## Transcript Of A Segment Of The 2001 Annual Report Of The Hoosier Backgammon Club

(Mr. Meese): I want to thank all of the members who have attended today's conference for their participation throughout the year and for their show of support for current management in rebuffing the hostile takeover attempt from the Indy Tiddle and Canasta Club. Now, without further ado, I will turn over the proceedings to Mr . Fuller Sawdust, a representative of our auditing firm, Toilette \& Douche, who will provide us with the verified final point standings for the club's regular members and a short analysis of those results.
(Mr. Sawdust): Thank you, Mr. Meeds. First, I would like to thank Mr. Garber for the excellent bottle of wine and prime rib dinner, and Mr. Curtis for the front row tickets to the Pacer game, and Mr. Stimming for the use of his Ferrari during my stay here. Unfortunately, Chuck, I can find no justification to award you double points for your victories during the period you were competing with only one eye. Had you also only been using one die, I'm sure something could have been worked out.

Before I present the results, I want to recommend for the coming year the club invest in an inexpensive four-function calculator for the Club's recorder. Mr. Meeds is apparently an adherent to the Bob Newman school of finger counting and a bit dyslexic as well, so this year's audit was a bit taxing. For those sharp-eyed readers of the monthly newsletter, the results contained herein are somewhat different than previously reported; however, the corrections made were not of such significance as to change any placements. In some cases, though, there were some close calls.

After exhaustive checking of all match results, it is definite that the points champ for the year 2001 is (insert drum roll here): Mr. James Curtis, esq. Jim garnered 1586 points, besting Sean Garber by a mere 36. Butch Meese was a close third with 1411 points. No one else was particularly competitive after the first couple of months of the year. Examining the weekly running totals reveal an extremely
close race for the entire year. There were several lead changes, and, if you could compare each weekly or Sunday tournament as a lap in an auto race; Jim was the lap leader after 30 laps, Sean 13 laps and Butch led for 8. Butch was leading the pack by a comfortable margin at the end of August, but an oh-fer-the-month of September dropped him to third place and a deficit from which he was unable to recover. With 3 weeks remaining, Sean was up by 63. Jim closed the gap to a single point during the December Sunday tournament and gradually edged away over the last three meetings.

Let's take a look inside some of the numbers on the accompanying chart that displays the performance of the top fourteen club members according to their point totals for the year. One notable statistic is that Jim, Sean, and Dave Groner each won more than $60 \%$ of their matches (Dave's record also included a remarkable 13 wins in a row!) Another interesting nugget is that although Jim played two fewer weeks than Sean, he played ten more matches and won nine more matches than did Sean. I thought at first that I had made an error of some kind; but on further review, this anomaly can be explained by the fact that a significant amount of Jim's points came as second place bonuses and many of Sean's were in first place bonuses. Jim spent a lot of time in the consolation bracket where he ground out win after win. In fact, Sean created this result in great part as he defeated Jim 12 of 17 times during the year, personally knocking his major opposition into the briar patch where Brer Jim ate up his opponents unrelentingly with one hand while still maintaining a chouette presence with the other. Another factor is that Sean's all-or-or nothing style earned him 10 bagels during the year while Jim had but 5. Obviously, early exits result in fewer matches played.

Another interesting statistic is the wide disparity in performances against the top players by the top players. Sean did enormously well against tougher opposition than any of his competitors. In fact, he won
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two-thirds of his matches against Jim and Woody combined. That's even better than his overall winning percentage. Dave Groner and Gabe Stiasny were the only other players to have a winning record against the top point getters. Woody attempted to lodge a protest of these results based upon alleged unfair draws that resulted in his playing one of the top 3 dogs in 64 of his 152 matches, or $42 \%$ of the time. This compares with only a $29 \%$ exposure incurred by the higher point winners against each other. The arbitrator disallowed this protest, as it was pointed out that on many occasions, Woody himself did the draw. Other large variations from the norm stand out. In the category of got your number, other than Sean's pasting of Jim and Woody are some even larger gotchas. Jim was 10-1 over Rick, who would otherwise have had about a $50 \%$ win rate. Scott got no respect from Chuck to the tune of an 8-1 whacking. Butch was unkind to MaryAnn by a 10-4 margin, but Jim was even nastier, abusing her 13-3. Al hung a $4-0$ donut on Woody. But the most unusual result from the standpoint of relative winning percentages is the 10-1 record that MaryAnn had over Gabe.

Kudos to Scott Day for his 51 of 54attendance record. You can't say he isn't paying his dues in learning the game. Persistence has paid off somewhat, if securing entry into the club championship tournament
can be considered as success. Terry and Rick were quite close to making the top ten also, but needed a few more weeks to gain enough points. Given Terry's 6-5 win record over Butch this year, the potential for a good next year is there.

It should be noted that the 14 players whose performance is shown here all achieved higher winning percentages than the average others players. Some of these others are experienced visitors to our tournaments, but many are newcomers who we would like to cultivate as prospective club members. It is therefore recommended that our guests not be immediately subjected to the hosting (or is it hosing?) at the hands of Jim, Larry, and Woody who have compiled a most unwelcoming 38-9 or almost $81 \%$ winning record against them. It takes very thick skin or head to survive learning this game at the higher levels, so let's be helpful and kind as we are gleaning our points.

Note: HBC would like to thank Mr. Sawdust for his time, effort and incentive report. The good news is none of errors affected the Player of the Month or the positions of Top 10 Players of the Year. We look forward in servicing you for another year of your backgammon needs.
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| Date | Player | Points Awarded | Should Be Given | Net Effect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/11 | Butch | 18 | 10 | - 8 |
| 1/18 | Gabe | 39 | 54 | +15 |
| 2/25 | Jeff F | 0 | 10 | +10 |
| 3/8 | Scott | Blank | 18 | +18 |
| 3/15 | Jim C | 63 | 51 | -12 |
| 4/26 | Chuck | Blank | 28 | +28 |
| 5/3 | Larry | 30 | Blank | -30 |
| 5/3 | Chuck S | Blank | 30 | +30 |
| 5/3 | MaryAnn | 36 | 24 | -12 |
| 5/17 | Scott | Blank | 8 | + 8 |
| 5/24 | Larry | 10 | 8 | -2 |
| 5/24 | Scott | Blank | 16 | +16 |
| 6/7 | Woody | 42 | 57 | +15 |
| $7 / 5$ | Jim C | 48 | 54 | +6 |
| 7/11 | Butch | 48 | 51 | + 3 |
| $7 / 18$ | Chuck S | 57 | 51 | - 6 |
| 7/25 | Butch | 51 | 39 | -12 |
| $7 / 25$ | Woody | 8 | 18 | +10 |
| $7 / 29$ | Kevin H | 38 | 35 | - 3 |
| $7 / 29$ | Jeff F | 48 | 53 | +5 |
| 8/15 | Terry | 0 | 8 | + 8 |
| 8/15 | Chuck S | 0 | 8 | + 8 |
| 8/15 | Gabe | 36 | 26 | -10 |
| 8/29 | Brussel | Blank | 60 | +60 |
| 8/29 | Kissane | 36 | 26 | -10 |
| 8/29 | Mary Ann | 16 | 8 | -8 |
| 8/29 | Karen Davis | 61 | 63 | +2 |
| 9/12 | Rick | 48 | 54 | + 6 |
| 9/25 | Sean | 26 | 36 | +10 |
| 9/25 | Al G | Blank | 16 | +16 |
| 10/3 | Al G | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| 10/24 | MaryAnn | 51 | 36 | -15 |
| 11/7 | Jim C | 48 | 54 | +6 |
| 11/7 | Woody | 16 | 18 | +2 |
| 11/21 | Terry | 16 | 18 | +2 |
| 12/9 | Butch | 60 | 45 | -15 |
| 12/9 | Gabe | 0 | 12 | +12 |

Th-th-th-th that's all folks!!

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6001 |  | 6とレ | 82 | $\varepsilon \varepsilon$ | SS | 18 | \＆乙 | 6S | Z6 | SS | LS | 68 | 69 | 乙8 | 9L | LL | sesso7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \％0＾8乙 | ヤS－レて | $\forall N$ | $\forall N$ | $\forall N$ | \％6＇ 5 ¢ | 6عL－8L | 82 | X | 9 | S | 9 | G | $\downarrow$ | 乙 | G | O1 | $\downarrow$ | レレ | 乙 | 6 | $L$ | S | SıəபłО ॥｜ |
| 1 | 1 | \％9＇8乙 | Oレ－ヤ | OZ | LL | 9\＆\＆ | \％ 1 －6t | $8 乙-L Z$ | LZ | G | X | 0 | 乙 | $乙$ | 1 | 乙 | $\varepsilon$ | 0 | 乙 | $\varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon$ | 1 | 乙 | 1 | SıəM |
| 1 | 1 | \％007 | てレ－8 | OZ | 81 | レธE | \％LOS | ยと－† | $\downarrow \varepsilon$ | † | $\downarrow$ | X | 1 | 1 | S | 0 | $\varepsilon$ | $\downarrow$ | 乙 | † | † | 乙 | $\varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon$ | zəس0๑ $\forall$ \＆ |
| † | 1 | \％0＇レヒ | 0て－6 | 91 | $0 \varepsilon$ | 16も | \％6をも | SS－¢ $\downarrow$ | $\varepsilon \downarrow$ | 9 | 乙 | 乙 | X | 乙 | 0 | † | S | $\varepsilon$ | 乙 | G | $\varepsilon$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | əəə1S પフ！પ てL |
| $\varepsilon$ | 1 | \％S＇レ | カて－Lレ | レレ | $\varepsilon \downarrow$ | て6巾 | \％で9を | 18－9力 | 9t | 8 | 0 | 0 | $\downarrow$ | X | 1 | $\varepsilon$ | † | $\varepsilon$ | 乙 | G | 乙 | 9 | $\downarrow$ | $L$ | ueməleg Kıə 11 |
| $\varepsilon$ | 9 | \％ 1 6S | 6－を1 | $0 \varepsilon$ | 81 | 975 | \％L゙レ9 | をて－LE | LE | $\varepsilon$ | 0 | $\downarrow$ | 1 | 1 | X | 乙 | G | 1 | S | $\varepsilon$ | 乙 | 乙 | 9 | S |  |
| $\downarrow$ | $\varepsilon$ | \％と＇ऽ\＆ | てて－で | L1 | $\varsigma \varepsilon$ | てし9 | \％6゙ゅヤ | 6S－8t | 8t | 8 | $\varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon$ | $\downarrow$ | S | 0 | X | $\downarrow$ | 乙 | 乙 | S | $\varepsilon$ | 乙 | $\varepsilon$ | $L$ | uəumoıls Kıeר 6 |
| $\downarrow$ | 乙 | \％8＇ऽ | ャع－61 | て1 | LS | 619 | \％ $0 \cdot \angle \varepsilon$ | て6－bs | $\downarrow$ ¢ | 8 | 1 | 乙 | $\downarrow$ | $L$ | 1 | $\dagger$ | X | 1 | 1 | $\downarrow$ | 乙 | OL | G | $\dagger$ | Keg Hoss 8 |
| G | † | \％899 | 91－して | SZ | $\downarrow \varepsilon$ | レヤ8 | \％6＇$\dagger$ S | SS－L9 | $\angle 9$ | レレ | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | $\Sigma$ | 8 | G | X | 乙 | 1 | S | 6 | 9 | 9 | Kuse！！s əqeo $L$ |
| 6 | $\downarrow$ | \％で8を | して－をレ | 92 | $\downarrow \varepsilon$ | 788 | \％6 25 | 15－0L | 02 | 8 | 0 | $\dagger$ | $\varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon 1$ | 1 | $\downarrow$ | 8 | $\varepsilon$ | X | 8 | G | $\downarrow$ | 9 | $\varepsilon$ |  |
| 9 | 乙 | \％ガレと | ¢ع－91 | 81 | OS | S88 | \％が9t | 68－LL | LL | ャレ | † | $\downarrow$ | $\varepsilon$ | 8 | 0 | 乙 | 6 | OL | $\dagger$ | X | $\varepsilon$ | $\downarrow$ | 6 | $\varepsilon$ | uu＊Kıew s |
| 9 | † | \％とら $\dagger$ | ¢ع－6乙 | S己 | $\downarrow$ | OLOL | \％ 9 ¢ | 69－を8 | $\varepsilon 8$ | O1 | 1 | 0 | $L$ | $L$ | 乙 | 9 | $L$ | G | $\downarrow$ | S | X | O1 | 6 | O1 | Kpoom $\downarrow$ |
| OL | 8 | \％ど $\llcorner\downarrow$ | 6乙－92 | 92 | $\dagger S$ | レレカレ | \％ガ99 | て8－901 | 901 | L1 | $\downarrow$ | $\varepsilon$ | 5 | 5 | $\varepsilon$ | 8 | $\varepsilon \downarrow$ | $L$ | S | O1 | 6 | X | $L$ | OL | əsəəW पวŋng $\varepsilon$ |
| て1 | 6 | \％8＇と9 | して－LE | 6乙 | $\downarrow$ ¢ | OSSレ | \％で09 | 9L－SIL | S1L | LL | 乙 | $\downarrow$ | S | $L$ | $\downarrow$ | $L$ | 8 | $\dagger$ | 8 | てレ | 91 | 6 | X | てレ | ләqueg ueas 2 |
| 91 | S | \％6＇を $\downarrow$ | ટદ－乌己 | $1 \varepsilon$ | ZS | 9851 | \％L19 | LL－tてL | 七てL | OZ | † | S | O1． | て1 | 乙 | $L$ | $\varepsilon 1$ | S | 8 | \＆レ | OL | O1 | 5 | X |  |
| puz | lS 1 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & \overline{3} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\sum_{\omega}^{\xi}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & \stackrel{D}{=} \\ & \frac{0}{\sqrt{n}} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \geq \\ & Q \\ & 0 \\ & \widehat{B} \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & \frac{0}{3} \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 00 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{3} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 5 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \sum \\ & \underset{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \gtrless \end{aligned}$ | D C C D Z D D D D |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{c} \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \bar{\vdots} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | s6u！puełs <br> レOOZ ןEu！」 |

