail to attract and retain qualified and skilled personnel, our business and operating results could be harmed.

Certain provisions of Maryland law could inhibit changes in control, which may discourage third parties from conducting a tender offer or seeking other change of control transactions that could involve a premium price for our shares or otherwise benefit our shareholders.

Certain provisions of Maryland law may have the effect of inhibiting a third party from making a proposal to acquire us or of impeding a change of control under circumstances that otherwise could provide the holders of our common shares with the opportunity to realize a premium over the then-prevailing market price of those shares, including:

- “business combination moratorium/fair price” provisions that, subject to limitations, prohibit certain business combinations between us and an “interested shareholder” (defined generally as any person who beneficially owns 10% or more of the voting power of our shares or an affiliate thereof) for five years after the most recent date on which the shareholder becomes an interested shareholder, and thereafter imposes stringent fair price and super-majority shareholder voting requirements on these combinations; and
- “control share” provisions that provide that “control shares” of our company (defined as shares which, when aggregated with other shares controlled by the shareholder, entitle the shareholder to exercise one of three increasing ranges of voting power in electing Trustees) acquired in a “control share acquisition” (defined as the direct or indirect acquisition of ownership or control of “control shares” from a party other than the issuer) have no voting rights except to the extent approved by our shareholders by the affirmative vote of at least two thirds of all the votes entitled to be cast on the matter, excluding all interested shares, and are subject to redemption in certain circumstances.

We have opted out of these provisions of Maryland law. However, our Board may opt to make these provisions applicable to us at any time without shareholder approval.

Our Trustees also have the discretion, granted in our bylaws and Maryland law, without shareholder approval to, among other things (1) create a staggered Board, (2) amend our bylaws or repeal individual bylaws in a manner that provides the Board with greater authority, and (3) issue additional equity securities. Any such action could inhibit or impede a third party from making a proposal to acquire us at a price that could be beneficial to our shareholders.

Our shareholders have limited control to prevent us from making any changes to our investment and financing policies.

Our Board has adopted policies with respect to certain activities. These policies may be amended or revised from time to time at the discretion of our Board without a vote of our shareholders. This means that our shareholders have limited control over changes in our policies. Such changes in our policies intended to improve, expand, or diversify our business may not have the anticipated effects and consequently may adversely affect our business and prospects, results of operations, and share price.

Our rights and the rights of our shareholders to take action against our Trustees and officers are limited.

Maryland law provides that a trustee or officer has no liability in that capacity if he or she performs his or her duties in good faith, in a manner he or she reasonably believes to be in our best interests and with the care that an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would use under similar circumstances. Our declaration of trust and bylaws require us to indemnify our Trustees and officers for actions taken by them in those capacities on our behalf, to the extent permitted by Maryland law. Accordingly, in the event that actions taken in good faith by any Trustee or officer impede our performance, our shareholders' ability to recover damages from that Trustee or officer will be limited.

Table of Contents

Our declaration of trust permits our Board to issue preferred shares with terms that may discourage third parties from conducting a tender offer or seeking other change of control transactions that could involve a premium price for our shares or otherwise benefit our shareholders.

Our declaration of trust permits our Board to issue up to 40,000,000 preferred shares, having those preferences, conversion or other rights, voting powers, restrictions, limitations as to distributions, qualifications, or terms or conditions of redemption as determined by our Board. In addition, our Board may reclassify any unissued common shares into one or more classes or series of preferred shares. Thus, our Board could authorize, without shareholder approval, the issuance of preferred shares with terms and conditions that could have the effect of discouraging a takeover or other transaction in which holders of some or a majority of our shares might receive a premium for their shares over the then-prevailing market price of our shares. We currently do not expect that the Board would require shareholder approval prior to such a preferred issuance. In addition, any preferred shares that we issue would rank senior to our common shares with respect to the payment of distributions, in which case we could not pay any distributions on our common shares until full distributions have been paid with respect to such preferred shares.

Risks Related to our Securities

Additional issuances of equity securities may be dilutive to shareholders.

The interests of our shareholders could be diluted if we issue additional equity securities to finance future acquisitions or developments or to repay indebtedness. Our Board may authorize the issuance of additional equity securities, including preferred shares, without shareholder approval. Our ability to execute our business strategy depends upon our access to an appropriate blend of debt financing, including unsecured lines of credit and other forms of secured and unsecured debt, and equity financing, including common and preferred equity.

Many factors could have an adverse effect on the market value of our securities.

A number of factors might adversely affect the price of our securities, many of which are beyond our control. These factors include:

- increases in market interest rates, relative to the dividend yield on our shares. If market interest rates go up, prospective purchasers of our securities may require a higher yield. Higher market interest rates would not, however, result in more funds for us to distribute and, to the contrary, would likely increase our borrowing costs and

potentially decrease funds available for distribution. Thus, higher market interest rates could cause the market price of our equity securities to go down;

- anticipated benefit of an investment in our securities as compared to investment in securities of companies in other industries (including benefits associated with tax treatment of dividends and distributions);
- perception by market professionals of REITs generally and REITs comparable to us in particular;
- level of institutional investor interest in our securities;
- relatively low trading volumes in securities of REITs;
- our results of operations and financial condition;
- investor confidence in the stock market generally; and
- additions and departures of key personnel.

The market value of our equity securities is based primarily upon the market's perception of our growth potential and our current and potential future earnings and cash distributions. Consequently, our equity securities may trade at prices that are higher or lower than our net asset value per equity security. If our future earnings or cash distributions are less than expected, it is likely that the market price of our equity securities will diminish.

Table of Contents

The market price of our common shares has been, and may continue to be, particularly volatile, and our shareholders may be unable to resell their shares at a profit.

The market price of our common shares has been subject to significant fluctuation and may continue to fluctuate or decline. Between January 1, 2014 and December 31, 2016, the closing price of our common shares has ranged from a high of \$33.30 (on March 31, 2016) to a low of \$15.63 (on January 27, 2014). In the past several years, REIT securities have experienced high levels of volatility and significant increases in value from their historic lows.

In the past, following periods of volatility in the market price of a company's securities, securities class action litigation has often been brought against that company. If our share price is volatile, we may become the target of securities litigation. Securities litigation could result in substantial costs and divert our management's attention and resources from our business.

ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

None.

ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

Overview

As of December 31, 2016, we owned 475 self-storage properties that contain approximately 32.9 million rentable square feet and are located in 23 states and the District of Columbia. The following table sets forth summary information regarding our stores by state as of December 31, 2016.

State	Number of Stores	Cubes	Total Rentable Square Feet	% of Total Rentable Square Feet	Period-end Occupancy
Florida	77	55,746	5,749,593	17.4	% 93.1
Texas	63	36,338	4,363,664	13.3	% 84.8
New York	43	51,984	3,066,009	9.3	% 81.4

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

California	40	25,750	2,831,254	8.6	%	94.6	%
Illinois	39	22,575	2,461,164	7.5	%	91.6	%
Arizona	33	18,847	2,054,791	6.3	%	91.3	%
New Jersey	25	16,826	1,700,430	5.2	%	91.8	%
Georgia	18	11,063	1,316,941	4.0	%	90.9	%
Ohio	20	11,089	1,293,096	3.9	%	90.2	%
Maryland	15	12,010	1,228,155	3.7	%	92.9	%
Connecticut	22	10,656	1,179,463	3.6	%	91.5	%
Virginia	10	7,873	787,982	2.4	%	87.3	%
Colorado	11	5,998	697,589	2.1	%	85.1	%
Massachusetts	11	7,261	674,772	2.1	%	87.9	%
North Carolina	9	5,601	654,175	2.0	%	89.7	%
Tennessee	7	4,416	618,212	1.9	%	85.8	%
Pennsylvania	9	6,023	609,289	1.9	%	89.2	%
Nevada	7	4,122	519,657	1.6	%	92.1	%
Utah	4	2,261	240,023	0.7	%	95.5	%
Rhode Island	4	1,971	236,995	0.7	%	92.2	%
Washington D.C.	3	2,849	224,302	0.7	%	85.0	%
New Mexico	3	1,648	182,261	0.6	%	93.5	%
Minnesota	1	1,018	100,978	0.3	%	83.5	%
Indiana	1	574	67,604	0.2	%	95.7	%
Total/Weighted Average	475	324,499	32,858,399	100.0	%	89.7	%

Table of Contents

Our Stores

The following table sets forth additional information with respect to each of our owned stores as of December 31, 2016. Our ownership of each store consists of a fee interest in the store held by our Operating Partnership, or one of its subsidiaries, except for eight of our stores, which are subject to ground leases. In addition, small parcels of land at two of our other stores are subject to ground leases.

Store Location	Year Acquired / / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Chandler I, AZ	2005	1985	47,680	94.3	% 454	Y	12.5	%
Chandler II, AZ	2013	2008	82,889	93.1	% 1,172	N	73.7	%
Gilbert I, AZ	2013	2010	57,300	86.8	% 443	Y	83.6	%
Gilbert II, AZ	2016	2005/14	91,505	84.0	% 679	Y	37.7	%
Glendale, AZ	1998	1987	56,807	98.4	% 528	Y	0.0	%
Green Valley, AZ	2005	1985	25,050	89.6	% 266	N	9.0	%
Mesa I, AZ	2006	1985	52,575	92.1	% 501	N	0.0	%
Mesa II, AZ	2006	1981	45,511	88.6	% 410	Y	16.7	%
Mesa III, AZ	2006	1986	59,629	95.1	% 524	Y	15.8	%
Peoria, AZ	2015	2005	110,835	94.5	% 925	N	35.3	%
Phoenix I, AZ	2006	1987	100,875	90.7	% 751	Y	21.8	%
Phoenix II, AZ	2006/11	1974	83,160	95.7	% 809	Y	6.7	%
Phoenix III, AZ	2014	2009	121,731	91.0	% 820	N	73.8	%
Phoenix IV, AZ	2016	2008	69,660	89.3	% 705	Y	99.9	%
Queen Creek, AZ	2015	2013	94,462	74.3	% 624	Y	61.0	%
Scottsdale, AZ	1998	1995	79,525	95.1	% 654	Y	20.4	%
Surprise, AZ	2015	2006	72,575	91.6	% 602	N	100.0	%
Tempe I, AZ	2005	1975	53,890	91.2	% 407	Y	18.8	%
Tempe II, AZ	2013	2007	68,409	88.8	% 733	Y	86.4	%
Tucson I, AZ	1998	1974	59,800	95.3	% 496	Y	0.0	%
Tucson II, AZ	1998	1988	43,950	88.3	% 537	Y	100.0	%
Tucson III, AZ	2005	1979	49,832	92.8	% 496	N	0.0	%
Tucson IV, AZ	2005	1982	48,040	95.2	% 504	Y	13.4	%
Tucson V, AZ	2005	1982	45,134	92.3	% 421	Y	11.3	%
Tucson VI, AZ	2005	1982	40,814	91.3	% 418	Y	13.6	%
Tucson VII, AZ	2005	1982	52,688	94.7	% 601	Y	7.0	%
Tucson VIII, AZ	2005	1979	46,650	93.3	% 454	Y	0.0	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Tucson IX, AZ	2005	1984	67,496	93.6	%	605	Y	5.9	%
Tucson X, AZ	2005	1981	46,350	89.8	%	414	N	0.0	%
Tucson XI, AZ	2005	1974	42,900	95.9	%	408	Y	0.0	%
Tucson XII, AZ	2005	1974	42,275	95.7	%	436	Y	3.9	%
Tucson XIII, AZ	2005	1974	45,800	85.8	%	493	Y	0.0	%
Tucson XIV, AZ	2005	1976	48,995	95.4	%	557	Y	17.9	%
Benicia, CA	2005	1988/93/05	74,770	95.6	%	720	Y	0.0	%
Citrus Heights, CA	2005	1987	75,620	95.0	%	683	Y	0.0	%
Corona, CA	2014	2014	94,975	93.8	%	971	N	6.9	%
Diamond Bar, CA	2005	1988	103,309	96.4	%	914	Y	0.0	%
Escondido, CA	2007	2002	143,645	94.6	%	1,260	Y	11.8	%
Fallbrook, CA	1997	1985/88	45,976	89.4	%	446	Y	0.0	%
Fremont, CA	2014	1987	51,243	93.7	%	526	Y	0.6	%
Lancaster, CA	2001	1987	60,450	97.0	%	358	Y	0.0	%
Long Beach, CA	2006	1974	124,571	95.1	%	1,371	Y	0.0	%
Murrieta, CA	2005	1996	49,785	91.9	%	449	Y	5.1	%
North Highlands, CA	2005	1980	57,094	96.8	%	472	Y	0.0	%
Ontario, CA	2014	1986	93,590	95.6	%	849	Y	0.0	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Orangevale, CA	2005	1980	50,542	93.2 %	529	Y	0.0	%
Pleasanton, CA	2005	2003	83,600	92.3 %	762	Y	0.0	%
Rancho Cordova, CA	2005	1979	53,978	96.3 %	468	Y	0.0	%
Rialto I, CA	2006	1987	57,391	97.6 %	455	Y	0.0	%
Rialto II, CA	1997	1980	99,783	95.4 %	717	Y	0.0	%
Riverside I, CA	2006	1977	67,020	94.0 %	656	Y	0.0	%
Riverside II, CA	2006	1985	85,176	95.9 %	811	Y	5.5	%
Roseville, CA	2005	1979	59,944	95.6 %	555	Y	0.0	%
Sacramento I, CA	2005	1979	50,664	96.2 %	554	Y	0.0	%
Sacramento II, CA	2005	1986	62,088	97.1 %	553	Y	0.0	%
San Bernardino I, CA	1997	1987	31,070	93.9 %	240	N	0.0	%
San Bernardino II, CA	1997	1991	41,546	91.6 %	373	Y	0.0	%
San Bernardino III, CA	1997	1985/92	35,416	97.8 %	370	N	0.0	%
San Bernardino IV, CA	2005	2002/04	83,277	91.5 %	719	Y	12.1	%
San Bernardino V, CA	2006	1974	56,745	95.9 %	487	Y	6.7	%
San Bernardino VII, CA	2006	1978	78,753	93.1 %	616	Y	2.4	%
San Bernardino VIII, CA	2006	1977	103,417	96.1 %	867	Y	0.0	%
San Marcos, CA	2005	1979	37,425	93.9 %	244	Y	0.0	%
Santa Ana, CA	2006	1984	63,916	92.4 %	740	Y	4.3	%
South Sacramento, CA	2005	1979	52,440	97.3 %	413	Y	0.0	%
Spring Valley, CA	2006	1980	55,035	93.1 %	713	Y	0.0	%
Temecula I, CA	1998	1985/03	81,340	92.4 %	705	Y	45.7	%
Temecula II, CA	2007	2003	84,543	94.9 %	682	Y	55.0	%
Vista I, CA	2001	1988	74,238	93.8 %	622	Y	0.0	%
Vista II, CA	2005	2001/02/03	147,763	92.6 %	1,300	Y	3.7	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Walnut, CA West Sacramento, CA	2005	1987	50,708	94.4	%	537	Y	16.0	%
Westminster, CA	2005	1984	40,015	97.3	%	479	Y	0.0	%
Aurora, CO	2005	1983/98	68,393	93.6	%	564	Y	0.0	%
Centennial, CO	2005	1981	75,867	86.4	%	618	Y	0.0	%
Colorado Springs I, CO	2016	2009	62,400	81.7	%	530	Y	95.1	%
Colorado Springs II, CO	2005	1986	47,975	92.1	%	468	Y	0.0	%
Denver I, CO	2006	2001	62,400	92.5	%	433	Y	0.0	%
Denver II, CO	2006	1997	59,200	88.3	%	449	Y	0.0	%
Denver III, CO	2012	2007	74,460	89.0	%	678	N	94.9	%
Federal Heights, CO	2016	2015	76,125	63.1	%	708	N	94.6	%
Golden, CO	2005	1980	54,770	90.2	%	549	Y	0.0	%
Littleton, CO	2005	1985	87,800	85.6	%	640	Y	1.6	%
Northglenn, CO	2005	1987	53,490	82.1	%	442	Y	64.2	%
Bloomfield, CT	2005	1980	43,102	93.2	%	483	Y	0.0	%
Branford, CT	1997	1987/93/94	48,700	93.1	%	445	Y	8.7	%
Bristol, CT	1995	1986	50,629	93.3	%	430	Y	3.5	%
East Windsor, CT	2005	1989/99	47,725	91.4	%	471	N	31.7	%
Enfield, CT	2005	1986/89	46,066	96.9	%	304	N	0.0	%
Gales Ferry, CT	2001	1989	52,875	90.5	%	371	Y	0.0	%
Manchester I, CT (6)	1995	1987/89	54,905	92.9	%	607	N	9.4	%
Manchester II, CT	2002	1999/00/01	46,925	93.2	%	465	N	44.1	%
Manchester III, CT	2005	1984	52,725	92.8	%	400	N	0.0	%
Milford, CT	2014	2009	60,113	91.9	%	583	N	87.0	%
Monroe, CT	1996	1975	44,885	92.3	%	375	Y	6.9	%
	2005	1996/03	58,500	95.0	%	394	N	0.0	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Mystic, CT	1996	1975/86	50,825	91.8	% 561	Y	4.6	%
Newington I, CT	2005	1978/97	42,620	93.2	% 248	N	0.0	%
Newington II, CT	2005	1979/81	36,140	97.3	% 195	N	0.0	%
Norwalk I, CT	2012	2009	30,328	93.8	% 349	N	100.0	%
Norwalk II, CT	2016	1990	78,175	82.7	% 936	Y	77.8	%
Old Saybrook I, CT	2005	1982/88/00	87,000	92.7	% 720	N	10.8	%
Old Saybrook II, CT	2005	1988/02	26,425	87.8	% 253	N	71.8	%
Shelton, CT	2011	2007	78,405	87.5	% 855	Y	93.9	%
South Windsor, CT	1996	1976	72,075	92.2	% 560	Y	1.2	%
Stamford, CT	2005	1997	28,907	88.0	% 363	N	38.6	%
Wilton, CT	2012	1966	84,515	89.5	% 771	Y	66.6	%
Washington I, DC	2008	2002	63,085	87.7	% 754	Y	97.2	%
Washington II, DC	2011	1929/98	82,787	91.1	% 1,043	N	99.5	%
Washington III, DC	2016	1961/13	78,430	76.5	% 1,052	Y	97.5	%
Boca Raton, FL	2001	1998	37,968	89.4	% 612	N	70.5	%
Boynton Beach I, FL	2001	1999	61,725	92.2	% 757	Y	61.7	%
Boynton Beach II, FL	2005	2001	61,514	92.5	% 576	Y	88.6	%
Boynton Beach III, FL	2014	2001	67,393	92.7	% 721	N	100.0	%
Boynton Beach IV, FL	2015	2002	76,362	95.3	% 642	N	84.0	%
Bradenton I, FL	2004	1979	68,298	92.7	% 592	N	6.6	%
Bradenton II, FL	2004	1996	87,958	91.9	% 845	Y	46.6	%
Cape Coral I, FL	2000*	2000	76,857	92.3	% 892	Y	90.7	%
Cape Coral II, FL	2014	2007	67,955	91.8	% 614	Y	71.3	%
Coconut Creek I, FL	2012	2001	78,846	95.8	% 757	Y	53.0	%
	2014	1999	90,147	93.6	% 811	N	79.6	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Coconut Creek II, FL									
Dania Beach, FL	2004	1984	180,588	94.3	%	1,778	N	27.4	%
Dania, FL	1996	1988	58,165	91.2	%	495	Y	53.7	%
Davie, FL	2001*	2001	80,985	92.3	%	837	Y	73.8	%
Deerfield Beach, FL	1998*	1998	57,230	92.5	%	520	Y	55.0	%
Delray Beach I, FL	2001	1999	67,833	95.2	%	816	Y	45.5	%
Delray Beach II, FL	2013	1987	75,710	91.6	%	1,180	N	96.8	%
Delray Beach III, FL	2014	2006	94,395	96.1	%	904	N	99.6	%
Ft. Lauderdale I, FL	1999	1999	70,043	94.7	%	694	Y	54.7	%
Ft. Lauderdale II, FL	2013	2007	49,577	94.8	%	862	N	100.0	%
Ft. Myers I, FL	1999	1998	67,534	90.1	%	592	Y	84.2	%
Ft. Myers II, FL	2014	2001	83,375	93.3	%	841	Y	62.8	%
Ft. Myers III, FL	2014	2002	81,554	91.2	%	868	Y	89.3	%
Jacksonville I, FL	2005	2005	79,705	92.1	%	717	N	100.0	%
Jacksonville II, FL	2007	2004	64,970	91.7	%	663	N	100.0	%
Jacksonville III, FL	2007	2003	66,010	92.8	%	683	N	100.0	%
Jacksonville IV, FL	2007	2006	77,525	93.0	%	717	N	100.0	%
Jacksonville V, FL	2007	2004	82,483	93.0	%	713	N	79.9	%
Jacksonville VI, FL	2014	2006	67,275	93.5	%	536	Y	71.2	%
Kendall, FL	2007	2003	75,495	89.4	%	702	N	79.4	%
Lake Worth I, FL †	1998	1998/02	159,799	92.7	%	1,278	Y	72.2	%
Lake Worth II, FL	2014	2004/08	86,924	92.6	%	757	Y	85.3	%
Lake Worth III, FL	2015	2006	94,015	96.5	%	780	Y	42.6	%
Lakeland, FL	1994	1988	49,079	95.9	%	487	Y	82.6	%
Leisure City, FL	2012	2005	56,075	93.4	%	616	N	69.9	%
Lutz I, FL	2004	2000	66,795	94.0	%	611	Y	44.0	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Lutz II, FL	2004	1999	69,232	95.9	% 537	Y	29.3	%
Margate I, FL †	1996	1979/81	53,660	95.5	% 370	Y	27.7	%
Margate II, FL †	1996	1985	65,380	91.4	% 446	Y	57.5	%
Merritt Island, FL	2002	2000	50,261	90.0	% 465	Y	66.4	%
Miami I, FL	1996	1995	46,500	91.7	% 557	Y	68.9	%
Miami II, FL	1996	1989	66,960	94.4	% 569	Y	18.9	%
Miami III, FL	2005	1988/03	151,620	91.8	% 1,513	N	91.1	%
Miami IV, FL	2011	2007	76,695	97.0	% 928	N	99.7	%
Miramar, FL	2013	2009	80,130	92.7	% 746	N	96.8	%
Naples I, FL	1996	1996	48,100	92.0	% 320	Y	48.4	%
Naples II, FL	1997	1985	65,850	91.9	% 648	Y	55.8	%
Naples III, FL	1997	1981/83	80,021	91.1	% 803	Y	48.7	%
Naples IV, FL	1998	1990	40,650	95.1	% 440	Y	64.0	%
New Smyrna Beach, FL	2014	2001	81,454	95.5	% 607	N	59.4	%
Ocoee, FL	2005	1997	76,150	92.5	% 631	Y	22.6	%
Orange City, FL	2004	2001	59,580	94.0	% 651	N	52.5	%
Orlando II, FL	2005	2002/04	63,184	95.8	% 586	N	81.6	%
Orlando III, FL	2006	1988/90/96	101,530	90.6	% 826	Y	21.9	%
Orlando IV, FL	2010	2009	76,581	92.0	% 645	N	68.3	%
Orlando V, FL	2012	2008	75,295	90.5	% 644	N	91.5	%
Orlando VI, FL	2014	2006	67,275	91.8	% 579	Y	35.3	%
Oviedo, FL	2006	1988/91	49,276	93.2	% 443	Y	3.6	%
Palm Coast I, FL	2014	2001	47,400	91.6	% 426	Y	52.3	%
Palm Coast II, FL	2014	1998/04	122,490	94.7	% 1,189	N	42.9	%
Palm Harbor, FL	2016	2001	82,685	93.4	% 740	N	73.2	%
Pembroke Pines, FL	1997	1997	67,321	93.0	% 692	Y	78.1	%
Royal Palm Beach II, FL	2007	2004	81,274	92.7	% 757	N	90.0	%
Sanford I, FL	2006	1988/06	61,810	89.6	% 441	Y	35.7	%
Sanford II, FL	2014	2000	69,755	93.3	% 667	N	62.2	%
Sarasota, FL	1999	1998	71,142	91.3	% 538	Y	60.6	%
St. Augustine, FL	1996	1985	59,725	91.0	% 722	Y	26.2	%
St. Petersburg, FL	2016	1987	66,050	94.9	% 846	N	35.0	%
Stuart, FL	1997	1995	86,756	93.5	% 967	Y	60.8	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

SW Ranches, FL	2007	2004	64,990	93.3	%	649	N	88.8	%
Tampa I, FL	2007	2001/02	83,913	93.0	%	787	N	34.2	%
Tampa II, FL West Palm	2016	1999	74,790	96.0	%	702	N	100.0	%
Beach I, FL West Palm	2001	1997	66,906	93.6	%	974	Y	52.5	%
Beach II, FL West Palm	2004	1996	94,353	92.6	%	835	Y	76.6	%
Beach III, FL West Palm	2012	2008	77,440	91.9	%	907	Y	90.1	%
Beach IV, FL Winter Park, FL	2014	2004	102,892	92.2	%	948	N	85.3	%
Alpharetta, GA	2001	1996	90,501	89.4	%	666	Y	80.1	%
Atlanta, GA	2012	2008	66,625	89.8	%	629	N	100.0	%
Austell, GA	2006	2000	83,655	90.9	%	672	Y	64.2	%
Decatur, GA	1998	1986	145,440	92.1	%	1,308	Y	2.7	%
Duluth, GA	2011	2009	70,885	91.6	%	590	N	100.0	%
Lawrenceville, GA	2011	1999	73,740	90.0	%	606	Y	27.5	%
Lithia Springs, GA	2015	2007	66,750	94.8	%	582	N	59.9	%
Norcross I, GA	2001	1997	85,420	91.4	%	603	Y	66.0	%
Norcross II, GA	2011	1996	52,595	91.5	%	401	Y	62.0	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Norcross III, GA	2012	2007	46,955	90.0	% 500	N	100.0	%
Norcross IV, GA	2012	2005	57,505	92.1	% 538	Y	88.7	%
Peachtree City I, GA	2001	1997	49,875	88.4	% 453	N	76.3	%
Peachtree City II, GA	2012	2005	59,950	89.0	% 431	N	43.0	%
Smyrna, GA	2001	2000	57,015	92.5	% 502	Y	99.0	%
Snellville, GA	2007	1996/97	79,950	91.1	% 801	Y	20.6	%
Suwanee I, GA	2007	2000/03	85,125	92.5	% 692	Y	27.4	%
Suwanee II, GA	2007	2005	79,590	89.4	% 590	N	66.2	%
Villa Rica, GA	2015	2009	65,365	87.5	% 499	N	61.3	%
Addison, IL	2004	1979	31,575	93.5	% 367	Y	0.0	%
Aurora, IL	2004	1996	73,985	98.2	% 558	Y	8.6	%
Bartlett, IL	2004	1987	51,395	94.7	% 413	Y	31.8	%
Bellwood, IL	2001	1999	86,350	89.1	% 736	Y	50.8	%
Blue Island, IL	2015	2008	55,125	93.9	% 557	N	100.0	%
Bolingbrook, IL	2014	2004	80,915	92.0	% 728	N	77.1	%
Chicago I, IL	2014	1935	95,745	95.1	% 1,086	N	94.5	%
Chicago II, IL	2014	1953	78,585	93.3	% 757	N	85.4	%
Chicago III, IL	2014	1959	84,990	90.4	% 1,076	N	99.7	%
Chicago IV, IL	2015	2009	60,495	91.3	% 613	N	100.0	%
Chicago V, IL	2015	2008	51,775	92.2	% 603	N	99.8	%
Chicago VI, IL	2016	1954/61/13	71,785	83.5	% 715	N	100.0	%
Countryside, IL	2014	2002	99,856	92.6	% 901	N	98.7	%
Des Plaines, IL	2004	1978	69,600	90.7	% 578	N	0.0	%
Downers Grove, IL	2016	2015	71,625	78.2	% 664	N	100.0	%
Elk Grove Village, IL	2004	1987	64,079	90.2	% 621	Y	7.2	%
Evanston, IL	2013	2009	57,850	88.9	% 593	N	100.0	%
Glenview, IL	2004	1998	100,085	94.6	% 738	Y	100.0	%
Gurnee, IL	2004	1987	80,300	88.4	% 709	Y	37.3	%
Hanover, IL	2004	1987	41,190	93.3	% 417	Y	2.1	%
Harvey, IL	2004	1987	60,090	92.2	% 575	Y	2.8	%
Joliet, IL	2004	1993	72,865	93.7	% 532	Y	93.6	%
Kildeer, IL	2004	1988	36,585	96.3	% 320	Y	0.0	%
Lombard, IL	2004	1981	57,691	95.4	% 536	Y	26.0	%
Maywood, IL	2015	2009	60,225	91.5	% 655	N	100.0	%
	2004	1979	65,000	94.0	% 579	Y	10.3	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Mount Prospect, IL									
Mundelein, IL	2004	1990	44,700	94.6	%	486	Y	12.3	%
North Chicago, IL	2004	1985	53,400	90.0	%	425	N	0.0	%
Plainfield I, IL	2004	1998	53,900	89.3	%	402	N	8.7	%
Plainfield II, IL	2005	2000	51,900	86.4	%	355	N	32.5	%
Schaumburg, IL	2004	1988	31,160	87.4	%	317	N	5.3	%
Streamwood, IL	2004	1982	64,305	96.3	%	550	N	7.6	%
Warrenville, IL	2005	1977/89	48,796	93.8	%	380	N	0.0	%
Waukegan, IL	2004	1977	79,500	87.9	%	662	Y	8.1	%
West Chicago, IL	2004	1979	48,175	92.0	%	435	Y	0.0	%
Westmont, IL	2004	1979	53,300	95.6	%	379	Y	0.0	%
Wheeling I, IL	2004	1974	54,210	91.2	%	491	N	0.0	%
Wheeling II, IL	2004	1979	67,825	92.3	%	603	Y	9.9	%
Woodridge, IL	2004	1987	50,232	90.5	%	463	Y	17.0	%
Schererville, IN	2014	2005	67,604	95.7	%	574	Y	40.1	%
Boston I, MA	2010	1950	33,286	87.6	%	584	N	99.8	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Boston II, MA	2002	2001	60,470	89.8	% 628	N	98.7	%
Boston III, MA	2014	1960	108,205	90.5	% 1,102	N	25.1	%
Brockton, MA	2015	1900/70/80	65,910	80.3	% 728	N	0.0	%
Haverhill, MA	2015	1900	61,169	89.2	% 609	N	93.0	%
Lawrence, MA	2015	1966	34,672	90.7	% 411	N	100.0	%
Leominster, MA	1998	1987/88/00	54,023	94.5	% 507	Y	50.7	%
Medford, MA	2007	2001	58,745	92.0	% 658	Y	97.1	%
Stoneham, MA	2013	2009/11	61,000	91.6	% 589	N	99.8	%
Tewksbury, MA	2014	2007	62,402	93.8	% 750	N	100.0	%
Walpole, MA	2016	1998	74,890	71.4	% 695	Y	31.1	%
Baltimore, MD	2001	1999/00	93,750	93.0	% 799	Y	48.9	%
Beltsville, MD	2013	2006	63,687	90.1	% 648	Y	9.7	%
California, MD	2004	1998	77,840	91.0	% 721	Y	41.1	%
Capitol Heights, MD	2015	2013	79,675	94.9	% 945	Y	98.7	%
Clinton, MD	2013	2008/10	84,225	92.3	% 914	Y	51.6	%
District Heights, MD	2011	2007	78,190	94.0	% 957	Y	96.1	%
Elkridge, MD	2013	1999	63,475	90.4	% 601	Y	91.2	%
Gaithersburg I, MD	2005	1998	87,045	90.3	% 789	Y	45.1	%
Gaithersburg II, MD	2015	2008	74,100	92.8	% 811	Y	98.9	%
Hyattsville, MD	2013	2006	52,765	93.7	% 602	Y	9.3	%
Laurel, MD †	2001	1978/99/00	162,896	92.0	% 1,013	N	64.3	%
Temple Hills I, MD	2001	2000	97,275	94.2	% 823	Y	70.7	%
Temple Hills II, MD	2014	2010	84,225	93.4	% 1,061	Y	99.3	%
Timonium, MD	2014	1965/98	66,717	89.8	% 662	Y	95.2	%
Upper Marlboro, MD	2013	2006	62,290	96.1	% 664	Y	21.6	%
Bloomington, MN	2016	1978	100,978	83.5	% 1,018	N	73.9	%
Belmont, NC	2001	1996/97/98	81,850	93.2	% 592	N	21.7	%
Burlington I, NC	2001	1990/91/93/94/98	109,300	87.3	% 952	N	7.8	%
Burlington II, NC	2001	1991	42,165	88.3	% 395	Y	16.4	%
Cary, NC	2001	1993/94/97	112,402	88.8	% 831	N	11.4	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Charlotte I, NC	2002	1999	69,000	87.9	%	746	Y	44.3	%
Charlotte II, NC	2016	2008	53,666	93.1	%	491	N	95.7	%
Cornelius, NC	2015	2000	59,270	82.7	%	526	N	43.0	%
Pineville, NC	2015	1997/01	77,847	95.8	%	643	N	13.2	%
Raleigh, NC	1998	1994/95	48,675	90.3	%	425	Y	11.7	%
Bordentown, NJ	2012	2006	50,550	96.1	%	382	N	27.1	%
Brick, NJ	1996	1981	51,720	94.2	%	433	N	0.0	%
Cherry Hill I, NJ	2010	2004	51,500	95.3	%	369	Y	0.0	%
Cherry Hill II, NJ	2012	2004	65,500	91.4	%	613	N	94.5	%
Clifton, NJ	2005	2001	105,550	91.3	%	1,004	Y	93.0	%
Cranford, NJ	1996	1987	91,280	93.1	%	847	Y	7.9	%
East Hanover, NJ	1996	1983	107,679	90.7	%	970	N	3.4	%
Egg Harbor I, NJ	2010	2005	36,025	94.7	%	290	N	14.7	%
Egg Harbor II, NJ	2010	2002	70,400	93.5	%	692	N	19.7	%
Elizabeth, NJ	2005	1925/97	38,830	91.7	%	674	N	0.0	%
Fairview, NJ	1997	1989	27,876	92.0	%	448	N	98.4	%
Freehold, NJ	2012	2002	81,420	96.1	%	747	Y	65.7	%
Hamilton, NJ	2006	1990	70,550	93.6	%	615	Y	0.0	%
Hoboken, NJ	2005	1945/97	34,180	93.6	%	741	N	99.5	%
Linden, NJ	1996	1983	100,425	91.9	%	1,118	N	5.3	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy		Manager Apartment	% Climate Controlled	
	(1)			(2)	Cubes	(3)	(4)	
Lumberton, NJ	2012	2004	96,025	90.4	% 772	Y	32.4	%
Morris Township, NJ (6)	1997	1972	72,226	93.1	% 560	Y	5.7	%
Parsippany, NJ	1997	1981	84,355	66.3	% 770	N	49.5	%
Rahway, NJ	2013	2006	83,121	94.3	% 983	Y	92.1	%
Randolph, NJ	2002	1998/99	52,565	91.2	% 549	Y	91.1	%
Ridgefield, NJ	2015	1921/44	67,803	94.9	% 684	Y	99.9	%
Roseland, NJ	2015	1951/04	53,569	93.2	% 658	N	98.5	%
Sewell, NJ	2001	1984/98	57,826	95.7	% 461	N	9.3	%
Somerset, NJ	2012	2000	57,385	92.7	% 508	N	83.1	%
Whippany, NJ	2013	2007	92,070	94.7	% 938	Y	85.9	%
Albuquerque I, NM	2005	1985	65,927	92.4	% 601	Y	13.8	%
Albuquerque II, NM	2005	1985	58,798	93.7	% 527	Y	15.1	%
Albuquerque III, NM	2005	1986	57,536	94.6	% 520	Y	11.1	%
Henderson, NV	2014	2005	75,150	95.9	% 529	Y	75.5	%
Las Vegas I, NV †	2006	1986	48,532	94.8	% 370	Y	13.4	%
Las Vegas II, NV	2006	1997	48,850	93.4	% 531	Y	66.2	%
Las Vegas III, NV	2016	2005	74,200	87.3	% 579	Y	92.9	%
Las Vegas IV, NV	2016	2004	71,217	87.4	% 566	Y	68.0	%
Las Vegas V, NV	2016	1996	107,226	95.1	% 909	Y	84.6	%
Las Vegas VI, NV	2016	2003	94,482	90.3	% 638	N	73.5	%
Baldwin, NY	2015	1974	61,380	92.4	% 613	N	99.3	%
Bronx I, NY	2010	1931/04	69,183	87.2	% 1,318	N	97.4	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Bronx II, NY (5)	2011	2006	99,046	60.3	%	1,881	N	99.5	%
Bronx III, NY	2011	2007	105,940	89.6	%	2,033	N	99.1	%
Bronx IV, NY (5)	2011	2007	75,030	87.9	%	1,310	N	99.2	%
Bronx V, NY (5)	2011	2007	54,733	90.5	%	1,100	N	99.5	%
Bronx VI, NY (5)	2011	2011	45,970	89.1	%	1,130	N	94.3	%
Bronx VII, NY (5)	2012	2005	78,625	89.3	%	1,524	N	100.0	%
Bronx VIII, NY	2012	1928	30,550	86.8	%	544	N	100.0	%
Bronx IX, NY	2012	1973	148,040	87.6	%	3,008	Y	99.6	%
Bronx X, NY	2012	2001	159,855	86.4	%	2,665	Y	74.7	%
Bronx XI, NY (5) *	2014	2014	46,457	89.4	%	1,085	N	98.7	%
Bronx XII, NY (5) *	2016	2016	90,300	19.7	%	1,847	N	100.0	%
Brooklyn I, NY	2010	1917/04	57,510	91.0	%	1,055	N	99.8	%
Brooklyn II, NY	2010	1962/03	60,920	93.5	%	1,146	N	18.8	%
Brooklyn III, NY	2011	2006	41,625	93.2	%	850	N	99.9	%
Brooklyn IV, NY	2011	2006	37,467	89.8	%	793	N	99.9	%
Brooklyn V, NY	2011	2007	47,020	92.0	%	884	N	100.0	%
Brooklyn VI, NY	2011	2007	75,640	88.0	%	1,416	N	97.6	%
Brooklyn VII, NY	2011	2006	72,725	89.1	%	1,398	N	99.9	%
Brooklyn VIII, NY	2014	2010	61,555	90.3	%	1,203	N	92.0	%
Brooklyn IX, NY	2014	2013	46,980	91.8	%	1,254	N	99.9	%
Brooklyn X, NY *	2015	2015	56,000	40.5	%	1,210	N	100.0	%
Brooklyn XI, NY *	2016	2016	109,846	28.7	%	2,293	N	100.0	%
Holbrook, NY	2015	2007	60,397	93.6	%	620	N	82.0	%
Jamaica I, NY	2001	2000	88,385	93.4	%	918	Y	21.3	%
Jamaica II, NY	2011	2010	92,805	93.2	%	1,500	N	99.9	%
	2014	2014	88,825	58.5	%	1,950	N	100.0	%

Long Island City, NY *									
New Rochelle I, NY	2005	1998	43,587	91.0	%	545	N	47.2	%
New Rochelle II, NY	2012	1917	63,220	90.3	%	1,026	Y	93.9	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
North Babylon, NY	1998	1988/99	78,341	96.3	% 650	N	11.7	%
Patchogue, NY	2014	1982	47,649	94.1	% 467	N	0.0	%
Queens I, NY *	2015	2015	74,238	43.6	% 1,438	N	99.4	%
Queens II, NY *	2016	2016	91,100	50.5	% 1,449	N	97.9	%
Riverhead, NY	2005	1985/86/99	38,340	90.7	% 327	N	0.0	%
Southold, NY	2005	1989	59,645	89.2	% 614	N	4.7	%
Staten Island, NY	2013	1900/11	96,573	97.1	% 914	N	100.0	%
Tuckahoe, NY	2011	2007	50,878	88.8	% 757	N	99.9	%
West Hempstead, NY	2012	2002	83,995	95.8	% 899	Y	35.3	%
White Plains, NY	2011	1938	85,864	91.2	% 1,507	N	77.9	%
Woodhaven, NY	2011	2008	50,665	92.8	% 1,029	N	99.9	%
Wyckoff, NY	2010	1910/07	60,290	89.4	% 1,037	N	96.2	%
Yorktown, NY	2011	2006	78,815	93.4	% 777	Y	79.1	%
Cleveland I, OH	2005	1997/99	46,000	90.2	% 342	Y	7.3	%
Cleveland II, OH	2005	2000	58,325	88.7	% 574	Y	0.0	%
Columbus I, OH	2006	1999	71,905	84.3	% 603	Y	26.1	%
Columbus II, OH	2014	1999	36,409	79.6	% 354	N	48.9	%
Columbus III, OH	2014	1998/05	51,200	88.4	% 405	N	0.0	%
Columbus IV, OH	2014	2006	60,950	92.2	% 479	N	20.8	%
Columbus V, OH	2014	2006	74,925	90.1	% 583	N	16.6	%
Columbus VI, OH	2014	2002	63,725	88.6	% 547	N	0.0	%
Grove City, OH	2006	1997	89,290	89.9	% 789	Y	14.9	%
Hilliard, OH	2006	1995	89,290	94.1	% 781	Y	24.8	%
Lakewood, OH	1989	1989	39,332	94.3	% 462	Y	37.3	%
Lewis Center, OH	2014	1985/05	77,774	92.5	% 567	N	32.0	%
Middleburg Heights, OH	1980	1980	93,200	91.7	% 708	Y	4.9	%
North Olmsted I, OH	1979	1979	48,665	87.1	% 444	Y	10.5	%
North Olmsted II, OH	1988	1988	47,850	91.1	% 401	Y	23.8	%
North Randall, OH	1998	1998/02	80,297	92.4	% 809	N	91.5	%
Reynoldsburg, OH	2006	1979	67,245	93.8	% 667	Y	0.0	%
Strongsville, OH	2007	1978	43,683	91.9	% 404	N	100.0	%
	1980	1980/82/98	90,281	86.6	% 716	Y	0.0	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Warrensville Heights, OH									
Westlake, OH	2005	2001	62,750	91.9	%	454	Y	8.6	%
Conshohocken, PA	2012	2003	81,255	86.8	%	730	Y	39.1	%
Exton, PA	2012	2006	57,750	86.7	%	542	N	96.1	%
Langhorne, PA	2012	2001	65,150	87.5	%	668	Y	58.8	%
Levittown, PA	2001	2000	76,130	91.0	%	652	Y	34.9	%
Malvern, PA *	2014	2014	18,848	93.1	%	229	N	98.7	%
Montgomeryville, PA	2012	2003	84,145	88.7	%	782	Y	50.8	%
Norristown, PA	2011	2005	61,556	95.0	%	608	N	99.8	%
Philadelphia I, PA	2001	1999	96,176	89.1	%	951	N	44.9	%
Philadelphia II, PA	2014	2005	68,279	88.2	%	861	N	58.3	%
Exeter, RI	2014	1968/90	41,275	90.2	%	412	Y	22.0	%
Johnston, RI	2014	2000	77,275	94.6	%	578	N	0.0	%
Wakefield, RI	2014	1956	45,745	88.6	%	387	N	39.1	%
Woonsocket, RI	2014	2004	72,700	93.1	%	594	N	11.4	%
Antioch, TN	2005	1985/98	75,985	88.0	%	635	Y	9.4	%
Nashville I, TN	2005	1984	107,790	88.7	%	736	Y	0.0	%
Nashville II, TN	2005	1986/00	83,416	92.2	%	631	Y	12.5	%
Nashville III, TN	2006	1985	101,525	82.5	%	600	Y	8.3	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Nashville IV, TN	2006	1986/00	102,450	88.8	% 731	Y	10.1	%
Nashville V, TN	2015	1993	74,560	91.7	% 534	N	22.8	%
Nashville VI, TN	2015	1956/01	72,486	66.2	% 549	Y	37.6	%
Allen, TX	2012	2003	62,710	91.9	% 496	Y	57.6	%
Austin I, TX	2005	2001	59,645	91.2	% 538	Y	63.1	%
Austin II, TX	2006	2000/03	64,625	84.3	% 597	Y	45.4	%
Austin III, TX	2006	2004	70,560	87.3	% 572	Y	92.9	%
Austin IV, TX	2014	2004	65,358	90.4	% 626	N	18.8	%
Austin V, TX	2014	1999	67,850	90.6	% 614	Y	34.9	%
Austin VI, TX	2014	2004	62,770	93.2	% 753	Y	55.1	%
Austin VII, TX	2015	2003/08	71,023	89.6	% 637	Y	38.8	%
Austin VIII, TX	2016	2015	61,075	42.8	% 586	Y	98.8	%
Bryan, TX	2005	1994	60,400	65.8	% 495	Y	0.0	%
Carrollton, TX	2012	2002	77,420	87.7	% 544	Y	40.5	%
Cedar Park, TX	2016	2014	89,050	48.6	% 521	N	27.9	%
College Station, TX	2005	1993	26,550	85.5	% 346	N	0.0	%
Cypress, TX	2012	1998	58,181	90.2	% 445	Y	45.9	%
Dallas I, TX	2005	2000	58,582	90.9	% 532	Y	37.8	%
Dallas II, TX	2013	1996	79,023	88.3	% 601	Y	27.7	%
Dallas III, TX	2014	1964/76	83,229	93.1	% 889	Y	91.2	%
Dallas IV, TX *	2015	2015	114,550	56.9	% 1,225	N	93.4	%
Dallas V, TX (5)	2015	2013	54,473	93.5	% 598	N	99.6	%
Denton, TX	2006	1996	60,846	92.2	% 457	Y	3.3	%
Fort Worth I, TX	2005	2000	50,446	96.0	% 405	Y	38.6	%
Fort Worth II, TX	2006	2003	72,900	94.9	% 651	Y	68.3	%
Fort Worth III, TX	2015	2000	80,445	90.2	% 675	N	76.7	%
Fort Worth IV, TX *	2016	2016	77,654	23.8	% 927	N	94.7	%
Frisco I, TX	2005	1996	50,854	90.0	% 428	Y	25.6	%
Frisco II, TX	2005	1998/02	71,399	89.7	% 523	Y	28.4	%
Frisco III, TX	2006	2004	74,765	92.5	% 625	Y	92.5	%
Frisco IV, TX †	2010	2007	76,000	89.4	% 514	Y	21.3	%
Frisco V, TX	2014	2002	74,415	92.0	% 554	Y	59.7	%

Edgar Filing: CubeSmart - Form 10-K

Frisco VI, TX	2014	2004	69,176	87.5	%	540	Y	54.4	%
Garland I, TX	2006	1991	70,100	89.9	%	681	Y	4.3	%
Garland II, TX	2006	2004	68,425	91.5	%	469	Y	53.9	%
Grapevine, TX *	2016	2016	77,294	26.7	%	829	N	100.0	%
Houston III, TX	2005	1984	61,590	93.1	%	467	Y	9.0	%
Houston IV, TX	2005	1987	43,750	87.1	%	380	Y	10.2	%
Houston V, TX †	2006	1980/97	125,280	88.7	%	1,017	Y	60.9	%
Houston VI, TX	2011	2002	54,690	93.3	%	595	Y	98.7	%
Houston VII, TX	2012	2004	46,991	87.8	%	524	N	100.0	%
Houston VIII, TX	2012	1989	54,219	90.7	%	497	N	78.0	%
Houston IX, TX	2012	1992	51,208	81.9	%	434	Y	47.9	%
Humble, TX	2015	2009/13	70,702	82.9	%	557	Y	42.2	%
Katy, TX	2013	2009	71,308	90.1	%	573	Y	88.5	%
Keller, TX	2006	2000	61,885	91.2	%	489	Y	23.0	%
Lewisville I, TX	2006	1996	67,340	91.9	%	429	Y	21.6	%
Lewisville II, TX	2013	2003	127,659	89.4	%	1,186	Y	30.6	%
Lewisville III, TX	2016	2002/04	101,872	93.0	%	639	Y	39.5	%
Little Elm I, TX	2016	2003	60,065	91.4	%	502	Y	47.6	%

Table of Contents

Store Location	Year Acquired / Developed (1)	Year Built	Rentable Square Feet	Occupancy (2)	Cubes	Manager Apartment (3)	% Climate Controlled (4)	
Little Elm II, TX	2016	2007/14	96,896	86.3	% 636	Y	37.8	%
Mansfield I, TX	2006	2003	63,025	92.3	% 483	Y	43.1	%
Mansfield II, TX	2012	2002	58,025	87.8	% 483	Y	68.0	%
Mansfield III, TX	2016	2002/14	70,995	80.8	% 514	Y	38.2	%
McKinney I, TX	2005	1996	47,020	89.6	% 356	Y	12.0	%
McKinney II, TX	2006	1996	70,050	92.8	% 538	Y	47.4	%
McKinney III, TX	2014	2014	53,148	86.8	% 393	Y	37.7	%
North Richland Hills, TX	2005	2002	57,200	84.9	% 433	Y	60.5	%
Pearland, TX	2012	1985	72,050	87.1	% 471	Y	45.5	%
Richmond, TX	2013	1998	102,278	93.5	% 539	Y	29.9	%
Roanoke, TX	2005	1996/01	59,860	94.6	% 449	Y	30.6	%
San Antonio I, TX	2005	2005	73,509	90.9	% 572	Y	89.4	%
San Antonio II, TX	2006	2005	73,230	88.6	% 668	N	91.5	%
San Antonio III, TX	2007	2006						