

Why I do not agree with the new USBC rule on eliminating extra holes and new static weights:

1. Eliminating extra holes is not practical or wise. There are so many ways around this, including the drilling an extra hole deep into the weight block and using plug (which is a much lower density-especially plug that hardens in 15 minutes) to fill the hole. Also, it leave open the potential to filling the hole with Styrofoam and plugging over top. What next, a no plug rule? **Also, with the 3 ounce rule we can now drill thumb holes and/or finger holes 4 inches deep or so and again be able to change differential to a large degree, and maybe more than the extra hole would have!**
2. The fallout on balls with an extra hole being illegal will be disastrous. Pro-Shops will charge \$15 to \$25 to plug and finish off these holes. I estimate that our shop will be plugging 2000 plus x-holes. Yes, we have 7 months, but I figure 100 work days. That's 20 balls a day! There will be little time to drill new balls, and there will be a rush at the end.
3. The USBC members that are our pro-shop customers are already not happy with the organization. They do not feel they get much of a benefit as USBC members.
4. The time tested rules of current static weights and extra holes has served us well. If the change would make a scoring difference that would be fine, but until lane conditions are monitored, scores will continue. This rule will not hurt the top bowlers but will hurt the middle and better bowlers, the heart of bowling. Extra holes benefit the player with 175 to 210 averages more than they do top players.
5. The PSO's already have the responsibility to balance balls and make sure they are legal, and now even more pressure is put on the shops. This rule diminishes the responsibility of the high end pro-shops that spent a great deal of time laying out balls and using extra holes, carefully weighing and balancing. We would watch customers throw and then decide on extra holes to increase OR DECREASE reaction. Now these bowlers are stuck with what they have. That makes unhappy customers and will ultimately reduce ball sales. PSO's need tools like this to differentiate themselves from their competition.
6. **Symmetrical Weight Block Balls:** Extra holes are used to fine tune the ball reaction and match it to the bowler to adjust ball motion. A hole on the axis smooths out the reaction, a high hole gets us length and makes it weaker, and a low hole (P-3) lowers the RG a little and gives more hit to some players. Usually, less than ½ ounce of weight, and the use a smaller hole, 3 inches deep, is all that is required. There would be a lot of symmetrical "ball failures" without this option. Without extra holes you are taking away much of the service of the PSO's. (Do we charge less now, in a business that is already struggling with internet sales and high costs?)
7. **Asymmetrical balls:** An extra hole is usually used just to balance static weights, which allows PSO's to adjust layouts for a bowlers positive axis point, rev rate, axis rotation and tilt. Elimination of extra holes in these balls really wouldn't matter with the new rule of 3 ounces of side, top, finger or thumb weight. A limit on the size of the x-hole to, say, 7/8" instead of 1.25" would have been a better move.
8. 3 ounces of imbalance would make progressively more difference in reaction going from high differential asymmetrical weight block balls, to low differential balls, to symmetrical balls and to urethane and spare balls. The less dynamic the ball, the more the imbalance will change it.
9. No thumbers (most two handers) are turning up in greater numbers and getting better. This rule will hurt them the most. In fact, **I think the USBC did this just for them!** No thumbers can hold the ball with their hand cocked to one side or the other and get totally different reactions on the same ball...on purpose. They can even throw the ball with the pattern reversed using the same sized grips or interchangeable grips. I don't know how the USBC can monitor that.
10. Basing a decision such as this using research that draws conclusions on data that is not statistically significant, with a low probability of repetition, is not a good basis to make new rules, AND it sets a bad precedence. For those of you not in the world of science and research, the USBC has drawn its conclusion based on poor science. There is not enough room in this article to properly explain. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statistical_significance

11. Sales of balls with symmetrical weight blocks will decline, but sales of balls with asymmetrical weight blocks will increase.
12. Confidence in the USBC is already at an all-time low and this adds fuel to the fire. The last thing we want is our "Big Government" making decisions that will lower confidence in the organization. The USBC should be working FOR the bowlers and members. Penalizing ball companies, PSO's, and members could lead to the creation of a new governing body. Evidently that's a risk the USBC is willing to take, but I think all of us just want our governing body to work with us.
13. Increased differential in balls can produce a stronger reaction, yes, but also a reaction that is harder for most bowlers to control. Extra holes were not just used to INCREASE differential. Many senior bowlers, women, and kids with very slow ball speeds, need reaction controlling holes. Sometimes you need to make an adjustment after the ball is drilled. Another good service by PSO's eliminated....
14. The lack of input from manufacturers, distributors, PSO's, and bowlers in the making of this decision by the USBC clearly undermines their cause, credibility and integrity. There is still time to recover.
15. Pre-order ball sales may be reduced based on expectations of new ball development to build in x-holes. We'll have right or left handed balls! Maybe no-thumber balls! There will be great pressure on ball companies to test their equipment with dozens of new layouts now with 3 oz of side, finger, thumb, bottom weight. Low top weight balls will be popular for upside down drillings and high top weight for others. This will make inventory and ordering a headache for distributors and ball companies alike, and will require a higher inventory for PSO's. We expect ball companies to do this research so as not to experiment with our customers!
16. Who is going to enforce the no x- hole rule in leagues? I would not want to be a league Secretary or President. Why would a proprietor bother to enforce? The first State Tournament with this rule could be a nightmare. What reason do league bowlers, that are not bowling tournaments, have to maintain a USBC membership that is of no value to them?
17. If the new rule actually does take effect, they should start it Aug 1, 2018, that you can have no x-hole with the 3 ounce rule, or x-hole with the old rule, with no x-hole by Aug 1, 2020. That gives bowlers and PSO's a lot more time to correct and plug holes, and reduces a possible lag in ball sales. Already I am drilling balls with no x-holes.
18. Ball testing by *Bowling This Month* and *Bowlers Journal* will be in total disarray until they can test with these new patterns and weights.
19. On a positive note, there will be quite an increase in ball plug sales!
20. I agree with not being able to clean balls with a cleaner during competition. That never should have been allowed in the first place. As a bowler, I did not do this myself, nor did most.

Rob Bailey, Rob Bailey's Pro-Shop, LLC

Sun Prairie, WI 53590

www.robbaileysproshop.com