

В

The WASHINGTON BRIDGE LEAGUE

welcomes our new Sectional Tournament Chair,

Steve Schatzow

Please join him at the next WBL sectional:

84TH ANNUAL D.C. CHAMPIONSHIPS

from **October 9-12** (<u>see p.5</u>)

Earlier start times & longer lunch breaks!
All levels of play! Teams games on Sunday!

WBL Bulletin News Alert!

Only 1 more issue is coming.

Printed mail subscriptions are available.

The Bulletin will continue to be available online.

Details on page 3

Help us keep you up-to date: Send us your email address.

SUGGESTION BOX

Do you have a suggestion that might help to increase membership or otherwise improve the Washington Bridge League? Give any and all ideas to Don Berman, 301-776-3581, don.berman@verizon.net, 13707 Engleman Dr., Laurel, MD 20708, or www.WashingtonBridgeLeague.org.

WBL OMBUDSMAN

Any player with helpful director issues including criticism or praise of the directing staff may contact the Ombudsman, Adrienne Kuehneman and be assured that the source of the information will remain confidential. Information should be provided in writing and may be handed to her at any game, or mailed to her at 6333 Tone Dr., Bethesda, MD 20817-5811.

DEADLINE: OCTOBER 20, 2014

TO SUBMIT NEW ARTICLES TO THE EDITOR FOR THE NOV/DEC 2014 ISSUE

Washington Bridge League BULLETIN (usps #861-240)

Vol. 72, #5— Subscription \$2 per year for members of Unit #147 (included in ACBL annual dues). Non-member subscription rate is \$21 for three years. Published bi-monthly by the Washington BRIDGE LEAGUE AT 14517 PERRYWOOD DRIVE, BURTONSVILLE, MD 20866. PERIODICALS POSTAGE PAID AT BURTONSVILLE, MD. POSTMASTER: SEND ADDRESS CHANGES TO WASHINGTON BRIDGE LEAGUE BULLETIN, ACBL, P.O. BOX 289, HORN LAKE, MS 28637-0289. ALL EDITORIAL AND GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO THE EDITOR AT 901 CLIFTONBROOK LN., SILVER SPRING, MD 20905-3711.

Editor — Donna Rogall (301-421-9615), drogall@verizon.net I/N Columnists — Shawn Stringer, shstringer@aol.com and Ron Zucker, ron@motherzucker.com Columnists — Steve Robinson, Richard Colker, Richard Ferrin, Chris Miller, Barry Bragin The opinions expressed by our columnists do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ACBL, the WBL, or even the editors of this publication. The WBL is not responsible for the claims of its advertisers.

> Richard Ferrin, President — (202-265-0718), rferrin@mac.com Ellen Cherniavsky, Vice President — (301-649-1350), eachernia@vahoo.com Rose Berman, Treasurer — (301-776-3581), Rose Berman@verizon.net Linda Marshall, Secretary — (301-320-6057), ldaimarshall@msn.com

UNIT DIRECTORS

Carole Banks — (301-622-0923), cy.banks@verizon.net Clyde Kruskal — (301-927-1023), cpkfam@gmail.com Melissa Price — (301-464-1261), melissadprice46@gmail.com Lloyd Rawley — (301-513-5338), lloydthevoid@hotmail.com Bob Stearns — (301-657-2353), snraets@erols.com Ollie Thomas—(301-951-0138), joliver.thomas@verizon.net

SOME KEY VOLUNTEERS

Leslie Shafer & Julie Marquette — NLM Tournament Chairs, (301-642-9197), imarq3428@vahoo.com Steve Schatzow — Sectional Tournament Chair, (202-332-3729), sschatzow@his.com. Shawn Stringer — Regional Tournament Chair, (301-275-6363), shstringer@aol.com Adrienne Kuehneman — WBL Ombudsman (301-229-2022) Don Berman, Webmaster — (301-776-3581), don.berman@verizon.net

Alex Gretsinger, e-List Administrator — (410-949-4834), agretsinger@gmail.com Frances Burke — Membership Secretary (301-384-6103)

Chris Miller — Unit Game Chief Director & Club Manager (301-318-6083), wblmanager@gmail.com Clyde Kruskal — Unit Game Chair (301-395-0480)

Barbara Doran — Unit Game & Tournament Partnerships (301-608-0347), barb.doran@verizon.net Kitty Gottfried — Unit Game and Sectional Hospitality Chair Emeritus

Margarett Whilden — WBL School Bridge Coordinator, (301-641-4200), mx2whilden@gmail.com DISTRICT 6 SITE:

Barry Bragin — Unit Recorder (301-598-6853) WBL WEBSITE:

www.WashingtonBridgeLeague.org www.districtsix.org

TO GET ON AN EMAIL LIST FOR BRIDGE NEWS & BRIDGE PROBLEMS. SEND A NOTE TO STEVE ROBINSON AT ROBINSWR@EROLS.COM REQUESTING SUCH.

CONTENTS

ARTICLE PAGE
President's Letterby Richard Ferrin 2
Bring a Friend to the 0-20 or NLM Unit Game!
WBL Bulletin News Alert!—Only 1 more issue is coming
Bits and Pieces
Welcome to the Washington Bridge League; Club News—Laurel
Adds a New Daytime Game; Las Vegas Summer NABC—WBL
Top 10 Lists; GNT 2014-2015—Get Your Team Together! 4
84th Annual D.C. Championships: October 9-12, 2014 \ldots
53rd Annual Presidential Tournament: January 8-11, 2015 \ldots 6
WBL Solvers' Club
Thursday Night Unit Game
2014 Trophy Race Standings by John Adams 14
0-20 Game & Lesson Thursday Nights, Carpools
Schedule, WBL Cell Phone, Map, Guaranteed Partner Program $\dots 15$
The Unit Game—Results Posting; Spare Brains or Muscle?;
Upcoming Sectionals
Committee Action #83
69th Annual Potomac Valley Tournament—Results
WBL Educational Foundation; Youths 25 and Under are Half Price;
The WBL is on Facebook!; The WBL Online
NLMaster Pointers $$ by I/N columnists, Shawn Stringer & Ron Zucker $$ 28
Stepping Up to New Heights
Need a Partner or a Ride to the Unit Game? back cover
Solvers' Club's New Problems



PRESIDENT'S LETTER

by WBL President, Richard Ferrin

rferrin@mac.com

As many of you may have heard, there has been a significant reorganization of responsibilities for regional tournaments in our area. For many years, our regional tournaments were run by the Mid-Atlantic Bridge Conference (MABC), which consists of District Six (most of Maryland, DC, and Virginia) and District Seven (North and South Carolina, Georgia, and part of Tennessee). However, for several good reasons, the two districts have decided to shift most of the responsibilities for running the regional tournaments from MABC to the two individual districts.

To accommodate these new responsibilities, the District Six Board of Directors recently voted to establish several new committees and reorganize responsibilities of other committees. District Six has asked each of the units within the district, including the Washington Bridge League, to encourage its members to volunteer for committee assignments. That is where we need *your* help.

Please consider volunteering for one of the committees or subcommittees below. Although several WBL board members, including myself, have agreed to serve on one of the new District Six committees, we need other WBL members to step up to the plate and make a small contribution of time to make District Six run smoothly.

If you are willing to contribute a little time to one (or more) of the committees listed below, please e-mail me at referrin@mac.com, and I will be glad to give you additional details. Because District Six encompasses a large geographic area, we expect that most committee activities will take place by e-mail or telephone. Travel is not required. All that is required is a little time and commitment to give back to the game we all love.

- ♦ Regional Management Committee
 - Subcommittee for Regional Operations/Finances
 - Subcommittee for Tournament Chair Support Services
 - Subcommittee for Regional Policies and Procedures
 - -Subcommittee for Contracts
 - Subcommittee for Supplies and Equipment
- ♦ Finance Committee
- ♦ Tournament Scheduling Committee
- ♦ Special Events/Functions Committee
- Volunteer Recruitment and Appreciation Committee
- ◆ Novice and Intermediate Recruitment and Education Committee
- ♦ Advertising and Communications Committee
- ♦ Community Outreach Committee
- ♦ Competition and Appeals Committee
- ◆ Liason to MABC/District Seven/District Four

BRING A FRIEND TO THE 0-20 OR NLM UNIT GAME!

Bring a new player (who has not previously played at the WBL) to the Unit Game to play in the 0-20 or NLM game and you both will play free that evening.

WBL BULLETIN NEWS ALERT!

Only 1 more issue is coming...

Starting in <u>January of 2015</u>, the WBL Bulletin will cease free mail distribution. The bulletin will continue to be available free online through our website: <u>washingtonbridgeleague.org</u>. You can be notified when the new issue is available online if we have your email address—see below.

◆ Yearly (6 issues), **Printed Mail Subscriptions** are available:

WBL members \$12.00/year.

Non-member \$18.00/year.

The bulletin comes out six times a year. To subscribe to the bulletin, give or mail a check to "Washington Bridge League" via *WBL Treasurer, Rose Berman,* at: 13707 Engleman Dr., Laurel, MD 20708-1325. Please include your full name and address (and player number if you are a WBL member).

♦ We are establishing a **WBL Unit Membership Email Database**.

The emailings will be used for occasional bridge news only.

One use will be to inform you when the bulletin is available online.

There will be no advertising, sharing or publishing of the addresses.

Send your <u>email</u>, <u>name</u> and <u>player number</u> to **WBL e-List Adminis**trator, Alex Gretsinger, at:

agretsinger@gmail.com

Please <u>also indicate if you would like to be included on Steve Robinson's email list</u> in order to receive additional bridge news, bridge problems, and other tidbits. (If your email address is up-to-date (and not marked private) with the ACBL, then we already have it.) You will be able to unsubscribe from either list.

BITS AND PIECES

WELCOME TO THE WASHINGTON BRIDGE LEAGUE

The WBL welcomes the following new ACBL members: Linda R Cohen. Ms Sudha Garg, Dr Jay I Krampf, Samuel F Lee, Ann Levin, Michael D Pak, Renay Regardie, Emma Emo J Thoms, Linda K Wiesman, Mrs Patricia D Allman, Mr William F Allman, Ms Deborah J Crockett, Benjamin Gunby, Steven H Gunby, John C Houghton, and Dr Kenneth J Shapiro.

In addition, we welcome the following transfers from other units: Michele Greengard, Ms Andrea J Law, Gwen Pemberton, Mr Tom Piliste, Mr Albert W Cowen, Carol Dyer, Galina I Fomenkova, Mr Barry W Goulding, Mrs Hillary Goulding, Mrs Nazan Kirdar, Mel Orlans, Ms Sylvia Shi, Joan Short, Mrs Adele Waggaman, and Elizabeth S Witter.

Please join us at our weekly Unit Game on Thursday evenings and frequent the local bridge clubs in the area. Information can be found at www.WashingtonBridgeLeague.org.

CLUB NEWS

Laurel Adds a New Daytime Game!

The Laurel Bridge Club has begun a new daytime game on Mondays at 11AM. The game features pre-duplicated hands, hand records and uses BridgeMates for scoring. Partners are guaranteed. For more information contact Priscilla Krueger at 301-90-5384 pj.krueger@verizon.net or Rose Berman at 301-776-3581 or rose.berman@verizon.net.

Las Vegas Summer NABC **WBL Top 10 Lists**

W/RI Momb

ART	Members
1	145.49 Steve Robinson
	145.49
3	128.02
4	112.40Beth Palmer
5	91.87 Robin Taylor
6	63.38William Pettis
7	48.66 Ellen Cherniavsky
8	46.48 Lou Reich
9	44.10 Fred King
10	43.76

WBL Members <2000 masterpoints

1	43.76
2	35.19 James Beller
3	27.67 Brian Hartwig
4	23.42
	23.42
6	21.07
7	19.87
8	19.54
9	16.62 Stanley Barg
10	14.54 Michael Berard

WBL Members <750 masternoints

***		Pozzas
1	23.42	Jill Benson
	23.42	David Benson
3	19.87	Hakan Berk
4	19.54	Colin Schloss
5	16.62	Stanley Barg
6	11.99	Timothy Stewart
7	4.97	Steven Nesseler
8	4.09	Julie Marquette
9	0.20	Julie Pettis

GRAND NATIONAL TEAMS 2014-2015

Get Your Team Together!!!!

It is time to get to your local club, your Unit Game qualifiers, or your NLM sectional to qualify to win a partially subsidized trip to Chicago, Illinois at the Summer 2015 NABC. If you win, you will represent District 6 in the national finals of this grassroots competition.

The club or unit game qualification period began on September 1, 2014 and will continue until March 7, 2015. Make sure vou qualify early. You can go out and play as often as you want with whomever you want.

Once again, the competition contains four flights at the District level. In the Open flight all players may enter. Flight A is limited to players with 0-6000 masterpoints. Flight B is limited to players with 0-2500 master points. Flight C is limited to Non-Life Masters with fewer than 500 masterpoints. Masterpoint eligibility is determined by the ACBL as of September 1, 2014. At the club level, the Open and A flights will be combined.

...continued on p. 26, column 2, bottom

OCTOBER 9-12, 2014



D.C. CHAMPIONSHIPS

KENSINGTON TOWN HALL/ARMORY

3710 Mitchell St, Kensington, MD ~ (except where noted)

(Stratification by avg. masterpoints of the team or pair.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9

Rockville Duplicate Bridge Club, 301-503-3348 (Mark Lavine) NO ENTRY TILL 11AM St. James Episcopal Church, 11815 Seven Locks Rd., Rockville

♦ StrataFlighted Open Pairs (A/X unlim/3000, B/C/D Separate 2000/1000/500) (both sites); Stratified NLM Pairs (NLM/100/50) & 0-20 Pairs (Kensington Armory only); Stratified 199er Pairs (Beth El only)

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10

* *StrataFlighted A/X (unlim/3000) & B/C/D Pairs (2000/1000/500) (single sessions) 10:00am, 2:00pm

Come out for this popular team game!—5 rounds, 5 boards a round, 5 minutes a board.

ALERT! NEW Earlier Start Times Saturday & Sunday—both sessions

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 11

* *StrataFlighted A/X (unlim/3000) or B/C/D Pairs (2500/1000/500) (single sessions) 10:00am, 3:00pm

♦ Intermediate/Novice Pairs (300/200/100) or Newcomer Pairs (50/20/5) (single sessions) 10:00am, 3:00pm

▼ Machlin Sportsmanship Award Presentation & Panel Show between sessions

A Eynon Trophy

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 12

First awarded in 1931—Try to add your name to the famous names inscribed bere!

Check out this format! Each bracket of eight teams (by average masterpoints) plays all of the other teams in its bracket! The top bracket will hold an unlimited number of teams and will play a Swiss format. Your team may choose to play up—but only into the top bracket (which awards the trophy).

♣ Lots of Intermediate & Novice Events with Silver Points! ♥

Separate I/N events & strata as advertised as attendance allows. (Director's discretion.)

Hospitality includes snacks, drinks, & Friday lunch free of charge. Chair: Steve Schatzow, 202-332-3729, sschatzow@his.com. Volunteer Coordinator: Barbara Summers, 301-598-5838, jimbarb1184@aol.com; Hospitality Chair: Mike Zane, 301-653-1215, Mikezane@msn.com; H.C. Emeritus: Kitty Gottfried: Partnerships: Barbara Doran, 301-608-0347, barb.doran@verizon.net

*StrataFlighted if attendance warrants—otherwise combined into Stratified Pairs (unlim/2000/500)

Directions to the Kensington Town Hall/Armory: 495 Beltway Exit 33, Connecticut Avenue North (Rt. 185N—to Kensington). 1.5 miles, right at light—Knowles Ave. 1st right at stop—Armory Ave. 1st left at stop—to 3710 Mitchell St. & parking lot on right. Additional parking in nearby lots—see website maps.

events except I/N

WASHINGTON BRIDGE LEAGUE. ORG

KENSINGTON, MD: JANUARY 8-11, 2015

53rd Annual

~ Presidential Tournament ~

at the KENSINGTON TOWN HALL/ARMORY

3710 Mitchell St, Kensington, MD ~ (except where noted)

ashington Bridge eague

THURSDAY, JANUARY 8

- ♦ StrataFlighted Open Pairs (A/X unlim/3000, B/C/D Separate 2000/1000/500) (both sites); Stratified NLM Pairs (NLM/100/50) & 0-20 Pairs (Kensington Armory only); Stratified 199er Pairs (Beth El only)

 2015...
Cheers to a
New Year &
a New Deal!

& Sunday-

both sessions

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9

- * *StrataFlighted A/X (unlim/3000) & B/C/D Pairs (2000/1000/500) (single sessions) 10:00am, 2:00pm



- * Special! JOINT ABA/ACBL *StrataFlighted A/X (unlim/3000) or B/C/D Pairs (2500/1000/500) 10:00am
- ▼ Intermediate/Novice Pairs (300/200/100) or Newcomer Pairs (50/20/5) (single sessions) 10:00am, 3:00pm

TEAMDAY, JANUARY 11

WBL Trophy Race Winners' Presentation

♣ Lots of Intermediate & Novice Events with Silver Points! ♥

Separate I/N events & strata as advertised as attendance allows. (Director's discretion.)

Hospitality includes snacks, drinks, & Friday lunch free of charge. Chair: Steve Schatzow. 202-332-3729, sschatzow@his.com. Volunteer Coordinator: Barbara Summers, 301-598-5838, jimbarb1184@aol.com; Hospitality Chair: Mike Zane, 301-653-1215, Mikezane@msn.com; H.C. Emeritus: Kitty Gottfried; Partnerships: Barbara Doran, 301-608-0347, barb.doran@verizon.net

*StrataFlighted if attendance warrants—otherwise combined into Stratified Pairs (unlim/2000/500) Stratification by avg. masterpoints of the team or pair. No individual may exceed the event's upper limit.

Directions to the Kensington Town Hall/Armory: 495 Beltway Exit 33, Connecticut Avenue North (Rt. 185N—to Kensington). 1.5 miles, right at light—Knowles Ave. 1st right at stop—Armory Ave. 1st left at stop—to 3710 Mitchell St. & parking lot on right. Additional parking in nearby lots—see website maps.

WBL Solvers' Club

Moderated by Steve Robinson

robinswr@erols.com

Congratulations to **Enid Hughes** who came in first with a score of 480. She wins a free entry to the Unit Game, and will be invited to be on a future panel. Tied for second were Karen Heath, Dror Axelrod, Jim Munday and **Barbara Israel** with a score of 470. Tied for sixth were Jack Hawks, Bill Haskitt, Becky Duty, Fred Allenspach, Chris Marks, Ram Sarangen, Ed Anania, Mike Berard, Carl **Jeschke** and **Joe Daniel** with a score of 460. Tied for fifteenth were Sam Kaplan, Carl Gutschick, Sumner Steinfeldt, Jim Wakefield, Audrey Warren, Marcia Carthey, Lynn Connelly, Sarah Lazarus, Jim Lynch, Paul Block, Tom Musso, Michael Berens and Carol Elfant with a score of 450. Tied for twenty-eighth were John Farber, Mike Gill, Hadi Abushakra, Michael Frosch, Myron Goldstein, Eric Gettleman, Ken Davis, Mark Rosen and Carol Halfon with a score of 440. The average score of the 188 solvers was 386. The average score of the experts was 443.

All readers are encouraged to send answers and/or new problems to Steve Robinson, 2891 S. Abingdon St. #A2 Arlington. VA. 22206-1329. In addition to the winner receiving a free play at the WBL Unit Game, Steve will play with anyone who gets a perfect score or who exactly matches all five of his answers. If you send a self-addressed stamped envelope to the above address along with your answers, I will send you a copy of the new problems to ensure that you can meet his next deadline. You can pick up a copy of the problems at the WBL Unit Game in Maryland, and can send answers or requests for problems to robinswr@erols.com. You can also see and answer the problems at the WBL website. WBL Solvers Club uses Washington Standard as published July 1996. I accept only the first answer from each solver unless it is clear that the solver wants to correct his answer.

I personally score all the problems. If a majority of the solvers vote for an answer, and

the answer is reasonable I will give that answer 100 points. I will not give 100 points to an answer that I consider bad no matter how many experts vote for it. There are times when I want to make a point. I will give that answer 100 points and will therefore give the majority answer 90 points. For the other answers I consider how good the answer is and how many experts vote for it for its score. If you submitted an answer that got 20 points, that bid would get a bad score at the table. A good exercise would be to figure out why I gave your answer 20 points. You might have misread the problem.

The book *Washington Standard* second edition is out. If you are a serious bridge player, this book is a must. You can purchase a copy from Steve for \$25.00 whenever you see him or can send him a check for \$30.60 which includes \$5.60 for priority mail.

1) IMPs, None Vulnerable

♦K54♥-**♦**A98654**♣**10632

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
Pass ?????	Pass	Dbl	1♥ 2♥
<u>Action</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Votes</u>	Solvers
4 lack	100	2	26
3♦	90	7	122
5♦	60	0	2
3♥	50	1	7
2♠	20	0	6
3NT	20	0	1
Dbl	20	0	10
2NT	20	0	4
4♥	20	0	2
3♣	20	0	2
Pass	20	0	6

Partner has made a balancing takeout double. A direct takeout double promises opening bid strength. A balancing double can be a king weaker. $\triangle Axxx \lor xx \lor Axx \lor xx \lor Axxx$ is a direct-seat takeout double. $\triangle Axxx \lor xx \lor Axx$



Great Game Products

7825 Tuckerman Lane, Suite 206, Potomac, MD 20854

1-800-GAMES-4-U or 301-299-9005

 $\underline{www.greatgameproducts.com} \bullet \underline{\mathrm{sales@bridgebaron.com}}$

(Shipping/handling not included • All prices in US dollars)





Bridge Baron 22 \$64.95

Comprehensive, easiest to use bridge game available. Download and CD available

Bridge Baron 22 is now available for iPad,

iPhone and Android devices. ** features may vary

Windows 2000 / XP / Vista / 7 (English, Francais, Deutsch) Macintosh/IMac/Mac OS X 10.5 or later (English, Francais, Deutsch)



<u>Introduction to Bridge — Play & Learn</u> with Pat Harrington \$34.95

Available on CD-Rom for Windows 2000/XP/Vista/7 (English Only)

• Teaches both bidding and play • Paced appropriately for beginners • Lessons 1-3 teach the mechanics, trick taking, and provide the background for

bidding • Lessons 4-6 teach opening bids and their responses • Quizzes to reinforce your understanding • Provides an extensive glossary and reference section • Includes 38 carefully crafted instructional deals, and 92 BONUS practice hands • Presented in an easy-to-use, interactive format



<u>Learn and Practice</u> Bidding Conventions \$29.95

Available on CD-Rom for Windows 2000/XP/Vista/7 (English only)

• Learn Conventions allows you to practice each convention in Bridge Baron. LPBC teaches you six conventions in depth using the interactive Bridge Baron Teacher architecture, and allows you to practice

these conventions as well. • LPBC teaches you and allows you to practice responses and rebids for conventions, while Learn Conventions does not offer practice of responses and rebids for conventions. • **LPBC 2** and $\underline{\mathbf{3}}$ are also availabe. They each contain seven convtions.

♣Jxxx is a balancing takeout double. There is something wrong with this hand. We don't have any hearts. If anyone would be void in hearts it usually would be the takeout doubler. The question is - Do we go conservative and allow for partner to have a strong notrump? Eight experts say yes. They don't want to bid above 3NT. The problem with bidding only $3 \spadesuit$ is that you're not going to get much help from partner if you belong in 5 ♦. Suppose LHO bids 3 \(\nsigma\) and it comes back to you. Are you now going to bid 5 ♦? I have found that passing when short in the opponent's suit expecting partner to have a stack or in this case bid 3NT, very rarely works. More likely you find partner with ♠AQxx ♥xxx ♦Kxxx ♣Ax and you miss a game as well as a cold slam.

Lublin: "3 ♦—It sounds like partner has a strong notrump."

Woolsey: "3 ♦ —No need to do more. Somebody is going to bid something when Γ'm void in hearts. When I find out who that somebody is and what they bid, I'll be better placed next round."

Theurer: " $3 \blacklozenge -I$ suppose there are those that would bid directly over $1 \blacktriangledown$ with this hand, but pass was our choice then. Partner rates to have more than a minimum for his balancing double since East only bid $2 \blacktriangledown$, but it isn't clear where we want to play this hand yet. So I will compete and see what partner does next. Also have to be careful since partner may not have good diamond support. He could have a balanced hand too good to bid 1NT initially."

Adams: "3 ♦ —Partner probably has some hearts. Given that, I expect a strong hand, which might include a one-suiter in spades. 3 ♦ is somewhat of an underbid, but since I expect there will be more bidding, it seems right. It shows values."

Hopkins: "3 ♦ —The auction seems strange, but I can see no reason for not showing my best suit. The auction might become more understandable in another round."

Schwartz: "3 ←—Seems that the most likely hand for partner is a balanced one too good for a 1NT reopening, Thus, I need to leave room for 3NT from partner."

Rogall: "3 ♦—Slight underbid, but leaves 3NT in play, and shows my diamonds. If part-

ner is doubling and bidding notrump, 3NT could easily be the limit of the hand or even go down. Unless we have a diamond fit, 5♦ needs a lot, so I can respect a 3NT bid if that comes next. If partner is balancing with an offshape hand, she probably has some extra values and no stopper or wasted values and we belong in diamonds at some level. If partner is doubling and bidding spades, I'll hear about that next. In the case where they're still uncovering a big fit, and partner actually has a standard takeout double, I'll get to bid again. Passing to let partner finish describing her hand was tempting, but it makes it even harder to describe mine and though unlikely, could end the auction. Cue-bidding or splintering takes up too much space. Bidding 2NT, which I play for takeout, wrong-sides notrump."

One expert joins me and makes the value bid for this hand.

King: " $4 \blacklozenge$ —Seems too good for just $3 \blacklozenge$ and I can stand partner correcting either directly or indirectly with $4 \blacktriangledown$ to find other strains."

One expert cue-bids. This hand is not strong enough to force to game.

Parker: "3♥—And then 4♦ over 3♠. Hopefully this will show a tolerance for spades, a four-three fit will play well if partner has good spades and bids 4♠."

Bid your own hand and don't worry about what partner might have.

2) IMPs, None Vulnerable

<u>SOUTH</u> 1 ♦ ?????	WEST Pass	NORTH 1♠	EAST Pass
Action	<u>Score</u>	<u>Votes</u>	Solvers
2 👫	100	3	26
3♦	90	7	111
3♣	70	0	16
5♦	50	0	1
2♦	50	0	20
3NT	30	0	5
4NT	20	0	2
2♥	20	0	1
4 lack	20	0	5
1NT	20	0	1

Paid Advertisement -9-

How do you show a better than average hand with long diamonds? One way is to jump to 3 ♠. 3 ♠ shows 16-18 with at least six diamonds. This hand is actually stronger than 16-18. How do you show a more distributional diamond hand? One way is to bid 2♣ and then bid diamonds, diamonds and more diamonds assuming 2♣ does not end the auction. When you bid diamonds again, partner will know that his club honors and major-suit aces are valuable.

Seven experts jump to $3 \spadesuit$. If partner bids over $3 \spadesuit$, you won't know how strong he is. He could have just enough to think about game or enough to think about slam. His subsequent bids won't tell you which of those he has.

Lublin: "3 ♦ —Seven-card suits are meant to be played in. I will bid 4 ♣ over 3 ♥ or 3NT bid by partner."

Parker: "3 ♦ — Then guess what to do over 3NT. I think 4. over 3NT. If he has a diamond fit then 5. ♦ should be fine."

Woolsey: "3 ←—I don't see any reason to introduce the club suit. Diamonds is where I live, and this looks like the right value bid."

King: "3 ♦ —3 ♦ seems right to me on both the suit to bid and the level to bid it."

Adams: "3 ♦ — Must be a trick here somewhere, this bid just seems obvious."

Hopkins: "3 ♦—Too strong in playing strength to do less. Partner will know a singleton Diamond honor is quite valuable."

He'll know about the diamond honor but he won't know about club honors.

Schwartz: " $3 \spadesuit$ —Certainly not introducing clubs with a three-card difference and that hand and suit is much too good for $2 \spadesuit$."

Two experts join me and bid $2 \, ... \, 2 \, ... \, is$ rarely passed and partner's response will give us a lot of information. If he bids $2 \, ... \, o$ or 3NT, you'll know that he has an opening bid. If he bids $2 \, ... \, o$, you'll know that he has a weak hand. If he raises clubs, jumps in spades or bids 2NT, you'll know that he has an invitational hand. You might even catch partner with $Axxx \, vxx \, o \, x \, o \,$

Rogall: "2♣—I hate underbidding, but there's just too much going for it again. 3NT is only likely if partner has the ◆K or invitational values and the five-level game needs some working values in clubs or some combination of enough points and tricks outside. In either case, partner will probably bid again, possibly taking a false preference with 2-3 in the minors."

Theurer: "2♣—I'd like to keep the bidding low since this hand could belong in anything from a partial to slam and not necessarily in diamonds. This bid is less limiting than a 2♦ rebid and conserves space; I intend to keep rebidding diamonds thereafter to show long diamonds and four clubs, but with a constructive hand. With a minimum six-four I would rebid 2♦. Sometimes I catch partner with short diamonds and five clubs so even with this suit disparity I think clubs should be mentioned. Imagine ♠Axxx♥xxx♦x♣KQxxx. A 3♦-rebid is possible here but the suit needs help and that bid gobbles up significantly more bidding space."

Bidding 2.4 and then rebidding your long suit can help you describe non-biddable hands and get information about partner's hand.

3) IMPs, They're Vulnerable

♦AQ9753♥984♦AKJ10♣-

<u>SOUTH</u>	WEST	NORTH	EAST Pass
?????	1 •	1 🗸	1 455
<u>Action</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Votes</u>	Solvers
4.	100	2	17
2 👫	90	8	94
2 🛦	70	0	16
1 🛦	70	0	39
5 .	70	0	1
4♥	50	0	14
3♣	20	0	3
2NT	20	0	1
2♦	20	0	1
3♥	20	0	1
4NT	20	0	1

Suppose partner holds $\bigstar Kx \, \nabla AQJxxx \, \bigstar xx$ $\bigstar xxx$ which is a middle of the road minimum $1 \, \nabla$ -overcall. In response to a cue-bid Γd probably bid $2 \, \bigstar$, which shows a Last Train mini-

mum. With a very bad hand I'd bid 2 ♥. With a 14-count, I'd force to game. Over 2 ♦ or $2 \heartsuit$, you could bid $4 \clubsuit$ which is a splinter, showing club shortness with slam intentions. However, West could easily have a long club suit. And guess what, he's allowed to bid 3 & or even 4. Then you'd lose your chance to splinter. You could easily have a slam if partner has no wasted honors in clubs and has good trumps. Over 4♣ which sets hearts as trump, if partner has good trumps, he'll bid 4 ♦ (Last Train) to encourage. Setting trumps ASAP is very important in constructive auctions. Showing good trumps is very important in slam auctions. 6 ♥ is not a bad slam opposite $\triangle xx \forall AKI10x \triangle xxx \triangle xxx$.

Only one expert joins me and sets trump ASAP.

Lublin: "4♣—I bid 2♠ if playing fit showing jumps. If not, I bid 4♣ which is a splinter."

Eight experts expect to be able to describe this hand. Since 1 & is not forcing, the only way to show a forcing spade hand is to cuebid and then bid spades which means that 2 & does not promise heart support.

Parker: "2♣—Then a forcing 2♠ and then a heart raise. What else could you bid?"

Partner will really be confused. He might think that you only have two-card heart support.

Woolsey: "2. —Since there are three possible trump suits, I need to start slowly. Partner's next bid may be helpful."

If there are three possible trump suits, you're not only worried about what's trump, you're worried about level.

King: "2♣—Clearly I want to force and as far as I know in Washington Standard this is about the only forcing bid. What to bid next is a little more problematic."

True, in Washington Standard, $1 \triangleq is$ not forcing and $2 \triangleq is$ only 98% forcing. Club bids are the only forcing bids.

Theurer: "2. —It would be better if a simple new suit bid here was forcing, but in Washington Standard it isn't. Since there is a chance that 1. could be passed out, I can't risk it here. Interesting that RHO didn't raise

clubs - either LHO has a bunch of them or partner has length there. The vulnerable opponents aren't too likely to make things difficult for us in our game or slam exploration so we should have an opportunity to explore for our best level and strain."

Suppose 1 \(\text{\alpha} \) was forcing. You bid 1 \(\text{\alpha} \) and LHO is allowed to have a long club suit and bid it. How are you going to make your heart slam try now?

Adams: "2 & —1 & and 2 & are not forcing, so 2 & it is. Vulnerable to a 4 & preempt, but at least I've shown support."

If someone is going to bid 4., why shouldn't it be you? Do you think that 2. shows heart support?

Hopkins: "2♣—I am going to keep it simple and try for a Heart slam."

4 ♣ keeps it simple.

Schwartz: "2. —Should be able to bid spades later at this vulnerability. If I was sure partner couldn't pass 1. , I would chance that."

Cue-bidding and bidding spades does not set trump. Cue-bidding and bidding spades means that all of partner's bids are trying to decide which suit is trump.

Rogall: "2♣—Fit Showing Jumps aren't available and a jump to 2♠ is only invitational. Next I'll bid spades, forcing, then hearts. A splinter doesn't let me get the spades in and distorts the trump support. If opener rebids some clubs, I'll have to decide whether I've still got time to mention the spades."

If $2 \triangleq was$ fit showing, then at least hearts are in the picture. However, if West bids $3 \triangleq$, you won't be able to show club shortness.

Set trumps ASAP. If you're playing new suits non-forcing, a cue-bid does NOT promise support.

4) IMPs, They're Vulnerable

♦K107654**♥**K10543**♦**2**♣**3

 $\begin{array}{c|cccc} \textbf{SOUTH} & \textbf{WEST} & \textbf{NORTH} & \textbf{EAST} \\ \hline & 1 \spadesuit & 2 \text{NT} \end{array}$

?????

<u>Action</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Votes</u>	Solvers
$4 \blacktriangle$	100	3	111
4NT	80	3	12
Pass	70	1	0
4.	70	2	5
3♦	40	0	25
5♠	40	1	13
$4 \blacklozenge$	40	0	2
3♠	40	0	5
3♥	20	0	8
$4 \mathbf{V}$	20	0	1
3♣	20	0	6

How do you handle a hand when you have at least an eleven-card fit? What you want to do is to show support without promising defense and then be able to pass if partner makes a penalty double. Suppose partner holds ♠AJxxx ♥x ♠QJ10x ♣KQJ. Partner will be very happy to double the opponents if they bid at the five-level and would be very unhappy if you pulled his double. If partner doesn't double them at the five-level then it makes sense to bid five over five.

Two experts splinter. $4 \, \$$ creates a force which means that we can't let them play the contract undoubled. Partner is going to double five-of-either-minor anytime he doesn't think you belong at the five-level. I'd double $5 \, \blacklozenge$, holding $AQJxx \, \blacktriangledown Qxx \, \clubsuit Jxx$.

Hopkins: "4. —I am going to splinter which might help us if we end up on defense and partner can give me a Club ruff against a Diamond contract. I don't see many losers for us in Spades and I can always cooperate if partner makes slam noises."

Lublin: "4♣—I bid 4♣ splinter and bid 5♠ and 6♠ over all saves."

Three experts bid 4NT. If partner has $AJxxx \bigvee xx \bigwedge xx Axx KQJ$, he'll show his two aces by bidding $5 \bigvee$ over $5 \bigwedge$ using the D0P1 convention. Over $5 \bigwedge$, partner doubles with no keycards, passes with one keycard, bids $5 \bigvee$ with two keycards and bids $5 \bigwedge$ with three keys. You'll be forced to play at the five-level even if partner has five-of-a-minor beaten in his own hand.

Parker: "4NT—Blackwood. Since I will compete to the five-level when they bid five-of-a-minor I might as well see if we have three aces and play a slam. All partner needs is ♠Axxxx♥Ax♠Axx♣xxx."

Of course if Opener has three aces there's

no guarantee that you can make anything. If Opener has $\triangle AQJxx \bigvee xxx \triangle Axx \triangle Ax$, you could have three heart losers and definitely have two.

Adams: "4NT—I figure the next bid will be at the five-level, and I'd like partner's response to be key cards, presumably D0P1 over five-of-a-minor. Hoping to buy the hand in 4♠ is wishful thinking."

Rogall: "4NT—Anything could be right. Whose hand is it? We could have a slam. They could have a slam. I'm guessing it's better than even odds that the opponents have a spade void. I'd like to show my hearts, support spades, and then cue-bid below game, but that's a fantasy. With such a big fit ourselves and one or more likely big fits with the opponents, there's no time. If we were playing Fit Showing Jumps (FSJ), I'd bid 4♥. Yes, I know that even playing FSJs, no one else would play a jump to four-of-a-Major was anything but natural, but I don't know why. 3♣ showing forcing hearts is available. I love FSJs! They're constructive and preemptive at the same time. Without a FSJ, 4NT RKC will have to do as the less constructive poor woman's preempt. At least it steals RKC from the opponents! Partner may be deluded into thinking that it's our hand, but all the bids have flaws, 3 showing forcing hearts doesn't take up any space. An all-out preempt of 5♠ doesn't show the trick taking ability of the hand. 6♠ is just a hair too unilateral. A direct bid of 5♦, exclusion RKC, would have been a fun psych, but really random —maybe good if we're way behind in a match.

If they bid at the five-level over 4NT, even 5 ♠ leaves room, with D0P1, to get good key card info and ignoring the trump Q is fine. We can't know about heart losers or heart ruff(s), but we can actually distinguish better between zero and three and between one and four key cards and then I should be captain. Taking partner out of the decision is a problem primarily when she shows two key cards because I won't know if one of them is the unlikely to cash ♠ A."

One expert passes. Passing lets the opponents describe their hands to each other. For instance, suppose West bids three-of-a-minor and East raises. Just because the opponents think they can make five-of-a-minor, doesn't mean that they can make it. Partner could have strength in their suits which would set them.

Woolsey: "Pass—Since I can always outbid West, I want to see how high he is willing to go without being pushed. If I make any kind of spade raise and he bids five-of-aminor, I won't know what he is thinking."

At least you'll know what partner is thinking.

Three experts jump in spades. Partner won't be expecting defense so any double by him will mean that he really has them. Why is it clear that the opponents are going to bid over 4♠? Is West going to bid 5♠ holding ♠xx ♥AQxx ♠Jxxx ♣xxx? I wouldn't. Is East going to take another bid over 4♠ holding ♠-♥J10x ♠AQ10xx ♣KQ10xx? I wouldn't. 4♠ could easily buy the contract. However, against Woolsey who passed 2NT, the opponents will easily find their five-of-a-minor contract.

One expert goes minus against my previous example for no good reason.

King: "5♠—I want to make them guess at as high a level as possible. Maybe I should make a lead directing bid in hearts but that might lead to confusion later on. Maybe pass or a tactical 3♠ would also work, but such actions seldom work for me."

Two experts join me and make the normal bid when holding a weak hand with long trumps.

Theurer: "4♠—I considered bidding 5♠ as advance save vs. a 5♣ or 5♦ contract and make them guess, but I'd rather let partner have a say in what to do if LHO bids 4NT, 5♣ or 5♦. He may have good defense and want to defend. If he passes I have the option of continuing on to 5♠."

Schwartz: "4♠—Who knows, at this vulnerability, I might buy it. Considered an immediate 4NT, at least I would know the limit of the hand."

Sometimes the simplest answer is the best answer.

5) IMPs, You're Vulnerable

AA32♥AK765◆J♣A654

SOUTH	WEST	NORTH	EAST
3♥	3 ^	4♦	2♠ Pass
?????			

<u>Action</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Solvers</u>
4 lacksquare	100	1	35
$4 \blacktriangle$	90	8	48
5♣	80	1	43
Pass	40	0	12
5♦	40	0	28
4NT	30	0	20
5NT	20	0	1
6♦	20	0	1

What do you think is the best contract based on the bidding so far? 3NT. However, I don't think the Directors will allow you to bid 3NT. What are your choices over $4 \spadesuit$? You could pass, however 4 ♦ is forcing and unlimited. If I had to guess, I'd bet that $4 \spadesuit$ would be the best possible contract. 5♣ is a choice, however partner had a chance to show diamonds and clubs by doubling $3 \clubsuit$. Double of $3 \clubsuit$ is responsive and shows diamonds and clubs. Raising to 5 ♦ is a possibility. There are many diamond hands such as $\triangle xx \lor Qx \land KQxxxx \land Kxx, \land xx \lor Qx \land Kxxxxxx$ ACQ or Axx <math>CQx AQxxxx ACQx where S AQx is a horrible contract. $4 \blacklozenge does not promise a self$ sufficient suit. Eight experts cue-bid. 4 A is a slam try showing a good hand with diamond support. You do have a good hand, however the diamond support is lacking. What's left? 4 ♥! If partner has two hearts, the 5-2 at the four-level could be the best possible contract. Partner could bid 5 ♦ over 4 ♥, but can't bid 4 ♥ over 5 ♦.

Eight experts think that their minors are $lack Axxx \clubsuit J$. I don't understand why they think that the singleton jack is great trump support. The singleton jack would be good support if partner had rebid the suit three times. $4 \spadesuit$ is a cue-bid and shows support.

What would partner's response to 4♠ mean? 4NT would be RKC for diamonds. 5♣ would be a Last Train bid. Too much to signoff but not enough to insist on slam opposite a 3 ♥-bid followed by a cue-bid. 5♠ would be a sign off showing a minimum 4♠-bid. Those experts expecting to find a club fit might end up in a 4-2 fit.

Woolsey: "4 — My jack of diamonds looks like a really fat card. With all these controls I must show some slam interest even with little diamond support."

Don't you need a fit?

...continued on p. 17

2014 Trophy Race Standings

www.WashingtonBridgeLeague.org

Updated by John Adams

The Lovenberg Race is open to all WBL members; the Izzy Cohen Race is open to all WBL members who started the calendar year with less than 1500 masterpoints; the Tubbs Race is open to all WBL members who started the

Izzy Cohen

3 33.11 Guillaume de Decker

1 39.10 Terry Klein

4 32.16 Barry Tash

9 27 87 Prem Card

5 32.16 James Wisman

6 28.80 Michael Kuehl

8 27.89 Charles Dearolf

28.65 Margaret Cooke

2 37.02 Myron Goldstein

calendar year as a Non-Life Master with less than 500 masterpoints; the Woolridge Race is open to all WBL members who started the calendar year with less than 20 masterpoints.

Winners in each category receive four sessions of free plays. Second place gets two and third place gets one.

This list is up to date through Au-K su

39.10 Terry Klein

35.42 Michael Gill

38.43 Andrew Gofreed

37.02 Myron Goldstein

rust	28, 2014	, not including the Unit	9	21.81	Prem Garg
-		and Robin. All points are	10	27.82	James Berry
		-	11	27.01	Leon Masiewicki
cas _j .	12 27.00 Peter Isard 13 26.52 Norman Kittrell 14 24.52 Jim Walsh 15 23.84 Ajit Thyagarajan Tubbs 1 39.10 Terry Klein 2 37.02 Myron Goldstein 1 39.10 Terry Klein 39.10				
		U	13	26.52	Norman Kittrell
1			14	24.52	Jim Walsh
2			15	23.84	Ajit Thyagarajan
3					
4		•	1	30.10	
5					
6	74.02	Larry Kahn	3		
7	69.08	Lloyd Rawley		32.16	2
8	66.70	Linda Marshall	4	28.80	
9	65.63	H John Edmonds	5	28.65	O
10	64.91	John Adams	6	27.89	
11	60.50	William Cole	7	27.00	
12	58.27	Donna Rogall	8		
13	58.10	Ronald Zucker	9	24.52	•
14	57.36		10	22.05	Mary Ourand
15	56.99	, 0			Woolridge
16	48.44	Michael Richey	1	14.53	Marc Zlotnik
17	47.03	Robert Bell	2	13.96	John Goon
18	44.91	William Pettis	3	13.08	David Narrow
19	44.10	David Ruderman	4	11.30	Kate Baldwin
20	42.94	Mark Shaw	5	11.30	Stephen Baldwin
21	40.99	Fred King	6	7.97	Carl Barth

UNIT GAME CARPOOL AVAILABLE

9

10

To arrange a carpool, contact Melissa Price, Carpool Coordinator, at 301-464-1261 or melissadprice46@gmail.com.

0 - 20LESSON & GAME

GUARANTEED PARTNERS!

> **7:00**PM LESSON

7:30 -10 ISH **G**AME

JOIN ANYTIME

The cost is \$5. This includes a 30 minute lesson followed by fun, enjoyable bridge for players with 0-20 masterpoints.

Lessons will cover slam bidding, weak twos, 3 level+ preempts, overcalls, takeout doubles, negative doubles, openleads, signaling. Each lesson will be tailored to the needs and interests of the players.

This is a great program for beginners as well as experienced social bridge players! Partners will be provided if needed. For more information, contact Bryan or Lois Geer at 301-236-0014 or by email at geerbridge@ verizon.net.

~ * + SCHEDULE * * ~ Most games held at Ohr Kodesh

09/25/14**StrataFlighted Unit Championship 10/02/14**D6 STaC Stratified Pairs 10/09/14** WBL Sectional 10/16/14⁺BAM <u>Teams</u>; NLM Charity Pairs *Christ the King Church: 2301 Colston Dr., Silver Spring $10/23/2014 \ldots \ldots \underline{NVBA \ Sectional}$ 10/30/2014Club Appreciation StrataFlighted Pairs 11/06/2014Unit Charity StrataFlighted Pairs 11/13/2014StrataFlighted Unit Championship 11/20/2014StrataFlighted Grand National <u>Teams</u> 11/27/2014CLOSED—Thanksgiving 12/04/2014StrataFlighted Unit Championship 12/11/14*Holiday Party; D6 STaC Stratified Pairs 12/18/2014StrataFlighted Grand National Teams 12/25/2014CLOSED—Christmas 01/01/2015<u>CLOSED</u>—New Year's Day 01/08/2015 WBL Sectional

Check website for any schedule changes. Bold dates held at other locations: *TBD; **Kensington Town Hall/Armory.

For a Last-Minute Partner, to say you'll be late, to hear announcements (closings posted by 4pm), or to contact the Unit Game for any reason, call the WBL Cell Phone:

(301) 395-2760

Map to Ohr Kodesh Congregation



ALERT? The Unit Game is now played at Ohr Kodesh. NO OUTSIDE FOOD IS ALLOWED. Snacks and drinks will be provided.

WBL GUARANTEED PARTNER PROGRAM

You never need to miss the unit game because vou don't have a partner at the last minute! The WBL has a guaranteed partner (GP) program for players who occasionally need a partner for the unit game. Here's how it works: we provide a standby partner; if an odd number of people in need of a partner arrive, we match the players as best we can, and the GP plays with the one who is left. (If there is an even number of players looking, the GP goes home). You can always get a game.

Players in search of partners should try to arrive between 7:00 and 7:15 (or call ahead). The partnership desk closes at 7:25. You can call the WBL cell phone (301) 395-2760 at the last minute if are on your way and know you'll be at bit late.

To find a partner in the Open or B/C/D game at least a day in advance, contact Barbara Doran at UnitGamePartner@DistrictSix. org or barb.doran@verizon.net, or call 301-608-0347 between 9am and 10pm. To find a partner for the NLM game, contact **Shawn Stringer** at 301-275-6363 or ShStringer@aol.com.

You might want to volunteer for the GP program yourself. It's a great way to meet people. If you play on the night you're the GP, you play free. If you volunteer, you receive a free play for any future unit game whether or not you play that night.

Partnerships Close AT 7:25pm TO START THE GAME PROMPTLY AT 7:30PM. CALL IF YOU'RE LATE. OR YOU MAY NOT BE ACCOMMODATED.

7.27 Antony Heatwole

6.41 Carolin Crabbe

6.41 Barbara Teng

6.00 Sheila Blum

THE UNIT GAME

Please contact Chris Miller, Club Manager and Chief Director, at <u>unitgamedirector@districtsix.org</u> if you have any questions about how the WBL Unit Game is run. This column answers some frequently asked questions.

RESULTS POSTING

The WBL home page no longer posts a separate recap of weekly results; instead, there is a link to the ACBL Club Results page for the Unit Game, where Thursday evening results have also been posted regularly for the last few years.

The ACBL site posts are in what I think is a very nice format, using information from the BridgeMates to give a recap of each board showing the hand record with the contract and matchpoints for every play of the board in every section. However, a few people miss the tabular format that was on the WBL site, which looks like the familiar printed recaps. For those people, we have now started posting that format also to the ACBL site, in the Thursday afternoon slot beside the evening link to the new format.

A tip for quickly reviewing your own scores in the new format (details may differ from browser to browser): type the "Find in Page" command for your browser (ctrl-F for Chrome and Internet Explorer) and type in your surname; then press the Find Next key (F3 for Chrome) or click the Next button to jump to the next result. You will also find that while a search is active, most browsers highlight every matching occurrence, so you can also see where you are easily while just scrolling down the page.

UPCOMING SECTIONALS

- ♠ October 9-12, 2014, WBL, Kensington, MD
- ♣ October 23-26, 2014, NVBA, Fairfax, VA
- ♦ January 8-11, 2015, WBL, Kensington, MD
- ♥ February 19-22, 2015, NVBA, Fairfax, VA
- ♠ April 9-12, 2015, WBL, Kensington, MD
- ♣ April 23-26, 2015, NVBA, Fairfax, VA
- ♦ July 30-Aug 2 2015, WBL, Kensington, MD
 - ♥ <u>Sept 24-27, 2015</u>, NVBA, Fairfax, VA

Do you have any MUSCLE OR BRAINS TO SPARE?

The Washington Bridge League could use a little of either! In order to keep events exciting and entry fees low, the WBL relies on the goodness of our members to volunteer for small jobs at the Unit Game and Sectional Tournaments. Some jobs require brains while others require muscle. We'll be happy to employ either.

From setting up and breaking down tables, to publicity and events development, a little effort from you will make our bridge community even better. Busy schedule? No worries. Most volunteer assignments take only 15 minutes to 1 hour a month.

Here's how to help:

- 1. Reply by email, phone or in person if you are willing to help in any way.
- 2. Please indicate if you can offer any special skills (such as marketing or a strong back).
- 3. Someone will contact you shortly with a choice of assignments you can pick from.

Thank you in advance for any assistance you can provide.

Barbara Summers, Volunteer Coordinator, 301-598-5838, jimbarb1184@aol.com,

Solvers' Club, cont. from p. 13...

King: "4♠—I hope partner reads this as uncertainty about strain rather than a strong diamond raise. If he has completely self-sufficient diamonds, then this cue-bid should help him judge the right level."

Theurer: "4♠—I have a sound hand for my initial 3♥ bid, especially in terms of controls. Partner neither supported hearts nor made a responsive double, so his pattern rates to be something like 1-2-6-4 possibly even seven diamonds. My diamond support is poor but at least I have an honor, even if it's only the Jack. Partner could easily have something like $A \times V Q \times KQ 10xxxx + Kxx$ where $6 \rightarrow is$ excellent. So I will cue-bid. If partner bids 5♦, I will pass. Otherwise if partner has excellent diamonds plus a side card in hearts or clubs he should cooperate since I would have to have very good controls to be issuing a slam try."

Adams: "4 — Likely we have a slam, probably in diamonds."

Hopkins: "4♠—A two-way bid covering whichever meaning partner intended for 4♠."

I think partner intended $4 \spadesuit$ as natural and forcing.

Schwartz: "4♠—Given my 3♥-bid, this is a great hand for diamonds as partner should have at least a good six-card suit. Also leaves wrong bid.

open the possibility of getting to clubs."

Rogall: "4♠—I'm assuming 4♠ is a cuebid for diamonds and not RKC, nor a choice of games since we're passed 4♥ and I could bid 5♣ to offer clubs. If partner has great diamonds (she could have made a responsive double with both diamonds and clubs) and the **V**O, a slam is very possible...even a grand. If she's looking at that, she can find out what she needs to know with 4NT—RKC. I'm also assuming 4NT isn't natural at any time here. The hand isn't quite good enough without a fit in either suit and with likely bad breaks to bid RKC myself. If all my assumptions are correct, I'm glad I can cue-bid below RKC to leave that option for partner. With an unlimited partner, I owe her one cuebid with my three key cards and a possible source of tricks on the side. I'm limited, so she shouldn't go crazy."

Lublin: "4♠—I bid 4♠ to get clarification from partner. Partner should work out I have club ace."

One expert bids clubs. I'm not sure that I'd Responsive double $3 \triangleq \text{holding} \triangleq xx \checkmark Qx$ $\triangleq AKQxx \triangleq xxxx$ since partner would choose clubs with equal minors.

Parker: "5♣—Partner must have a good hand so I can't pass. I will bid out my shape and pass 5♦ if he bids it."

When all bids seem wrong, make the cheapest wrong hid.

Solvers' Scores

John Adams	3♦	3♦	2 👫	4NT	4♠	440
Robbie Hopkins	3♦	3♦	2 ♣	4 ♣	4♠	430
Glen Lublin	3♦	3♦	4 ♣	4 ♣	4♠	440
Fred King	4 lacklar	3♦	2.	5 ♠	4♠	410
Steve Parker	3♥	3♦	2 ♣	4NT	5 ♣	390
Steve Robinson	4 lacklark	2 ♣	4 ♣	4 🛦	$4 lap{\hspace{-0.5em}\checkmark\hspace{-0.5em}}$	500
Donna Rogall	3♦	2 ♣	2.	4NT	4♠	450
Alan Schwartz	3♦	3♦	2 ♣	4 🖍	4♠	460
Brad Theurer	3♦	2 ♣	2 ♣	4 🖍	4♠	470
Kit Woolsev	3♦	3♦	2 .	Pass	4♠	430

COMMITTEE ACTION #83

by Rich Colker, rcolker@gmail.com

The following appeal decision occurred in the third quarter-final segment of the Wagar Women's KO at the 2014 Summer NABC in Las Vegas. It caused quite a row among many of the players so let's see if you can sort out the wheat from the chaff. A few things you should know up front are that the event was played behind screens (North and East screenmates, as were South and West) and N/S were US players while E/W were Chinese (and East's English was not very good).

Bd: 15; Vul: N/S; Dlr: South

North

- **▲** J98
- ▼ KQ3
- ♦ K8 ♣ AJ932

West		<u>East</u>	
\blacktriangle	53	^	AQ76
¥	A76	~	J82
•	AQJ975	•	32
*	107	*	KQ63

South

- **♦** K1042
- ▼ 10954
- ♦ 1064 **\$** 85

West	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>	South
			Pass
1 •	Dbl	Rdbl	Pass ⁽¹⁾
Pass	2 ♣	Pass ⁽²⁾	Pass
2♦	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

- (1) South said to West, "Means nothing."
- (2) Forcing

South led the \$8, at which point North lowered the screen (for privacy) and told East that her partner (South) would not usually have a fourcard major on this auction. The contract went down two, -150 for E/W, and East summoned the Director at the end of play. She told him she believed she had been told that South could not have a four-card major, so if the club lead was from a doubleton, South's distribution had to be 3=3=5=2. The Director determined that the play to the first five tricks went as follows:

Trick 1: **48-47-4A-4** Trick 2: ♥K - ♥2 - ♥4 - ♥6 Trick 3: ♥0 - ♥8 - ♥5 - ♥A Trick 4: \$10 - \$J - \$0 - \$5 Trick 5: $\diamond 2 - \diamond 4 - \diamond 5 - \diamond 8$

The Director decided that E/W had received an accurate description of their opponents' methods, but East had not fully understood what she was told. In that case there was no misinformation (MI) and, therefore, the table result was allowed to stand (3NT by East down three, +150 for N/S).

Committee ruling: North-South minus 430, East-West minus 150

E/W appealed the ruling. All four players attended the hearing. E/W told the Committee that East's English was poor and she did not understand the meaning of the term "usually." Based

Did You Know?

The Rockville Duplicate Bridge Club has a game almost every day!

Join us often and spread the word!

DAY	TIME	LOCATION
Monday*	11:15 AM	St James
Tuesday	7:00 PM	Rockville Senior Center
Thursday*	11:15 AM	St James
Friday *	11:15 AM	St James
Saturday*	1:00 PM	St James

*0-1000 game in addition to the open game --as attendance allows--

www.rockvilledbc.com

Need a Partner? Call Mark Lavine: 301-503-3348

Locations:

St James Episcopal Church 11815 Seven Locks Road
11815 Seven Locks Road
Potomac, MD

Rockville Senior Center 1150 Carnation Dr Rockville, MD

on the given information, East expected South to be 3=3=5=2 and she played the deal accordingly. N/S told the Committee that South's second pass was explained by her to West as, "Pass means nothing." After the opening lead North closed the screen window and pointed to the word "usually" on her written explanation in an attempt to emphasize it. Her full written statement was: "Usually she doesn't have four hearts or four spades."

The Committee decided that North, though trying to be helpful, explained an agreement that she and her partner did not explicitly have, and therefore gave MI. East was also culpable; she should have asked for more information, as she didn't understand the word "usually." In addition, her play of a diamond to the five was a "practice finesse" that could never gain. In these situations Law 12C1(e) instructs the Director (or Committee) in an ACBL event to assign the offending side "the most unfavorable result that was at all probable" while the non-offending side is assigned "the most favorable result that was likely had the irregularity not occurred." The declarer here gets the benefit of the doubt and, with best play, the Committee decided that she would have emerged with 10 tricks. Accordingly, the result for N/S was adjusted to 3NT by East making four, -430. Law 12C1(b) also instructs that the non-offending side does not receive the benefit of the adjustment if they contributed to thier own damage by a serious error unrelated to the irregularity. Accordingly, the Committee allowed the table result to stand for E/W (3NT down three, -150). Since this was a KO match the two results were each imped against the result from the other table and the two resulting imp scores averaged to determine the final score for the board. (It should also be pointed out that no one on the Committee knew the state of the match during their deliberations.)

The Committee's decision that there was MI and that the non-reciprocal score adjustments described above were appropriate was carried by a three-to-two vote. One of the minority members offered the following dissenting opinion (paraphrased somewhat for brevity):

This decision has two distinct parts: the determination of whether there was MI and the determination of the resulting adjustment. I dissent on the former. Communication between bridge players who do not speak each other's language must be a two-way street. A non-native speaker cannot be allowed to extract only 70 percent of the meaning of something said and hold her opponent entirely liable for failure to communicate completely - especially when she has evidence that only part of the meaning has been extracted.

In this case North wrote a note explaining a partnership tendency that was not an explicit agreement but she did not say or imply that it was an explicit agreement. This was proactive, full disclosure. Further, her written statement was not inaccurate. When it became apparent to her that East was ignoring the word "usually" she lowered the screen after the opening lead and pointed repeatedly at the word "usually." East thus had considerable evidence that she wasn't understanding the written explanation. With a duty to clear up communication problems, East had much reason to believe she was not processing North's attempt to communicate. In my opinion, when East made no effort to close the communication gap, she should be held to proceed at her own risk.

There may have been a technical irregularity in North's zealous attempt to fully reveal what was going on, but that should not exempt East from her responsibility to close the obvious communication gap so that the game of bridge can determine winners.

So, do you agree with the Committee majority, the minority (as reflected in the minority opinion), or think that some other decision should have been reached? You might want to decide on your position before reading on.

I fail see any justification for the majority position that East was given MI. Most players in the South position in this auction would normally bid a four-card major over the redouble if they had one (which is where the "usually" comes in) but holding both there was no need to do so since North would normally ("usually"?) bid a major if she had one to stay as low as possible. The Committee's written decision talks about North explaining an agreement that she and her partner did not explicitly have, as if this was some sort of irregularity. Hardly. Law 20F1 requires every player to explain not only their explicit partnership agreements but also their tendencies, knowledge stemming from their past experience playing together, any inferences deriving from their agreements that might not be readily available from just knowing their agreements, and even information about alternative calls available that were not made. In short, players are required to provide the opponents with anything that might help them understand the implications of the auction. If anything, North bent over backwards to make sure

East had all the relevant information. Indeed, it was East who failed to find out more about N/S's methods when it was painfully obvious from North's frantic pointing at "unusually" in her written explanation that she (East) did not fully understand what she was being told.

As for East, she clearly played North to be 4=4=0=5, as evidenced by her play of the 45 from dummy at trick 5, expecting North to show out. But as the write-up says, this was an unnecessary ("practice") finesse since with the ♥A gone from dummy she could never take more than three diamond tricks if South held four or five diamonds. In fact, her whole line of play was strange. Just ask yourself why South would bid a major over the redouble holding both of them and risk North passing with three of the bid major and four of the other for fear of getting a level higher than necessary. Wasn't North going to find her side's best fit with her next bid if South just passed? And if South held king-fourth or -fifth of diamonds then wasn't the AK was a heavy favorite to be onside? She could simply play to take two clubs, three diamonds, two hearts and two spades. And what if North had the stiff ♦ K? Now the diamonds would come in for four or five tricks if she put in the $\blacklozenge 9$ on the first round and the spade finesse would not even be needed. And that play would only lose to the stiff ◆10 with North (and she might survive even then with her club spots given the \\$8 opening lead).

It seems that East was awarded the match (the adjustment was just enough to swing the match in E/W's favor) despite her incompetence in both failing to get the information she needed from the auction which she clearly didn't understand and from her inferior play. And why did East not double 2♣? Maybe she didn't like her club spots to double in front of partner, but did she really want to hear West bid 2♦ opposite her 3-2? And why didn't she consider why North failed to look for a four-three major-suit fit at the one level rather than a potential five-one or five-two club fit at the two level if she was really 4=4=0=5?

Sorry, but North did nothing wrong here. In fact, I commend her efforts at full disclosure, or what Bobby Wolff would call "Active Ethics." It is certainly not MI to explain implications of your system based on past experience or inference. Indeed, it is an obligation. The minority was right on the money on this point - indeed, with its entire dissent. I'm terribly disappointed in this Committee's decision; NABC Appeals Committee members really should have known better.

Dedicated to excellence in

OUR PROFESSIONAL TEAM OF

CERTIFIED PUBLIC

ACCOUNTANTS

IN ROCKVILLE

CAN ASSIST YOU

WITH A WIDE RANGE

OF ACCOUNTING

AND TAX SERVICES.





Tax & Business Services Available:

- · Income Tax Return Preparation
- Estate & Trust Administration
- · Business Profitability Enhancement
- Estate Tax Return Preparation
- · Planning for Retirement Plan Setup & Distributions
- · Buying & Selling Business Consulting
- IRS Audits and Negotiations
- Divorce Tax Issues/Planning
- Nonprofit Organization Accounting & Income Taxes
- · Quickbooks Setup & Consulting

BARKANIC & AMES ED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

15825 Shady Grove Road, Suite 130 Rockville, MD 20850 301-330-6664 • 301-330-6860 Fax • www.fbacpa.com

67th Annual POTOMAC VALLEY TOURNAMENT

August 7-10, 2014

-Results-

TOP TEN CUMULATIVE		
POINT WINNERS		
All I	Players	
1	31.84Steve Robinson	
2	29.03	
3	26.31	
4	26.02	
5	20.11 Steven Schatzow	
6	19.54 Ronald Zucker	
7	19.14 Linda Marshall	
8	17.45 James Geist	
9	15.50 Albert Lauber	
10	15.39 Robert Bell	
Play	vers with fewer than 2000 masterpoints	
1	19.54	
2	15.50 Albert Lauber	
3	13.50 Jay Cherlow	
4	12.18Šven Pride	
5	10.58 Suzanne Abrams	
6	10.06	
7	9.71	
8	8.56	
9	8.54Michael Richey	
10	8.43Yuen De Anda	
	8.43	
Play	vers with fewer than 300 masterpoints	
1	8.56	
2	8.41	
3	5.33Samuel Huneke	
4	5.26Margaret Cooke	
	5.26	
6	4.87Deborah Cobb	
	4.87	
8	4.84	
	4.84 Mohammed Moiduddin	
10	4.77John Jackson	

Players with fewer than 100 masterpoints

4.77 Lester Slaback

2	4.87Deborah Cobb
3	4.84 Mohammed Moiduddin
	4.84
5	4.77John Jackson
6	3.95
	3.95
8	3.33 Wendy Morrison
9	2.77Richard Galleher
10	2.52 Arthur Keefe III



On Sunday afternoon of the tournament, Tournament Chair, Ron Zucker (right), stepped in for Steve Robinson in order to present the **Steve Robinson** Trophy to the 11th Annual Washington Bridge League Trophy Pairs winners: Steve Robinson and Bill Cole.

—Results—

	THURSDAY MORNING OPEN PAIRS
Stra	atum A, 16.0 Tables / Based on 33 Tables
1	James Garnher - Eileen Theimer 61.67
2	Steven Schatzow - Kenneth Davis60.07
3	Daniel Shankle Jr - Juline Glaz 58.96
4	Hillary Goulding - Barry Goulding58.06
5	Bob Boyd - Mark Tonnesen
6	Suzanne Abrams - David Loken 55.64
St	ratum B, 9.0 Tables / Based on 7 Tables
1	Hillary Goulding - Barry Goulding58.06
2	Malvern Sheffield, Jr - Andres Doernberg 54.53
3	Marshall Kramer - Suzanne Floyd54.37
4	Lester Slaback - John Jackson 54.10
5	David Bubes - Mike Sutton51.04
	Stratum C, 2.5 Tables
1	Lester Slaback - John Jackson 54.10
2	David Bubes - Mike Sutton
_	
	THURSDAY MORNING 0-1000 PAIRS
	Stratum A, 17.0 Tables
1	Randall Stephens - Philip Sticha 66.65

John Arnett Sr - Arthur Keefe III 64.77

- 20 -- 21 -

3 4 5 6	Robert Mendelsohn - Marilyn Forrest 60.95 Rosemary Kuntz - Hugh McNaughton 60.17 Ellen Forman - Dan Calistrat	1 2	Stratum C, 25.5 Tables Eric Poskanzer - Francesco Parisi- Presicce
	Stratum B, 12.0 Tables	3 4	Annapurna Satpathy - Sam Pal60.42 Richard Wissing - Dave Naftaly59.82
1	Randall Stephens - Philip Sticha 66.65	5	Barry Tash - James Wisman
2	John Arnett Sr - Arthur Keefe III 64.77	6	Jim Walsh - Charles Dearolf 59.23
3	Rosemary Kuntz - Hugh McNaughton 60.17		
4	Barbara Teng - Carolin Crabbe		Stratum D, 14.5 Tables
5 6	Mohammed Moiduddin - David Marchal 54.02 Reina Lerner - Gay Pirozzi	1	Jim Walsh - Charles Dearolf 59.23
U	Rema Lemer - Gay Firozzi	2	Michelle Zygielbaum - Ettie Gordon .54.76
	Stratum C, 5.5 Tables	3	Sandra Ferretti - William Hughes 54.33
1	Barbara Teng - Carolin Crabbe55.46	4/5 4/5	Samuel Huneke - Craig Huneke 54.17 Joy Oliver - Jill Benson
2	Mohammed Moiduddin - David Marchal 54.02	6	James Summers Jr - Stephen Weiner .52.38
3	Jeffrey Kayden - Mark Eisenstadt51.40		James Cammers J1 Stephen Weller .02.00
4	Patti Kemmer - Louise Deisseroth 50.96		THUR EVE NLM/100/50 @ WBL
	THU EVE FLIGHT A/X PAIRS		Stratum A, 8.5 Tables
C.		1	Tim Kuhn - Jake Kuhn
Sura	tum A, 25.0 Tables / Based on 75 Tables	2	Kate Baldwin - Stephen Baldwin 64.26
		3	Richard Barth - Carl Barth
		4	Terry Klein - Myron Goldstein 55.65
		5	Joseph Lebaron - Norman Kittrell55.07
			Stratum B, 6.0 Tables
		1	Tim Kuhn - Jake Kuhn
		2	Kate Baldwin - Stephen Baldwin 64.26
		3	Richard Barth - Carl Barth
		4	Phillip Shapiro - David Matusow 54.83
$\frac{1}{2}$	Larry Kahn - H John Edmonds		a
3	Leo LaSota - Mark Shaw	١,	Stratum C, 4.5 Tables
4	Lloyd Rawley - Ronald Zucker	$\begin{array}{ c c }\hline 1\\ 2 \end{array}$	Kate Baldwin - Stephen Baldwin 64.26
5	Alan Tenenbaum - Barry Goulding58.19	3	Phillip Shapiro - David Matusow 54.83 Kenneth Jones - John Goon 52.07
6	Michael Richey - Clyde Kruskal 57.22	4	H Wesley Ashendorf - Jack Schiff47.99
7	Monique Smith - Merril Hirsh		
8	Barbara Ames - Ellen Cherniavsky55.97		THUR EVE 199ER PAIRS @ NVBA
	Stratum X, 13.0 Tables		Stratum A, 8.0 Tables
1	Larry Kahn - H John Edmonds 61.39	1	Ellen Haines - Cynthia Larre
2	Lloyd Rawley - Ronald Zucker58.75	2	Amy Elmore - James Connor
3	Monique Smith - Merril Hirsh	3	John Peterson - Richard Poznanski56.25
4	Albert Lauber - Jay Cherlow	4	Lawrence Shuman - Deanna Shuman .55.36
5	Janet Dence - John Sedgewick	5	Jovica Medic - Duncan Wainwright54.17
6	Sven Pride - David Genne		Stratum B, 5.0 Tables
	THUR EVE FLT B/C/D PAIRS	1	Ellen Haines - Cynthia Larre
	Stratum B, 30.5 Tables	2	Amy Elmore - James Connor 60.12
1	Eric Poskanzer - Francesco Parisi-	3	John Peterson - Richard Poznanski56.25
-	Presicce	4	Jovica Medic - Duncan Wainwright54.17
2	Clifford Feldman - Thomas Jennings .60.95		0 0 1 == 13
3	Annapurna Satpathy - Sam Pal60.42	.	Stratum C, 4.5 Tables
4	Richard Wissing - Dave Naftaly 59.82	1	Ellen Haines - Cynthia Larre
5 6/7	Barry Tash - James Wisman	2 3	Amy Elmore - James Connor
0/1	Camaci Oupta - janet Comm		John Lotoroom Thomalu Lozmanski90.29

THUR EVE 0-20 PAIRS @ WBL **Stratum A,** 3.0 Tables



Linda Wiesman - Michael Benefiel . .64.17 Joel Greengard - Michele Greengard .60.83

Stratum B, 3.0 Tables

Linda Wiesman - Michael Benefiel . .64.17 Joel Greengard - Michele Greengard .60.83

Stratum C, 2.5 Tables

- Linda Wiesman Michael Benefiel . .64.17
- 2 Joel Greengard Michele Greengard .60.83

FRIDAY MORNING FLT A/X PAIRS

Stratum A, 8.5 Tables / Based on 24 Tables



1	Bruce Houston - Kenneth Davis(pic) .60.42
2	Peter Boyd - Ruth Potter59.79
3	Brad Theurer - James Geist 57.41
4	Blake Schwartzbach - Barry Goulding 56.88
5	Albert Lauber - James Beller 56.08

Stratum X, 4.0 Tables

- Blake Schwartzbach Barry Goulding 56.88
- Silas Wasserstrom Michael Gottesman 55.36

FRIDAY MORNING FLT B/C/D PAIRS

Stratum B, 8.0 Tables



1 Douglas Woods - Donna Hankey-Woods 56.85

2	Yuen De Anda - Ron Sutter
3	Thomas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh 55.95
4	Samuel Huneke - Craig Huneke 55.65
5	Vladi Basch - Leo Potsiadlo 55.06
	Stratum C. 7.0 Tables

1	Donna Hankey-Woods - Douglas Woods 56.85
2	Yuen De Anda - Ron Sutter
9	Thomas Poolsford Polynog Fordshiphol 55 05

Samuel Huneke - Craig Huneke 55.65

Stratum D, 3.5 Tables

Samuel Huneke - Craig Huneke 55.65

FRIDAY MORNING NON-LM PAIRS Stratum A, 7.0 Tables



	027/02274WHAITHOU
1	Margaret Cooke - Peter Isard
2	Jane Dolkart - Julie Marquette 57.67
3	Mary Ann Goldenson - Ina Smith-
	Tornberg
4	Nancy Ferris - Judith Riggs 56.17
5	Phillip Shapiro - David Handwerker .52.08
	Stratum B, 3.0 Tables
1	Mary Ann Goldenson - Ina Smith-
	Tornberg
2	Nancy Ferris - Judith Riggs

FRIDAY AFTERNOON FLT A/X PAIRS

Stratum A, 13.0 Tables / Based on 30 Tables



1	Richard Wegman - Robert Hopkins Jr 58.52
2	Lynn Jones - Steven Schatzow 57.77
3	Barbara Ames - Mita Banerjee 57.58
4	Steve Robinson - Jim Allen, Jr 57.01
5	Michael Stoller - Robert Kutz 55.30
6	Leo LaSota - Barbara Shaw55.11

- 22 -- 23 -

	Stratum X, 5.5 Tables
1	Michael Stoller - Robert Kutz55.30
2	Ronald Zucker - Rammohan Sarangan54.73
3	James Geist - Michael Richey 54.36
4	Lloyd Rawley - Kitty Gottfried 52.27

FRIDAY AFTERNOON FLT B/C/D PAIRS Stratum B, 9.0 Tables



1	Craig Olson - Michael Lawrence63.10
2	Ed Krest - Deborah Cobb
3	Larry Wallace - Calvin Konner 56.25
4	Ron Sutter - Yuen De Anda
5	Thomas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh 52.98
	Stratum C, 8.0 Tables
1	Craig Olson - Michael Lawrence 63.10
2	Ed Krest - Deborah Cobb
3	Ron Sutter - Yuen De Anda54.76
4	Thomas Reckford - Behnaz Fardshisheh 52.98
5	Michael Gottesman - Silas Wasserstrom 52.68
	Stratum D, 3.5 Tables
1	Ed Krest - Deborah Cobb

FRIDAY AFTERNOON NON-LM PAIRS Stratum A, 8.0 Tables



4	Randolph Elkins - Francesca Mazarella .55.15
5	Sarath Silva - Donald Freedman55.14
	Stratum B, 3.5 Tables

	Stratum B, 3.5 Tables	
1	Sarah Jenkins - Wendy Morrison 50.38	
2	Barbara Gifford - Geri Elias 50.08	
3	Karen Sandler - Anne Weismann48.38	

FRI EVE IMP PAIRS

Stratum A, 9.0 Tables / Based on 19 Tables



1	Suzanne Abrams - David Fleischer46.57
2	David Genne - Donna Rogall 35.43
3	Hank Meyer - Rebecca Duty
4	Vincent Wilmot Jr - Martin Graf18.29
5	Sorina Negulescu - Witold Palosz16.00
Sta	ratum X, 3.0 Tables / Based on 4 Tables
1	Hank Meyer - Rebecca Duty23.86
2	Sorina Negulescu - Witold Palosz16.00

FRI EVE B/C/D PAIRS Stratum B, 10.0 Tables



1	Samuel Huneke - Craig Huneke 68.15
2	Deborah Cobb - Ed Krest
3	Azmat Ali - Dev Chattopadhyay 55.06
4/5	Merna Hart - Michael Hart54.46
4/5	Aaron Navarro - Judith Dausch 54.46
6	Lorraine Hegel - Saul Penn
	Stratum C, 6.0 Tables
1	Samuel Huneke - Craig Huneke 68.15
2	Deborah Cobb - Ed Krest
3	Dennis Hamlet - Jess Feinman52.08
4	Joy Oliver - Jim Walsh
	Stratum D, 2.5 Tables
1	Dennis Hamlet - Jess Feinman 52.08
2	Barbara Teng - Carolin Crabbe48.21
	SAT MORNING FLT R/C/D PAIRS

SAT MORNING FLT B/C/D PAIRS Stratum B, 19.5 Tables



Gary Weinberg - Sarah Weinberg67.86 Blake Schwartzbach - John Arnett Sr .67.51

3 4 5 6	Jeffrey Kosnett - Robert Rovner
1 2 3 4 5 6	Stratum C, 16.5 Tables Gary Weinberg - Sarah Weinberg
1 2 3 4 5 6	Stratum D, 11.0 Tables Blake Schwartzbach - John Arnett Sr. 67.51 Barbara Sadick - Erik Kitagawa 64.58 Richard Hart - Michael Hart 58.78 Richard Levin - Mark Eisenstadt 56.18 Barbara Levine - Neil Crane 56.08 Beth Wisinski - Gary Wisinski 54.69
	SAT MORNING NON-LM PAIRS Stratum A, 13.0 Tables
1 2 3 4 5 6	Margaret Cooke - Peter Isard
1 2 3 4 5	Stratum B, 9.0 Tables Richard Galleher - William Tallant63.45 Cate Frezza - Kim Gandy62.88 Martha Stout - Elizabeth Williamson .59.00 Sharona Sapoznikow - Reina Lerner .57.58 Barbara Teng - Carolin Crabbe57.01
1 2 3 4 5	Stratum C, 7.0 Tables Richard Galleher - William Tallant63.45 Cate Frezza - Kim Gandy62.88 Sharona Sapoznikow - Reina Lerner57.58 Barbara Teng - Carolin Crabbe57.01 Dave Marchal - Mohammed Moiduddin 52.65
	SAT TROPHY PAIRS 8.0 Tables / Based on 50 Tables

1 Steve Robinson - William Cole129.90

2	Linda Marshall - Vonnie Lavender118.21
3	Stan Schenker - David Milton
4	Jay Kelkar - James Geist106.68
5	Sven Pride - David Genne105.69
6	Brad Theurer - Robert Bell103.80
7	Albert Lauber - Jay Cherlow102.46
8	Michael Richey - Ronald Zucker 102.00
9	Donna Rogall - Clyde Kruskal 101.97
10	Leo LaSota - Mark Shaw101.70
11	Art McCann - David Grabiner
12	Witold Palosz - Barack Peled

SAT AFT B/C/D PAIRS Stratum B, 13.0 Tables



1	Joy Oliver - Jim Walsh
2	Leslie Jessell - Jennifer Elliott 58.52
3	Gary Weinberg - Sarah Weinberg 58.45
4	John McCormick - Todd Zimnoch 58.37
5	Jeffrey Kosnett - Robert Rovner 58.16
6	Andrew Lipps - Eric Branfman57.70
	Stratum C, 12.0 Tables
1	Joy Oliver - Jim Walsh
2	Leslie Jessell - Jennifer Elliott 58.52
3	Gary Weinberg - Sarah Weinberg 58.45
4	John McCormick - Todd Zimnoch 58.37
5	Jeffrey Kosnett - Robert Rovner 58.16
6	David Marshall - Eldon Compton55.37
	Stratum D, 7.5 Tables
1	Joy Oliver - Jim Walsh
2	Leslie Jessell - Jennifer Elliott 58.52
3	David Marshall - Eldon Compton55.37
4	Carl Ingebretsen - William Leishear .54.91
5	Duncan Thompson - Terry Klein51.20

SAT AFT NON-LM PAIRS

SAL AL LIMIN-LIMITALIO
Stratum A, 10.0 Tables
Mark Brenner - Anita Christman 62.29
Wendy Morrison - Nicole Swain 58.71
Rosemary Kuntz - Susan Ward 58.63
Sheila Kaplan - Michael Watts 57.36
Mahmoud Katirai - Shala Panbechi56.17
Barbara Levine - Neil Crane55.23

- 24 -

Stratum B, 7.0 Tables



3	Walt Pumo - Janice Pumo51.79
4	Jane Dolkart - Mary Ourand
5	Sandy Haberlin - John Haberlin51.11
	0 0
	Stratum C, 3.5 Tables
1	Wendy Morrison - Nicole Swain 58.71
1 2	*
-	Wendy Morrison - Nicole Swain 58.71

Wendy Morrison - Nicole Swain 58.71

Mahmoud Katirai - Shala Panbechi . .56.17

SAT AFT FLT A/X PAIRS Stratum A. 7.0 Tables

1 Lloyd Rawley - Steven Schatzow 61.67



5	Carole Banks - David Fleischer 53.75
	Stratum X, 2.5 Tables
1	Sorina Negulescu - Daniel Feldman55.42
2	Roma Chandra - Neal McKinney 48.33

Martin Graf - Vincent Wilmot Jr 56.25

Sorina Negulescu - Daniel Feldman . .55.42

SUNDAY A/X B-A-M TEAMS

Stratum A, 11 Tables / Based on 41 Tables



1	Mark Shaw - Steve Robinson - William
	Cole - Peter Boyd
2	Ai-Tai Lo - Fred King - Alan Schwartz -
	Robert Bell
3	Linda Marshall - Andrew Gofreed - Steven

4	Merril Hirsh - Ronald Zucker - Monique Smith - Ted Ying28.5
	Stratum X, 5 Tables
1	Merril Hirsh - Ronald Zucker - Monique

Schatzow - Alan Tenenbaum31.50

SUNDAY FLIGHT B/C/D SWISS TEAMS

3 David Grabiner - Brian Hartwig - Chris Rowe - Suzanne Abrams88.00

4 Ron Sutter - Yuen De Anda - Bernice Hacke - Benazir Ghaussy87.00 5 Jeffrey Kosnett - Katherine Rabenstein -

7 Blake Schwartzbach - Todd Zimnoch - John McCormick - Thomas Grahame 80.00

Stratum C, 16 Tables / Based on 14 Tables

chal - Mohammed Moiduddin82.00 3 Blake Schwartzbach - Todd Zimnoch - John

3 Blake Schwartzbach - Todd Zimnoch - John McCormick - Thomas Grahame 80.00

Bits & Pieces, cont. from p. 4...

Masterpoints awarded at the club or unit level are half-red and half black. These masterpoints are an easy way to earn colored points without traveling or changing your local partners or playing habits. At the District level competition, the match awards are red and the overall awards are gold (Flight C awards 25% gold and 75% red).

We will be holding the first weekend of the District Finals of Flight A on February 7-8. The finals will be held the

...continued on p. 29, second column, top

Stratum D, 11 Tables / Based on 9 Tables John Jackson - Lester Slaback - Dave Marchal - Mohammed Moiduddin 82.00

SUNDAY MORNING NON-LM SWISS TEAMS

Stratum A, 6 Tables / Based on 5 Tables



Stratum B, 6 Tables / Based on 5 Tables

Stratum C, 5 Tables / Based on 4 Tables
1 Yaeko Perera - Barbara Gifford Julie Marquette - Geri Elias 55.00

THE WASHINGTON BRIDGE LEAGUE IS ON FACEBOOK!

https://www.facebook.com/ washingtonbridgeleague

WBL EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

Thanks to Dick Wegman and Barbara

Ames, for bringing this project about!

The Washington Bridge League has established a new WBL Educational Foundation. The Foundation will promote bridge in the Washington area by developing teaching programs in D.C. and suburban Maryland schools, and expanding opportunities for adults to learn bridge or improve their bridge playing skills. All contributions to the Foundation are tax-deductible.

If you are interested in contributing to the Educational Foundation, please contact Rose Berman, WBL Treasurer: rose.berman@verizon.net.

If you are interested in helping to develop bridge teaching programs (either in schools or for interested adults), please contact either Richard Ferrin, WBL President, at refrin@mac.com, or Dick Wegman, at aliveg@aol.com.

YOUTHS 25 AND UNDER PLAY FOR HALF PRICE IN ALL WBL EVENTS

THE WBL ONLINE

The Washington Bridge League is providing two online services:

1. The WBL Online Bulletin Board

On an OPT IN basis only, this service will include an online directory of members. Send any of the following information that you're willing to have posted to the WBL webmaster, Don Berman, at don.berman@verizon.net or call him at 301-776-3581.

Name, Email Address, up to two Phone Numbers, ACBL Number

2. The WBL Online Partnership Desk

Check it out at <u>washingtonbridgeleague.org</u> Contact Clyde Kruskal at <u>cpkfam@gmail.com</u> or 301-395-0480 with any questions.



NEGATIVE DOUBLES: PART 2

Last month, we began investigating Negative Doubles, which can be used on a wide variety of hands. Indeed, it would be difficult to find top players who do not use Negative Doubles in a number of situations. Advancing players should become familiar with the basics of the bid, so here are some further concepts to expand your knowledge.

1. Does a negative double promise exactly four of the unbid Major?

In our $1 \spadesuit - 1 \spadesuit - X$ auction, the Negative Doubler promises four hearts. Sometimes he has five hearts but not enough strength to bid at the two level. Holding ♠Jxx ♥KOxx ♦ Qxxxx ♣x, Responder has a clear negative double. Change the hand slightly to \(\lambda \) Jxx ♥KQxxx ◆Qxxx ♣x, and even though he now has five hearts, Responder should still double rather than bid $2 \, \Psi$. The minimum hand for Responder to bid 2♥ would be ♠ xx ♥KQxxx ♦Kxx ♣Kxx.

In summary, the Negative Doubler will have no less than four hearts. If he has more than four, he makes a negative double when he does not have enough points to bid at the two level.

2. Does a negative double promise support for both unbid suits?

While Responder may hold both unbid suits, he is not required to have both of them in order to make the negative double. When there is exactly one unbid major, the Negative Double only promises 4+ cards in the unbid major, and says nothing specific about the other suits.

3. What strength is needed to make a **Negative Double?**

Responder's strength varies depending on the level at which he forces his partner to bid. Six HCP is sufficient if Opener can bid at the one level and this table indicates the relative strength needed for each level of bidding:

One level	6+ HCP
Two level	. 8+ HCP
Three level	.10+ HCP
Four level	12+ HCP

4. How do you evaluate borderline strength hands?

Be aware that on borderline strength hands, the shorter Responder is in opponent's suit (and consequently the more support he has for the other suits) the more likely the negative double is the best bid. With a singleton (or void) in the opponent's suit, Responder can make a negative double with slightly fewer HCP. So, compare these hands after $1 \spadesuit - 1 \spadesuit$:

- ♠ Qxx ♥xxxx ♦xxx ♣KJx despite having four hearts, Responder is not obligated to double. This 6 HCP hand is flat and the ♠ Q may be worthless.
- ♠ x ♥Kxxx ♦xxxx ♣QJxx a negative double is perfectly acceptable with this 6 HCP. The singleton in opponent's suit is well placed and Responder can support all three other suits.

5. Does Responder deny a spade stopper by doubling instead of bidding NT?

No. Even though Responder may have spades well stopped, he should look for a

heart fit first. Holding ♠ AQT ♥Kxxx ♦QJxx ♣Jx, responder should make a negative double showing his four hearts. If his partner does not also have four hearts, then 3N is likely.

6. After $1 - 1 \Rightarrow$ auctions, leaving two unbid Majors, what does a double promise?

The vast majority of players agree that a double here promises 4+ cards in each major. If Responder has values but is, for example, 4-2 or 4-3 in the Majors, then he cannot double and he cannot pass. So he should bid 1 . This is an unusual case where Responder is allowed to bid a new suit with only 4 cards (and both partners need to recognize this.) Note that Responder may have a very weak hand (such as A KTxxx ♥Kxxx ♦xx ♣Jx) and wants to get both suits shown in one bid.

Next month, we'll continue to investigate this crucial bidding concept. Until then, if you have questions, feel free to contact us at ron@motherzucker.com or ShStringer@aol.com. Have fun, and we'll see you at the table!

Bits & Pieces, cont. from p. 22...

weekend of February 21-22. The first weekend of the Open Flight, Flights B and C will be held on March 7-8. Flights B and C will be held at one northern and one southern site. The finals for these flights takes place on May 2-3 (Flight C just on May 3.) You must pre-register to play. Pre-registration ends Midnight on the Thursday, nine days before the event.

Cost per team is \$100. This pays for the first day (2 sessions). Make checks payable to District 6 Money and send them to Lynn Jones, 10 Tenby Court, Timonium, MD 21093. Along with the check, please send the names of all players on the team, their ACBL numbers and a contact e-mail address for the Team Captain.

Any questions, please contact Lynn Jones at 410-560-3244 or bridgelynn@comcast.net.

You can find Conditions of Contest, directions to sites, and where to qualify at www.districtsix.org.

STEPPING UP TO NEW HEIGHTS: As of September 1, 2014

Junior Masters: 5 Masterpoints

Mr Kyle R Butts Dr David C Handwerker Dave Marchal Emily C Volz Cate T Frezza Ms Kim A Gandy Stephen M Goldberg

Club Masters: 20 MPs

Mr John Goon Bethany Kadish Ms Wendy W Morrison David M Narrow Mr Clayven D Smith Jr Mrs Ellen N Forman Mrs Patti Kemmer Nathan Tash

Sectional Masters: 50 MPs

Fadi Eidi Ms Sheila A Odell Mr Mark Brenner Ms Geri B Elias Ms Geri Wood

Regional Masters: 100 MPs

Mae S Beuchert Ms Bonnie R Cohen Ms Martha L Stout Mr Michael L Cooperman Mr Myron L Goldstein Mrs Jane E Marsh Mr Johnny M Marsh Mr Mohammed Moiduddin Mrs Joanne P Ranshaw

NABC Masters: 200 MPs

Dr Charles R Dearolf Ms Carrolena M Key Mr David E Siegel Mr Joseph L Abita Mrs Jean C Barquin Dr Neil A Crane Sally S Garfinkel Mr Terry M Klein Ms Barbara C Levine Mr Steven W Mendelsohn Ms Mary E Ourand Mr Peter Schiff Ms Lenore C Yellen

Ms Kathleen Zellmer

WBL Solvers' Club's New Problems

1) IMPs, None Vulnerable	ıe Vulnerab	ole .		3) IMPs, You're Vulnerable	're Vulnera	ble		5) IMPs, None Vulnerable	e Vulnerab	le	
4	974♥Q63♦	♦ 974 ♥ 063 ♦ AK43 ♣ KJ4	<u> </u>	♦ K	763♥-◆K(♦ K763 ♥ - ♦ KQ82 ♣ AKJ103	33	₩3.	2♥AQJ97a	★ 32♥AQJ976◆A2♣AKQ	c
SOUTH 1◆	WEST 3.	NORTH Dbl	EAST Pass	SOUTH 1 *	WEST 1◆	NORTH Pass	EAST 2♥	SOUTH 1♥	$\frac{\mathbf{WEST}}{\mathrm{Pass}}$	NORTH 1♣	$\frac{\text{EAST}}{\text{Pass}}$
6666				66666				33333			
2) Matchpoints, None Vulnerable	nts, None Vı	ulnerable		4) IMPs, Both Vulnerable	h Vulnerabl	<u>e</u>		Return	answers b	Return answers by October 16 to:	to:
+	1KQJ43♥ 3	AKQJ43 = 3 + K4 + A543	8	→ K1	09 ♦ 9 ♦ A	♦ K109♥9◆A ♣ AKQ107653	53	286	Steve Kobinson 91 S. Abingdon St	obinson gdon St #A2.	
SOUTH	WEST	NORTH Pass	EAST 2♥	SOUTH	WEST	NORTH 3◆	EAST Pass		Arlington '	Arlington VA, 22206 robinswr@erols.com	
33333				66666			_ _				

NEED A <u>RIDE</u> OR A <u>PARTNER</u> FOR THE THURSDAY UNIT GAME?

Contact **Barbara Doran** UnitGamePartner@DistrictSix.org, (301-608-0347 between 9am and 10pm) to find a partner in advance. For a last minute partner, call the **WBL cell phone (301-395-2760)**.

To arrange a carpool, contact Melissa Price, Carpool Coordinator, at 301-464-1261 or melissadprice46@gmail.com.

Good luck! We look forward to seeing you on Thursday evenings.

September/October 2014