

HTR Monthly Report
Thoroughbred Handicapping Newsletter
June 2006

Brought to you by –
KM Software
Handicapping Technology and Research

This Month

[1] Front Page

[2] Triple Crown

Belmont Stakes – Stats and Analysis

[3] Handicapping

Good Trainer – Bad Jockey
Good Jockey – Bad Trainer

[6] Handicapping with HTR

New DFIGS and V2 Ratings Tested

[9] Stat Profiles

Factor-X
Trainer Wayne Catalano

[11] Seminar 2006

Early Schedule / Info

[12] Back Page

Late News and Tournament Doings

The HTR Monthly Report is converted from a Microsoft Word Document to a .PDF file for viewing with the free Adobe Reader. The newsletter may be viewed while on-line or the file can be downloaded to your computer hard-drive for off-line reading and printing.

Each month, the current edition of the HTR Monthly Report is available on the Internet from our members' web site only. This is not a free newsletter; it is included as part of a paid subscription to HTR's monthly download service (\$119/mo). Selected articles can be found on the free HTR web site (see back page for web address). The HTR Monthly Report is normally available by the 5th of each month.

All proprietary rights to this material belong to KM Software. No portion of this product may be reproduced, copied or transmitted on the Internet without the express written consent of KM Software. All articles and information in this newsletter are written by Ken Massa unless otherwise stated. Test data files are provided with permission from Handicappers Data Warehouse and Equibase Corp. The test results, analysis and opinions found herein are those of KM Software/HTR only - Handicappers Data Warehouse and Equibase Corp are not responsible for the written contents of this newsletter and cannot be held accountable for any claims made in it.

Triple Crown
Belmont Stakes 2006

With Barbaro and Bernardini out of the running, it might be an interesting betting race. I'm writing this well ahead of entry time, so a look at the past six Belmont Stakes results will give us a head start.

Key

Last = Track and Finish of previous start

PIM = Preakness Stakes

CD = Kentucky Derby

***** = top 2 rank

Belmont Stakes; Top-2 Finishers from 2000-2006 / PL-5

<u>Year</u>	<u>Horse</u>	<u>Fin</u>	<u>Odds</u>	<u>Lay</u>	<u>Last</u>	<u>(K)</u>	<u>PED</u>	<u>Wk</u>	<u>TRN</u>	<u>Ev</u>	<u>Lv</u>	<u>PER</u>
2000	Comendabl	1	18.8	035	CD(17)	6	433	86*	300	2*	9	104*
2000	Aptitude	2	1.8*	035	CD(2)	1*	852*	78	415*	9	2*	105*
2001	Point Giv	1	1.4	021	PIM(1)	1*	908*	93*	375*	4	1*	111*
2001	AP Valent	2	6.9	021	PIM(2)	3	999*	89*	286	4	2*	109
2002	Sarava	1	70.2	021	PIM(x)	3	636*	69	306	8	4	108*
2002	Medagil'D	2	7.1	021	PIM(8)	9	456	86*	420*	5	1*	102
2003	Empire Mak	1	1.4	035	CD(2)	1*	951*	81	456*	4	3	105*
2003	Ten Most W	2	7.1	035	CD(9)	4	502*	81	474*	3	6	100
2004	Birdstone	1	36.0	035	CD(8)	6	486	80	287	7	2*	102
2004	Smarty Jo	2	0.4	021	PIM(1)	1*	999*	93*	358	2*	1*	109*
2005	Afleet Al	1	1.0	021	PIM(1)	1*	646	86	421*	2*	4	109*
2005	Andromeda	2	11.9	035	CD(8)	6	676	88*	339	7	9	104

x = Sarava had won a minor stakes race at PIM on Preakness day.

Analysis

Look at the depth of the numbers throughout on Smarty Jones in 2004. Impeccable. How he could possibly lose this race (and the Triple Crown) to an upstart like Birdstone?! There is a lot to like in that PED column and even the longest Belmont Stakes winner in history (Sarava 2002) had a top-2 PED rating.

Notice that there are four horses on this list, all longshots, that ran poorly in the KyDerby and waited until the Belmont: **Commendable** and **Birdstone** won, **Ten Most Wanted** and **Andromeda's Hero** finished second, and all of them were high odds. **Aptitude** and **Empire Maker** ran well in the Derby and waited for the Belmont, and ran well again. No question about it, passing the Preakness has its payoff. There should be several contenders fitting this pattern in the Belmont Stakes 2006. Don't be overly critical of their effort in the Derby.

Not a single winner was rank = 1 in the Ev column, but 6 of the 12 horses listed did have a 1-2 rank with the Lv. That makes sense in a 12.0-furlong marathon. Also 7 of the 12 top finishers had a workout rating of 86 or higher. The median PED rating is about 700 and the median trainer rating = 370. Although the Belmont has its share of longshots in the exacta, the strength of the numbers for nearly all these horses is apparent in HTR.

Handicapping with HTR2
Good Trainer – Bad Jockey

It's curious when a top trainer (TRN ≥ 375) names a rider with a low rating (JKY < 200). Here are some of the reasons why this might occur →

- The trainer is doing a favor for a loyal exercise rider that has been working the barn's horses in the morning. Especially if the young jock has been getting along well with today's entrant.
- They are offering a young apprentice jockey a shot. This favor can be returned later if the apprentice gets hot. The trainer will want to use a potentially talented and energetic "bug boy" and take advantage of the reduced weight in the future. The apprentice and his agent will be in debt to the barn that gave them early opportunities.
- The horse has questionable talent. The agents for the top riders keep detailed records on the ability of every thoroughbred on the backstretch and don't want a top jockey taking on a longshot loser.
- The horse has a reputation as a troublemaker - unruly or difficult. Word gets around to the jocks room fast and none of the top riders want to deal with a dangerous rogue.
- There were no other jockeys available. This is common in the last race of the day if the finale is a maiden claimer or a race for cheap fillies. The big names want to get home early and see no need to stick around for such an unimportant race with a mediocre purse.
- They are taking a risk with a lesser jockey to get better odds on the horse today.

A couple of notes about the HTR2 jockey rating (JKY) →

1. The JKY rating is computed using a weighted formula that tallies results of all mounts taken during the previous 365-day period prior to today's race. The rating is adjusted for any jockey + trainer records and if the jockey has ridden or won with the horse in the past.
2. The average JKY rating is about 250 with a normal range between 220-320. The minimum rating score is 050 and the maximum is 595.
3. If the entries show "no rider" at the time our data files are compiled at HDW, the current JKY rating = 085. But further tests on my part have shown this to be too low and the average rating of the jockeys that eventually take these mounts = 215. This change will appear in the July update. This 215 rating will also given to any foreign jockeys with limited North American stats or a brand new apprentice jockey that has less than 10 starts in the past year. There is obviously a wide variance between the unknown riders, but the 215 is a solid median and is a neutral adjustment for later factor algorithms such as the (K).

The tests you'll see this month involve jockeys with ratings < 200 that have at least 11 mounts in the last 365-days. This is a level of JKY competence that we can establish as the "below average". An experienced rider rated 199 or less is certainly "cold" and probably not getting regular quality mounts.

I chose TRN ≥ 375 for the trainer filter here. This puts it close to the 'super trainer' (400+) range and nearly all these barns will be well known to the public and winning regularly on the circuit. We know these trainers have excellent results overall -- so how does it impact them when they assign a struggling jockey to their horses?

Handicapping with HTR2
Good Trainer – Bad Jockey

I don't like calling the riders with below average stats – *bad* – the majority of the JKY < 200 are talented enough, but they not receiving decent regular mounts. In any case, we become interested if a top trainer assigns one of his horses to these jocks, particularly if better riders were available. Below are the results of the combo. The first two items are the TRN >= 375 and JKY < 200 by themselves. The third item (TRN + JKY) is the combination of the two. All races were tested during a 365-day period, with purse \$10,000+ as the only filter.

TRN >= 375 / JKY < 200 / Purse \$10,000								
Item	Plays	Win	ITM	WROI	PROI	SROI	High	I.V.
TRN >= 375	22027	24%	55%	0.89	0.86	0.85	\$109	1.90
JKY < 200	75934	07%	25%	0.66	0.67	0.64	\$301	0.62
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
TRN + JKY	1069	15%	43%	0.83	0.80	0.79	\$67	1.30
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Analysis

Trainers rated at 375 or higher perform very well statistically in this overall sample. Considering they are the most popular conditioners known to the public, and often over bet, the ROI results are reasonable. These trainers will win about twice their normal share of races as well (I.V. = 1.90) and get their horses in the money more than half the time (ITM = 55%). HTR users are well aware that as the trainer rating rises to 400 and beyond we call them 'super trainer' and the results get even better. I chose 375 for this test to increase the sample size of the TRN + JKY category to over 1000 plays.

Jockeys rated below 200 seem to live up to their reputations. Most of them are on high-odds longshots and yet the ROI is a disaster because they seldom win. The sample size is over 75,000, indicating that two or more such jocks are typically riding in the same race – but they are winning far below their normal share of races (I.V. = 0.62).

Next we can see the results of this *good/bad* combination. There were 1069 cases of a high-rated trainer using a low-rated jock. It's unlikely there was more than one instance of in any given race. The 15% winners is just above the normal range (I.V. = 1.30) and the Win ROI = 0.83 (- 17%) is weak. The Place and Show ROI drop down despite a pretty good ITM rate of 43%. These horses are getting bet in all pools. Notice the highest paying winner was just \$67; and the longshot percentage (not shown) was below normal. These indicators tell us that most of the winners are risky bets at odds too low for the handicapper to take a chance on them in any betting pool.

Conclusions

I see several things happening here. Foremost, these horses are generally being (over) bet on the basis of the trainer, not the jockey. The ROI and longshot results are definitely lower than expected for trainers of this caliber. Are the trainers telling us something when they assign these riders to their horse? Apparently they are – they don't expect them to win – and yet the public does! If the handicapper is faced with this dichotomy of good-trainer / bad-jockey at low odds, it is wise to try and beat them.

What about the opposite situation -- *good* Jockey and *bad* trainer?
 We'll check that out on the next page.

Handicapping with HTR2
Good Jockey – Bad Trainer

This time we look at the reverse of the previous. The jockey is high rated but the trainer is struggling. What are some of the reasons this would happen?

- The rider is doing the barn a favor out of loyalty or past relationships.
- The agent feels the horse has a real shot at winning despite the trainer's poor record.
- Jockey is working on a milestone, a record or a wants to win riding honors at the meet and is taking more mounts than usual.
- The purse is substantial and the jockey will make good money with a decent placing.

The key reason for presenting the trainer/jockey ratings dichotomy this month is to remind you to consider the intentions of the human connections. The motives for the J/K tandem are not always obvious at first glance, but need to be considered by the handicapper. We'll discuss many of these intangible issues at the seminar this summer, particularly as they relate to pedigree.

The test below used the following parameters →

- Trainer < 200.
- Jockey >= 350
- Purse \$10,000+

<u>JKY >= 350 / TRN < 200 / Purse \$10,000</u>								
<u>Item</u>	<u>Plays</u>	<u>Win</u>	<u>ITM</u>	<u>WROI</u>	<u>PROI</u>	<u>SROI</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>I.V.</u>
JKY>=350	22863	21%	53%	0.83	0.84	0.84	\$122	1.72
TRN<200	10228	07%	26%	0.68	0.68	0.66	\$301	0.64

T+J	02249	14%	43%	0.74	0.78	0.80	\$59	1.14

Analysis

Trainer < 200

Quite a bit more sample size here as there is no shortage of trainers rated below 200. With nearly 10,000 chances, the TRN < 200 won just 7% of their races and finished in the money just 25% of the time. In other words – most of them are also-rans. The ROI was likewise miserable, meaning that most of these horses are high risk and over bet in most cases despite long odds.

Jockey >= 350

High rated jockeys (JKY >= 350) have a major impact on race outcomes but the ROI is low due to the public betting heavily on them. Note that the top riders will finish in-the-money more than half the time with their mounts (ITM=53%), so they are riding live horses most of the time – except perhaps when the trainer is in a funk ---

Trainer < 200 + Jockey >= 350

A highly rated jock does not help much if the horse is managed by a TRN < 200. The stats are poor with a bare impact of 1.14 and a failed ROI below 0.75. The good jocks hold onto a decent percentage of live ones with 43% finishing 1-2-3, but they are over bet for sure as only the Show ROI can reach 0.80 or more. The word to the wise here is to try and beat these horses out of the Win spot if the odds are paltry.

Conclusion for both T/J studies

It is apparent that the trainer is the key member of the tandem for success or failure. But the jockey is the primary motivator for people betting on the horse. We can take advantage of that paradox.

Handicapping with HTR2
New Performance Figures / DFIGS and V2

A new beta-test version of HTR2 has been available since May. The file name is HTR_BETA.EXE and it is available on our website for download if you are interested. There is a good chance these figures will appear in the July HTR2 update in some form.

DFIGS

We coined the name for these figs with the "D" for Don Nadermann as it was his idea to use the current PAC ratings in a 'sheet' style format. The DFIGS are adjusted with the Cramer speed figures and then fit into the graph style sequence similar to our current FIG2 screen. This allows you to view the performance cycle from the standpoint of pace rather than final time. Check the numerous messages on our Discussion Board for more information by reading the threads *Donnie* has posted about these figs.

Example: PAC = 100; Cramer 'sheet style' Fig = 15

DFIG: 100-15 = 85

The Cramer figure is subtracted in this case because lower is better with the 'sheet style' figs.

The DFIGS are a brand new baby, so a lot of trial and error will be necessary before firm conclusions can be drawn about their usage. But one thing is pretty clear -- the methodology is in the form-cycle -- not the mechanical use of the numbers. The tests below are designed to locate the strong points of the rating and to gauge their approximate value compared to the other figures in HTR, including the PAC itself.

V2 – Whole Number Velocity Figures

An old DOS version of HTR had a set of figures called the PRAT (Performance Rating Analysis Tool) that were whole integers instead of the traditional feet-per-second ratings and placed in the past-performances. It's easier for most people to eyeball strength and weakness this way and the ratings help to identify de-acceleration with ease. Example below →

Figure	Fr1	Fr2	Fr3	(Total)
FPS	58.93	56.28	50.72	
V2 or PRAT	119	083	027	229

The 'Total' adds up the three figures and would be analogous to the A/P rating with the feet-per-second velocity, but not quite the same. The relative rank of the Fr1, Fr2, Fr3 will be exactly the same. It is the Total V2 rating that we will test this month and compare with other figures in HTR.

List of figures that will be tested this month are summarized below.

PAC = pace figure; 2nd call rating; 4f sprints, 6f routes.

PER = performance rating

P & P = PAC + PER added together

CSF = Cramer speed fig 'sheet' style (rank order will be about the same as the regular rating)

V2 = The total of the Fr1+Fr2+Fr3 integer ratings (see above)

DFIGS = PAC – Cramer fig (see above)

Handicapping with HTR2
Performance Figures Test

The fairest way to assess the various ratings side-by-side is to test them all using the most recent figure, or last race fig (PL-1). This is not the ideal method for handicapping obviously. Yet researching for accuracy and greater understanding requires looking at them with equal footing on a strictly mechanical basis – and last race figure is the most logical approach. Listing the stats for the top-2 rankings adds to the depth of the test results. Below are the parameters used for this data: →

- Non-Maidens
- Fast Dirt 5.5f – 9.0f (no grass or wet tracks)
- Purse \$10,000 up.

Removing the grass, wet track and maiden races takes out most of the unknown horses and lowers the volatility of the sample. Total races tested = **17,083** (May 2005 – April 2006). The (=1) and (=2) refers to rank = 1 and rank = 2 respectively. The sample sizes vary between each factor and is greater than the total races tested because of ties --- the larger the “Plays” total, the greater the number of ties in the data.

<u>Last Race Fig / Non-Maiden / Fast Dirt 5.5-9.0f / Purse \$10,000+</u>									
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Plays</u>	<u>Win</u>	<u>ITM</u>	<u>WROI</u>	<u>PROI</u>	<u>SROI</u>	<u>\$AvgM</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>I.V.</u>
DFIG=1	18708	24%	57%	0.87	0.87	0.85	\$7.16	\$82	1.88
DFIG=2	17664	18%	51%	0.84	0.84	0.84	\$9.23	\$128	1.40
P&P=1	18618	24%	57%	0.88	0.87	0.86	\$7.21	\$71	1.88
P&P=2	17750	18%	51%	0.84	0.84	0.83	\$9.23	\$128	1.41
V2=1	17174	25%	58%	0.86	0.86	0.85	\$6.89	\$128	1.91
V2=2	17159	18%	52%	0.82	0.81	0.83	\$8.96	\$117	1.41
PAC=1	19591	21%	51%	0.88	0.88	0.84	\$8.54	\$120	1.60
PAC=2	18123	17%	47%	0.81	0.82	0.81	\$9.60	\$128	1.30
PER=1	20703	25%	59%	0.86	0.86	0.86	\$6.81	\$128	1.96
PER=2	18445	18%	51%	0.85	0.82	0.83	\$9.47	\$91	1.39
CSF=1	18666	26%	60%	0.85	0.86	0.86	\$6.63	\$128	1.99
CSF=2	17643	18%	52%	0.85	0.82	0.83	\$9.24	\$89	1.42

Analysis

With significant numbers of ties in the data for most of these ratings, the I.V. is a better separation factor than Win%. The Cramer speed figures had the highest impact for winners. All of the ratings except PAC pulled in 42% winners or more with the top-2. The ROI is a pretty close call with the Cramer figures falling below the others despite the strong I.V., which is typical of final time speed figures.

Notice the PAC had by far the highest average mutuel. This is not a surprise as it is the only figure among the group that is based 100% on pace only; all the other ratings shown have some relationship to final time performance. PAC=1 is definitely the best bet for hitting a longshot.

What conclusions can we make in terms of accuracy? None really, they all perform fine in terms of picking winners at typically low odds. The P&P would probably win the overall award by a tiny margin in terms of all the statistical categories, but just by a hair. The two new figures: DFIGS and V2 do as well as the others, but nothing dramatic. But they prove they are viable for any form-cycle or past-performance analysis.

Next page we'll see how the figures stack up when combined with the HTR=1.

Handicapping with HTR2
Performance Figures Test

No sensible handicapper will make a bet based on “best last race speed fig” alone (although that simple angle is very influential to the betting) so we’ll combine HTR=1 to add some insight. I tried K=1 and the results were very close with the each of our figures. It seems the (K) does better by itself because the last race best figure attracts too much attention from the bettors and depletes the odds.

HTR=1 is a better choice with its equal mix of handicapping factors including workout, pedigree, trainer and jockey. Normal ROI is 0.92 for HTR=1 for all races -- this strict sample produced 0.90 -- that will be tough to improve upon using last race figures, but let’s see how they did. One clear advantage to adding HTR=1 is that nearly all ties are eliminated.

<u>Last Fig + HTR= 1 / Non-Maiden / Fst Drt 5.5-9.0f / Purse \$10,000+ / PL-1</u>									
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Plays</u>	<u>Win</u>	<u>ITM</u>	<u>WROI</u>	<u>PROI</u>	<u>SROI</u>	<u>\$AvgM</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>I.V.</u>
HTR=1	17764	28%	60%	0.90	0.89	0.88	\$6.49	\$102	2.13
DFIG=1	08980	31%	64%	0.88	0.90	0.88	\$5.77	\$45	2.32
DFIG=2	03829	28%	61%	0.93	0.90	0.88	\$6.76	\$102	2.10
P&P=1	08969	31%	64%	0.89	0.90	0.88	\$5.80	\$45	2.32
P&P=2	03870	28%	61%	0.95	0.92	0.89	\$6.74	\$102	2.14
V2=1	06591	33%	67%	0.89	0.91	0.89	\$5.32	\$33	2.51
V2=2	03345	28%	62%	0.87	0.87	0.87	\$6.28	\$45	2.07
PAC=1	08904	28%	60%	0.90	0.90	0.88	\$6.50	\$102	2.10
PAC=2	03936	28%	61%	0.89	0.89	0.87	\$6.32	\$57	2.16
PER=1	08225	33%	67%	0.88	0.90	0.88	\$5.39	\$45	2.47
PER=2	03206	27%	61%	0.88	0.87	0.87	\$6.60	\$39	2.02
CSF=1	07408	34%	68%	0.89	0.90	0.89	\$5.25	\$45	2.53
CSF=2	03255	27%	62%	0.87	0.87	0.87	\$6.42	\$39	2.03

Analysis

Only two of the ratings are able to beat the natural 0.90 ROI for HTR=1 by itself. They were DFIG =2 and P&P=2. Notice how all the top-rank figures, except PAC=1, lower the average Win mutuel. This confirms the notion that the public does bet heavily based on the most recent top ranked figure.

Final Conclusions

There really is no dramatic difference between any of the figures tested. The results pretty much met my modest expectations. The (K) and the HTR-Consensus don’t require them to improve results.

The most important lesson from this study is that last race performance is over-bet by the public. A similar study using any of the other commercial speed ratings would most likely have similar predictable results because bettors are especially attracted to the best-last-race-figure angle.

So the figure itself doesn’t matter as much as how well it “fits” for the handicapper when perusing the entire past-performance and historical form-cycle. We cannot reasonably increase the accuracy of the numbers anymore, but we can improve our understanding and knowledge of them with experience.

What about adding the DFIGS and V2 numbers in future versions of HTR2? I think the DFIGS are a good replacement for FIG1 screen because FIG2 has all the same information anyway and the DFIGS provide a reasonable form-cycle approach using the pace ratings. I’ll probably create a ‘hot-key” to pop up the V2 numbers while in the FPS past-performances.

If you have a different opinion, let us hear from you.

Stat Profile

Factor-X – The Forgotten Velocity Rating

$$\text{FactorX (F/X)} = (\text{Fr1} + \text{Fr2}) / 2$$

FactorX is the odd-man-out with the compound velocity ratings. The “X” was first coined by the Sartin group to describe a rating that combined the first and third fractions. They had suggested the rating was powerful, but only viable for sprints, but that was a common sense appraisal based on observation, not raw data samples. We’ll test it definitely here with a large sample and find out if the top ranked F/X has any value. Over the years I have tested F/X extensively and found it the least effective of all the velocity compound ratings and certainly not as potent as Fr1 or Fr3 alone. Apparently the combination of the ‘bookends’ dilutes the power of the individual fractions alone. If you are wondering why I didn’t display F/X = 2, 3, etc, the reason is that the results are terrible and worthless for your attention.

<u>F/X = 1 /</u>	<u>Purse \$10,000+</u>	<u>All Races</u>	<u>PL-5</u>	<u>May 2005</u>	<u>April 2006</u>				
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Plays</u>	<u>Win</u>	<u>ITM</u>	<u>WROI</u>	<u>PROI</u>	<u>SROI</u>	<u>\$AvgM</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>I.V.</u>
All	36129	22%	54%	0.87	0.86	0.85	\$7.78	\$157	1.81
Favorites	11265	40%	75%	0.87	0.91	0.91	\$4.39	\$11	3.13
Odds-On Fav	03369	54%	85%	0.88	0.92	0.89	\$3.25	\$4	3.93
MLO=1	11004	36%	71%	0.83	0.87	0.88	\$4.58	\$20	2.88
Wk=1	05290	28%	60%	0.94	0.90	0.87	\$6.80	\$141	2.14
WK80+	09281	25%	58%	0.90	0.88	0.87	\$7.08	\$141	2.02
WK85+	03409	27%	60%	0.95	0.91	0.89	\$7.00	\$141	2.12
\$	08495	11%	35%	0.86	0.84	0.80	\$16.08	\$131	0.92
\$\$	02232	12%	38%	0.92	0.86	0.84	\$15.34	\$141	1.01
@	01973	15%	39%	0.94	0.79	0.76	\$12.23	\$87	1.28
Alw/Stakes	11859	23%	55%	0.89	0.86	0.84	\$7.65	\$157	1.79
Claiming	13667	20%	50%	0.88	0.86	0.83	\$8.77	\$124	1.59
Msw	05261	25%	59%	0.86	0.86	0.89	\$6.79	\$64	2.25
Mcl	05342	23%	56%	0.79	0.84	0.87	\$6.96	\$68	1.97
Dirt Sprint	20849	23%	55%	0.86	0.84	0.85	\$7.57	\$157	1.84
Dirt Route	10113	22%	54%	0.86	0.86	0.84	\$7.84	\$85	1.69
Turf Sprint	00981	21%	52%	1.00	0.93	0.91	\$9.37	\$80	1.91
Turf Route	04186	21%	52%	0.88	0.89	0.89	\$8.41	\$58	1.91
F	02532	28%	57%	0.91	0.87	0.84	\$6.38	\$75	2.25
E	11721	25%	57%	0.87	0.87	0.85	\$7.07	\$87	1.98
P	11601	22%	54%	0.88	0.87	0.86	\$7.98	\$131	1.80
S	08691	19%	51%	0.85	0.84	0.85	\$9.20	\$157	1.53
R	01584	15%	45%	0.69	0.70	0.75	\$9.10	\$59	1.26

Analysis

Overall the F/X=1 hits about 22% winners and produces a modest ROI of 0.87. This is a lower win impact than most of the other velocity factors. There is almost no difference between Dirt Sprint and Dirt Route results, which puts the theory to bed that F/X works better with sprints. The rating does have good results with Turf Sprints and the Turf Route results exceeded either dirt results --- another paradox.

The workout rating proved to be the best tandem factor and pushes the ROI into the 0.95 range at Wk=85 or higher. Interesting that F/X does well with “@” horses (lost by 20 lengths last out) yet not so great with the large sample of (\$) horses.

I have added F/X = 1 to the Robot Update coming out in July. The ranking of each horse’s F/X is already available in the HX4 export (rFX) enabling self-testing and further research right now.

Stat Profile
Trainer Wayne Catalano

Chicago based Wayne Catalano suddenly emerged as a 'super trainer' during the last 5 years. But the former jockey has been a fixture on the backstretch at HAW, AP and formerly Sportsman Park for more than 20 years. The rumors that his barn uses 'performance enhancing' substances has become a broken record among horseplayers. Whatever he feeds his horses, they run – and win – a lot of races.

Data: May 2005 – April 2006 / All Races / PL-5

Factor	Plays	Win	ITM	WROI	PROI	SROI	\$AvgM	High	I.V.
Play All	00394	36%	68%	0.98	0.90	0.94	\$5.53	\$23	2.89
Favorite	00245	44%	75%	0.99	0.92	0.93	\$4.44	\$8	3.54
Odds-On Fav	00073	58%	90%	0.95	1.03	0.98	\$3.32	\$4	4.06
MLO=1	00214	45%	75%	1.01	0.93	0.94	\$4.51	\$18	3.52
K1	00222	42%	74%	0.93	0.91	0.91	\$4.42	\$9	3.25
K2	00075	33%	75%	1.09	1.10	1.15	\$6.55	\$18	2.80
K3	00034	21%	53%	0.65	0.76	0.84	\$6.29	\$10	1.73
K4	00026	23%	46%	1.10	0.80	0.87	\$9.53	\$23	1.97
K110	00154	42%	78%	0.84	0.90	0.91	\$4.06	\$9	3.04
HF	00019	53%	95%	0.86	0.76	0.99	\$3.26	\$4	3.43
ALW/STK	00111	25%	58%	0.75	0.79	0.83	\$5.94	\$23	2.11
Claiming	00240	39%	71%	1.02	0.93	0.95	\$5.27	\$21	3.09
Msw	00018	44%	83%	1.27	0.97	1.29	\$5.73	\$9	4.17
Mcl	00025	44%	68%	1.44	1.07	1.02	\$6.56	\$18	3.52
Dirt Spr	00201	33%	68%	0.94	0.85	0.96	\$5.66	\$23	2.57
Dirt Rte	00111	36%	70%	0.87	0.89	0.88	\$4.82	\$11	2.83
Turf Rte	00076	41%	64%	1.25	1.04	1.00	\$6.14	\$20	3.95
Purse 100k+	00012	08%	50%	0.15	0.44	0.87	\$3.60	\$4	0.76
FTS	00013	46%	92%	2.03	1.42	1.67	\$8.80	\$18	3.59
Claims	00095	42%	65%	1.14	0.89	0.91	\$5.40	\$11	3.36
Layoff 90+	00013	31%	46%	0.96	0.78	0.73	\$6.25	\$8	2.65
AP	00171	40%	73%	1.03	0.95	1.00	\$5.18	\$18	3.10
HAW	00160	35%	66%	0.94	0.86	0.88	\$5.39	\$21	2.93
GP	00045	29%	56%	0.95	0.66	0.82	\$6.55	\$20	2.48

Analysis

Catalano sends out an amazing number of favorites. Of the 394 horses he saddled, 243 were the final betting choice – that's about 2/3 of them. He doesn't disappoint his backers very often as a whopping 44% of his favored horses won and 68% finished in the money. With odds-on favorites (1/1 or less) he rarely has a hiccup. Despite the heaps of betting that are common with Catalano horses, a wager on all his chalk plays nearly produces a profit.

As with most super trainers, Catalano excels with recent claims. His last out claims won over 40% of the time and produced good profit. Arlington appears to be his favorite track and his best overlays seem to come from grass races. He did not do well in big stakes last year (purse \$100k+) and his worst ROI category is the Alw/Stakes class. The record with the (\$) and (\$\$) plays was weak also (not shown).

Wayne Catalano has spoiled some of the fun with Chicago racing in the same way Asumussen and Norman have at Lone Star and Hollendorfer in Northern California. They win so often it becomes alarmingly predictable!

HTR Seminar 2006
Schedule and Information

Date / Time

The HTR Seminar and Data Workshop 2006 will take place Wednesday July 19
10am – 10pm (see tentative schedule below).

You may attend any time period and come and go as you wish.

Location

Gold Coast Hotel – Las Vegas. Our conference room is located upstairs to the left of the escalator in the banquet and meeting area. There will be a sign on the door for “HTR”.

Rooms at the Gold Coast have been blocked for the tournament (July 20-22). If you are not entering the tournament, you can stay for nearly the same rate Sun – Thurs at the Orleans Hotel about 1-mile away. The more expensive Palms and Rio hotels are within walking distance.

Gold Coast room info and telephone: www.goldcoastcasino.com

Orleans room info and telephone: www.orleanscasino.com

Seminar Fee

\$40 cash or check payable during the seminar. Includes contest entry.

10am

Gather, Save Seats, Welcome and Introductions,

10:30am – 11:45am

Tom Walters – exotic betting strategy.

Lunch

12:30pm – 3:30pm

Ken Massa – New Tools and Strategies using HTR2. Advanced Handicapping Topics.

3:45pm

Tournament Discussion / Contest (automatic entry with seminar fee)

5:00pm

Don Nadermann – Database (Access) Workshop using HTR Export Functions. Creative Ideas.

- HTR2 Update will be available for download prior to the meeting.
- Bring laptop for afternoon Data Workshop only. Access version to be announced.
- Handouts provided for other sessions.
- Dress casual – water and coffee provided.
- Breaks taken frequently – restrooms, food and betting areas nearby.
- Check the HTR Discussion Board for further information.

We appreciate our seminar helpers!

Ernie John Buls (*dawgfan*) Herman Bell (*Hbee*) Webmaster Rick (*yes, he's coming this year*)

Note: Mike Dee will not be presenting this year -- his daughter is getting married – congrats to Mike and family - have a fantastic wedding day!

Back Page

Late News and Announcements

Congrats to AlanN

Alan Noring finished 5th at the South Coast tournament. Contest was held May 18-19 at the new South Coast hotel located at the far south end of the Las Vegas strip. He picks up about 5 grand and a qualifier for the Horseplayer World Series next January. Nice going Alan!

Seminar Set for Wednesday July 19

See page-11 herein for full details.

HTR is a service of –

KM Software

Voicemail: 714-366-1HTR

Fax: 714-693-3399

Email: kmssoft@earthlink.net

HTR website (software updates): www.htr2.com

www.homebased2.com/km

HTR Monthly Report is an on-line newsletter and is normally completed at the end of each month, then placed on the HTR member (download) web site around the 5th of each month. Monthly subscribers to HTR can view the current newsletter for no charge on-line, Adobe Reader software (free) required. Past issues are available in our website archive library.

Products and services from KM Software

HTR Unlimited Download: \$119/mo includes the on-line edition of this newsletter.

HTR Monthly Report newsletter: \$79 for a one year subscription mailed 1st class.

HTR Software FREE requires download subscription for use.

Download the latest copy of HTR software from our web site.

KM Software has been a licensed business in California since 1994.