

Bridge News

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

by Robert Shore



Introductions

In my inaugural column, I mentioned that I intended to promptly appoint the ExComm's two at-large members. After thoroughly consulting with the other District officers and our District Director, I settled (with considerable difficulty) on two candidates among a number of highly qualified possibilities. Both candidates agreed to serve in this capacity, so I am delighted to introduce as at-large members of the ExComm Patrick Cardullo of the Glendale Unit and Marta Monheim of the San Fernando Valley Unit.

And Now, to Work

Our newly constituted ExComm got right to work. It turns out that you learn stuff in this job. Stuff I'm going to share now. Stuff that, in my opinion, should have been shared earlier.

Everything I'm going to describe here is entirely legitimate, and in fact has now been ratified by a unanimous vote of the ExComm. Let me repeat that. Nothing wrong with anything that happened, now or in the past. It just needed a dose of sunlight, which it now has received. This column is a second dose of that same sunlight.

In my new position I had the opportunity to review the contract offered to us by the Long Beach Hilton for the 2022 running of Bridge Week, the Summer's Best Regional. The business terms were unexceptional. It covers the usual subjects you'd expect – function space pricing, room rates, room obligations, food obligations, etc. Long Beach continues to offer us business terms reasonably comparable to those it has offered us in the past. There was, however, an additional term that I did not expect. I believe that term to be common in the business

PRESIDENT continued on page 2

District Director Report September 2019

by Kevin Lane

“Bridge is a game and should be fun.”



Las Vegas recap

The Las Vegas NABC slightly exceeded the original tablecount projections, but the 13600 tables is well below the 16600 tables from Las Vegas in 2014. I suspect the board's decision to substantially raise card fees last year has turned some people off of NABCs, but the Cosmopolitan is also a much more expensive venue than the Westgate.

2019 a good year

Management has projected 2019 to be a good year. I welcome this news after a tough 2018. Still, management reported in Las Vegas that the Memphis NABC wasn't as profitable as hoped for – despite exceeding tablecount estimates – because of some unexpected expenses.

But the downside to projecting a good 2019 is that the board seems to lose focus on long-term structural issues in “good” times. And in bad times the board focuses on short-term financial patches. The Ed Foundation, for example, has some good new

DIRECTOR continued on page 3

Inside This Issue	
Director's Chair	page 3
North American Pairs Update	page 4
Correction to August SCBN	page 5
Rank Changes	page 6
Around the Units	page 7
Problem Solvers' Panel	page 12

PRESIDENT continued from page 1

world, and it was certainly present in previous contracts, but I wasn't aware of it until assuming this position.

The Hilton offered a very substantial points award to our Tournament Manager, Peter Benjamin, in the nature of a "thank you" for providing the business. When I saw that provision, due to the obvious conflict of interest I asked Peter to hold off on signing the contract until the ExComm had a chance to discuss the matter and vote on it. It was my view that this award was and is appropriate compensation to Peter for all the work he does, not just running the tournament, but traveling all around the county locating and vetting potential additional tournament sites. This takes a lot of time and energy, and Peter's efforts to that end have been unflagging. I was happy to support Peter receiving this award in compensation for his site-selection work, and a unanimous ExComm agreed with me. I hope you do as well.

All the News that Fits in Print

A rather substantial fraction of the District's budget goes toward producing the *Southern California Bridge News*, so it's a fair question whether the expenditure is worthwhile. That's certainly a question that's come up among some of the Units who have financially supported the paper with their contributions. With the help of the District's Webmaster, Dave White, I was able to come up with at least a starting point for discussion.

It turns out that the on-line version of the *Bridge News* is rather popular, and has grown more so over the last couple of years. David advises that in an average month, the *Bridge News* Web page receives visits from 3693 discrete visitors. Our highest month has been 4520 discrete visitors. The highest single day, naturally, is usually the first or second of the month, and the average for the highest day is 420 unique visitors. Our single-day high is 500 hits. And of course, these figures do not include the people who read the *Bridge News* in hard copy. Dave tells me these numbers have approximately doubled over the last two years.

Given the Southern California bridge population, I consider these numbers quite high and a mark of success. Nevertheless, I'd like to do better in a couple of respects. First, I'd like to make the *Bridge News* even easier to find. I've been trying to make a habit of posting links to the current issue on

bridgewinners shortly after publication. I've started expanding those efforts. I've been asking the District clubs with an on-line presence to add a prominent link to the *Bridge News* to their Web sites. A number of local clubs have already obliged (earning my gratitude), and I hope most of the rest will follow.

Second, I'd like us to function as more of a newspaper. I believe it should be easy for the members of this District to know what the District's representatives are doing in their name. I also believe it should be easy for the members of our Units to know what the Units' representatives are doing in their name. So I intend to use this space to keep the bridge-playing public informed of the issues facing the District, both large and small, and how the District's officers are responding to those issues. To that end, if our editor-in-chief believes it's feasible, I hope to offer space to each Unit to publish the minutes of its monthly Board meetings. [*Editor's Note: yes, this is certainly feasible.*]

Looking Ahead

Historically our District's Board met three times a year, once at each of our regionals. That habit has fallen by the wayside in recent years, simply because we are no longer holding three regionals each year. Nevertheless, a number of issues have already arisen that I believe deserve the attention of the entire District board. I intend to convene a Board meeting sometime this fall, but I have not yet settled on a date or location.

I do have the beginnings of an agenda, though. One item to be discussed will be the future of the *Bridge News*. The *Bridge News* is funded entirely by voluntary contributions by the Units to the District. That contribution was reduced by approximately 10% a year and a half ago, but multiple Units still have raised concerns about whether the price is worthwhile. So I anticipate a vigorous discussion of the subject at our next meeting.

A second item is support for our collegiate teams. Each summer, the ACBL holds a Collegiate Championship. Our District financially supports its representatives in the annual Grand National Teams competition. I would like to offer comparable support to college teams based in our District that earn the right to attend the Collegiate Championships. So that is another issue I will ask the Board to consider.

And finally, I continue to hope that we can work with District 22 to expand our regional offerings

with a joint regional. Given the Summer Nationals in Las Vegas and the upcoming Fall Nationals in San Francisco, it didn't seem feasible to launch this project in 2019. But we are still hoping to put together a proposal that works for both Districts by 2020 or 2021. We will report to the District Board on the status of this undertaking.

Something you want me to know? Contact me at Bob78164@yahoo.com.

DIRECTOR continued from page 1

leadership that our board is excited about. We voted, in Las Vegas to create a special month (February) to fundraise for the Ed Foundation. But since the ACBL's short-term financial outlook is good our board is turning over the money to the Ed Foundation without any guidance or restrictions on what the money should be spent on.

Basic business practice is to align the ACBL's goals with those of the outside organization. For example, it's long been a strategic priority of the ACBL to create a bridge app. Certainly facilitating a bridge app is a more effective use of money than other recent major expenditures. Sadly, management reported in Vegas that there is no current effort/plan to make a bridge app happen. And by fundraising for outside organizations instead of addressing our own needs we have squandered a good opportunity to make real change.

Too many tournaments

The ACBL holds too many tournaments. This fact has become a much more serious problem in the past year because a significant gap has emerged between the amount of money taken in by the ACBL for tournaments and the costs to the ACBL – such as paying tournament directors and expenses. In short, the ACBL is losing money on regional and sectional tournaments.

Now, these costs will have to be recovered somehow, and that will likely mean fee increases to tournament sponsors (such as districts and units). The good news is that management has worked effectively over the past year on ways to address the problem through internal efficiency rather than fee increases. Nevertheless in Las Vegas it became evident that fee increases will be necessary. To me, the problem is severe enough to prompt a real effort to reduce the number of regionals. The idea is that with fewer tournaments, the attendance at each tournament will

bump up and so districts can better afford the fee increases.

The issue was discussed in Las Vegas but not resolved. I'm frustrated because it's important to address long-term problems early. Districts often plan regionals years out so any reductions must account for that timeline. Again, the positive short-term financial outlook of the ACBL seems to undermine the urgency to address long-term structural issues.

Feel free to contact me at klaned23@gmail.com

From the Director's Chair: *by Brian Richardson*

An Insufficient Bid



There are very few bridge players who have NEVER made an insufficient bid! If the LHO of the player who made the insufficient bid, makes any call, and that includes a Pass, then the insufficient bid becomes a legal bid, having been accepted by LHO's action.

The acceptance of the Insufficient Bid can lead to some interesting auctions. In the three examples following the Insufficient Bid is in *italics*.

Example 1. *1♠ - P - I♥ - P, 1♠*. Once a call is made after the insufficient bid then that insufficient bid becomes the "bid of record". Thus, a repeat of the opening bid of *1♠* is acceptable.

Example 2. *1♠ - I♥ - 1♠*. Here, opener's partner has the opportunity of showing some type of support at a very low level.

Example 3. *3♦ - 2♣ - 2♦*. Here Responder has had the opportunity of mentioning Opener's suit at a level lower than stated in the original bid.

It should be noted that a player's statement "that's insufficient" is nothing more than a statement of fact. It does not signify acceptance, or non-acceptance, of the Insufficient Bid. PLEASE CALL THE DIRECTOR!!!! The Director will ensure that LHO has the right to accept the insufficient bid, and

will explain the other options IF the Insufficient bid is NOT accepted.

One of the issues that the Director may well have to deal with, in relation to an insufficient bid, is whether the bidder intended to make the bid that was insufficient, or was it mechanical error, where he intended to make a sufficient bid, but pulled the wrong card out of the bidding box. This is a situation which is best handled by taking the player away from the table and, after discussion, and looking at the cards, determining whether the actual bid made was inadvertent, and it was clear that the player intended to make a bid at a sufficient level. *[As a Director I would, periodically, be presented with a claim that the insufficient bid was a mechanical error. Often that is correct, but when the 2♣ card is pulled from the box when RHO had bid 2♥, the Director needs to find out what bid the 2♣ bidder had intended to bid. If that person states that they had intended to bid 3♣, but pulled the 2NT bidding card by mistake this would not be considered a mechanical error. Why? The 3♣ bidding card and the 2NT bidding card are not adjacent in the bidding box. This insufficient bid was a brain error, NOT a mechanical error.]* In such a situation the original bid will be the bid of record, and can be accepted or rejected.

If LHO has already taken some action BEFORE the Director was called, then that action is cancelled. It is important to note that if Opener's partner has also taken some action, no redress can be taken. The original auction remains in place.

Procedure when the insufficient bid is NOT accepted.

If the insufficient bid is not accepted and is corrected by the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination, the auction would almost always be able to proceed without rectification. However, and bridge does have a number of 'however's,' there is an exception. If the insufficient bid, or its substitute, is artificial, then there may well be additional factors to consider.

In dealing with possible implications from artificial bids, the Director would normally take the bidder away from the table, in order to investigate possible agreement and meanings. Having this discussion between player and Director away from the table reduces the opportunity for the other players being in receipt of unauthorized information.

Here are some examples showing artificial bids:

Example 1. 1NT – 2♠ - 2♦. Here the 2♦ call (intended to be a transfer), could be corrected to 3♦, if the partnership understanding is that 3♦ would still be a transfer. If so the Director should allow the auction to continue.

Example 2. 1♠ - 3♠, 4NT – 4♦. Here Responder was clearly answering his partner's inquiry of 4♦. The Director should permit a correction to 5♦ without any penalty.

Example 3. 1NT – 2♦ - 2♣. If the partnership understanding was that the 2♣ call was meant to be Stayman, AND a cue-bid of 3♦ would be asking for a 4 card major (the identical meaning to 2♣ then that bid should be permitted without penalty. If that was indeed the partnership understanding, a bid of anything other than 3♦ would require partner to Pass for the rest of the auction. There could also be lead penalties involved if the offending partnership end up as defenders.

Example 4. 2NT – P – 2♦. If the partnership is playing transfers then 3♦ would have a similar meaning and that correction would be permitted. However, a correction to 3♥ would NOT be permitted, as this should also be a transfer bid.

In all cases involving an insufficient bid the Director is empowered to consider a subsequent adjustment for the non-offending side, IF it is determined that the result on the board may well have been different if the insufficient bid had not occurred.

When infractions occur at the table and the Director is called (correctly) it can be a stressful situation for many people. It is also often a thankless task for the Director who has to resolve a situation, with a decision which will often please one partnership and displease the other.

The Director needs the wisdom of Solomon and the patience of Job, together with the hide of a rhinoceros.

North American Pairs Club Qualifying Complete
Morris Jones, District 23 NAP Coordinator

The end of August also ends the period for players to qualify for the 2019 North American Pairs tournament. Nearly every club in the district held qualifying games. The top 50% in each strat has

qualified to continue competing in the Unit Final games.

The North American Pairs is really three tournaments: Flight A open to all players, Flight B for players with fewer than 2500 masterpoints, and Flight C for non-Life Masters with fewer than 500 masterpoints.

Note that Flight C eligible players who qualified in A or B at the club level may compete in Flight C of the Unit Final games. Likewise, Flight B eligible players who qualified in Flight A may compete in Flight B at the Unit Final. Each player may only play in one of the two Unit Final games in a given flight, but may enter the other Unit Final if they play in a different flight for which they qualified. Full details are available in the Conditions of Contest on nap.bridgemojo.com or acbl.org.

The first Unit Final game will be held this month, Sunday, September 15, at the Long Beach Bridge Center. The second Unit Final will be on Sunday, October 20, at the San Marino Bridge Club. 60% of the pairs playing in each Unit Final will be invited to compete in the District Final to be held at the South Bay Bridge Club in Lomita on November 17. The top two pairs in each flight will be invited to compete for the national title at the Spring NABC in Columbus, Ohio.

Each Unit Final game is a two-session matchpoint pairs game. The first session will start at 10:00 a.m., with the second session starting TBA after at least 45 minutes for a lunch break. The games are usually completed by 6:00 p.m. You might want to pack a lunch for the day.

With so many players qualified to compete, again this year we will be asking players to reserve their space at the Unit Final games. Card fees for the games will be \$13 per player per session with a reservation (\$26 for the day), or \$13.50 without a reservation (\$27 for the day).

The Unit Finals and District Finals pay big masterpoint awards, including a small bit of gold points, even for Flight C. It's a day well spent playing bridge!

Starting around the first of September, I plan to send email invitations to all the District 23 qualifiers. The email will include instructions for securing your reservation at the Unit Final.

All information about the 2019 North American Pairs for District 23 can be found at the NAP website, <https://nap.bridgemojo.com> There you'll be able to see the list of qualified players and reserve your spot in the Unit Final. Be sure to take a glance at the Conditions of Contest as well. If you have questions or need help reserving your seat, shoot at email to nap@bridgemojo.com.

Correction to the August SCBN

Due entirely to Editorial Oversight (take that how you wish), the authorship of the "Long Beach Winners" article, on page 5, was omitted from the article.

We wish to thank Mike Marcucci, District President during the Long Beach tournament, for this contribution to the SCBN.

Southern California Bridge News
Published monthly by ALACBU, Inc.
410 Mill Creek Lane, San Gabriel, CA 91775
Phone: 626-281-2179
email bridgenews@acbldistrict23.org
Editor/Designer..... Tom Lill
Managing Editor..... Bob Shore
Contributing Editor..... John Jones

Copy deadlines: the 23rd of the preceding month. Opinions expressed in the Southern California Bridge News are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of ALACBU, Inc., The Bridge News or the Editor. The Bridge News reserves the right to reject material it considers to be in poor taste or deems otherwise unsuitable for publication.



But there is one player whom I have never learned how to cope with and that is the player who never stops to consider that you also hold 13 cards; he will ignore your bids, he will pay no attention to your warnings, come hell or high water he will take command of the hand, and when he has been doubled an gone down several tricks, he'll ascribe it to nothing but bad luck. You are fortunate if he doesn't smile blandly and say, "Well, I think it was worth it, partner." I am still looking for the book that will show me how to deal with him. Shooting is too quick and too painless, and besides, there might not be another fourth available. (W. Somerset Maugham)

District 23 Rank Changes July 2019

Junior Master

Nicole R. Berte
 Richard Chan
 Ashley Y. Chen
 Thomas J. Cox
 David Dai
 Sihui Dai
 Kim Ebner
 Donna J. Falcon
 Shouzhen Gu
 Cynthia Gullen
 Eric D. Kaplan
 Mary T. Mauck
 Diana Parmeter
 Marty E. Shober
 Jeffre Silver
 Rita L. Van LieRop
 Anyi Zhao

Club Master

John L. Benson
 Priscilla C. Caillouette
 Marty Foster
 William L. Krantz
 Wendy Meek
 Thomas Percer
 Phillipe R. Perebinosoff
 Timothy V. Singer
 Bruce F. Steckel
 Jianping Xu

Sectional Master

Paul T. Brunton
 Harriet Finebaum
 James V. Gates
 Carl F. Lundgren
 Alan Nueman
 Douglas Senour
 Madhu Singhal
 Lisa A. Walker

Regional Master

Bob Becker
 David S. Cohen
 Barbara Ann F. Haas
 Sam H. Lee
 Georgette Tarantini
 Rosalie T. Zalis

NABC Master

Gregg Alsdorf
 J. Ross Bengel
 Mara R. Cohen
 Jean K. Futami
 Lisa Karako
 Sunny H. Lee
 Lillian Slater
 Jack D. Stewart

Advanced NABC Master

Lynn W. Edelson
 Richard E. Halverstadt
 Tim Lee
 Homa Nassri
 Shoreh Toufanian

Life Master

Patricia A. Berg
 Marsha A. Bocan
 Judi Friedlander
 Hanan Mogharbel
 Jojo Sarkar
 Bruce G. Schelden
 Douglas I. Timmer
 Alexander F. Wiles

BronzeLife Master

Patricia A. Berg
 Judi Friedlander
 Lynn Heckler
 Barry Heller
 Emma Kolesnik
 Hanan Mogharbel
 Jojo Sarkar
 Douglas I. Timmer

Ruby Life Master

Margaret Yeh
 Chi-Chong Yu

Gold Life Master

Renee Hoffman

Sapphire Life Master

Martin L. Weiss

Diamond Life Master

Edward P. Piken
 Robert M. Shore

Carolyn Taff & Marion Napier
REALTORS

Your Real Estate Partners for Life



RESIDENTIAL BROKERAGE

Relocation, Seniors, Luxury Properties and First Time Buyer Specialists Representing Buyers and Sellers in Probate & Trust Transactions; Estate, Condo and Investment Properties; Complex Real Estate Matters; Referrals; and Executive Transfers

Carolyn 310-871-5051

Marion 310-721-7782

2444 Wilshire Blvd.

Santa Monica, CA 90403

Around the Units in District 23



Long Beach by Jon Yinger

www.acblunit557.org
www.LongBeachBridge.com

July 16 North American Pairs game:

Overall results: 1st in A Louis Shen/John Petrie, 2nd Kay Tseng/John Melis, 3rd Bruce Horiguchi/Jack Waller, 4th George Alemshah/Martin Lipman, 5th Larry Slutsky/Baum Harris, 6th Pamela Cole/John Crabtree, 7th Mark Tang/Chiye Horiguchi. In the B flight overalls Jeanette Estill/Jane Reid were 2nd, Carol Hezlinger/Lois Mullin 3rd, Lynn Danielson/John Tholen 4th, Hank Dunbar/Rob Preece 5th, Mark Beizer/Don Hauser 6th. Congratulations to all!!

August 10 Annual Chinese Club game:

Overall results: 1st in A: Liang Min/Lili Wang, 2nd Marcie Evans/Betty McClellan, 3rd Frank Shih/Joe Viola, 4th Ten Pao Lee/Xingping Kang, 5th Jack and Nolan Chang, 6th Jackson Chao/Tsu Jan, 7th Yas Takeda/Chi Chong Yu. In the B flight overalls Hanefi Erten/Oliver Yildiz were 5th, Wenjia Yan/Arvind Seth 6th. In the C flight overalls Tim Lee/George Tien were 5th, Terry Binns/I D Patel 6th. And in the NLM section Patricia Luehrs/Adele Peggy Rahn were 1st, Ed Bucklin/Carolyn Woo 2nd, Jerry Reid/Darlene Harrison 3rd, Kathleen Pecarovich/Marilyn/Henschel 4th. Congratulations to all!

July 28 Unit game: 1st in A: Eva Mroz/Penny Wentworth, 2nd Jackie Hess/John Melis, 3rd Bill Skupan/Bill Clark, 4th Henry Crowder/Henry Sheehan, 5th Betti Harris/Kiyo Nagaishi, 6th Alan Flower/Cayce Blanchard. In the B flight overalls April and John Berg were 6th. In the C flight overalls Nava and Naum Grutman were 2nd, Robit and Shalini Dubey 3rd, Mark Singer/Paul Chen 4th, Nancy Toussaint/Bettyanne Houts 5th. Congratulations to all!

70% GAMES July 16 through August 15:
In open games: In the evening game July 17 Judy

Cook/Larry Topper had 70.42%. July 29 John and Suzy Hand had 70.67%. August 13 John Melis/Colleen Gardner had 71.52%. In NLM games July 19 Dennis Mitchell/Ken Ritmire had 72.92%. July 28 Bill Cray/Diane Parmeter had 70%. July 30 Nancy Toussaint/Joyce Roberts had 70%. August 3 Fred Willbanks/Julie Weinstein had 70.83%. Congratulations to all seven pairs!

BIG MASTER POINT AWARDS July 16 through August 15: In the Unit Team Game July 21 the team of Carol Herzlinger/Michael Macy/Melanie Smothers/Ted Dowe was first, each winning 0.80mp. In open games July 16 John Petrie/Louis Shen won 6.05mp for 1st, John Melis/Kay Tseng 4.50mp for 2nd, Bruce Horiguchi/Jack Waller 3.88mp for 3rd. July 17 in the afternoon game Ed Davis/Sidney Brownstein won 5.63mp for 1st, Richard and Robert Bakovic 4.22mp for 2nd, Martin Lipman/George Alemshah 3.02mp for 3rd. In the evening game Judy Cook/Larry Topper won 3.56mp for 1st. In the Unit Game July 28 Eva Mroz/Penny Wentworth won 4.96mp for 1st, Jackie Hess/John Melis 3.72mp for 2nd. August 4 Kiyo Nagaishi/Kay Tseng won 3.19mp for 1st. August 10 Lili Wang/Liang Min won 5.83mp for 1st, Marcie Evans/Betty McClellan 4.37mp for 2nd, Frank Shih/Joe Viola 3.28mp for 3rd. August 14 Chuck Laine/John Melis won 4.69mp for 1st, Toni Morford/Loren Hilf 3.52mp for 2nd. August 15 Richard Bakovic/Ralph Beazley won 4.69mp for 1st, John Melis/Colleen Gardner 3.52mp for 2nd. Congratulations to all!

NEW CLUB MEMBERS: Saul Zenk, Linda Leventhal, Cliff Goodrich Welcome to the club!

STATUS CHANGES: New Jr. Masters: Mary Guzetta, Katherine Jervik, Lyn Kratz. New Club Master: Daniel Frank. Congratulations to you all!

GET WELL: Phyllis Parker

UP-COMING EVENTS AT THE CLUB:
International Fund Games \$11 card fee. Extra points.

Sept 3 (Mon) 12:30

Sept 6 (Fri) 12:30 & 4:15

Sept 10 (Tues) 12:30

Sept 13 (Fri) 12:30 & 4:15

Sept 16 (Mon) 12:30

Sept 18 (Wed.) 12:30 & 7:00

Sept 23 (Mon) 12:30
 Sept 25 (Wed) 12:30 & 7:00

Other special games.....

Sept 5 (Thurs) 11:30 ACBL-wide
 International Fund Game \$12 card fee
 Sept 9 (Mon) 9:30-11:30 Pro-am game
 Sept 15 (Sun) Swiss Teams 12:30
 Sept 16 Birthday Monday 12:30pm. Play for
 \$5 on your September birthday
 Sept 16 (Mon) 9:30-11:30 Invitational Pro-
 Am game
 Sept 22 (Sun) 12:30 Unit Game \$8 card fee,
 dessert served
 Sept 30 (Mon) 9:30-11:30 New classes begin

**NEWS FROM LEISURE WORLD
 BRIDGE CLUBS
 Judy Carter-Johnson**

This was a very quiet month in Leisure World....no unit game or club championship games...So I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the Officers and "helpers" that keep our game going...

Club managers: Ted Wieber--Clubhouse #3
 Stan Johnson--Clubhouse #1

Refreshment volunteers: Jeanette Estill--
 Clubhouse #3 Joan Tschirki-- Clubhouse #1

Also our Directors and the hard working Board Members at each Club, those who take reservations, help set up games, etc etc.

Any news for next month's column, please e mail me @ jjc90740@gmail.com. Results of all Leisure World games are posted on www.acblunit557.org



**Pomona –
 Covina
 by Tom Lill**
www.acblunit551.org

Unit Game: Saturday September 21,
 11:00 a.m., Glendora

Individual: Saturday, September 14, 9:30 a.m., Chino

Yes, the Individual is delayed one week, to avoid conflict with the Costa Mesa Regional.

The top finisher in the August Individual was Your Correspondent. Newcomer Arthur Weinstein was second, Don Logsdon tied with Clint Lew for third, and Linda Tessier placed fifth.

The August Unit game was a another real squeaker, making last month's ½ point winning margin look like a runaway. The top two finishers from last month swapped places: Penny and Gino Barbieri nosed out Bill Papa – Vic Sartor by 0.06 matchpoint. Margie Hall – Sandra Rucker tied for third with Amr Elghamry – Joe Viola. Newcomers Arthur Weinstein – Stephen Andersen took top honors in flight C.

The last full week of this month (that's the 24th, 26th, and 27th) we will hold club championship games at La Fetra. That means extra masterpoints for the same low, low price.

Advance Notice: October is Club Appreciation month. That also means special games paying extra masterpoints. (No extra entry fee.) The plan is to hold 3 team games and 3 pairs games (1 each, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday). The team games pay 5% gold points, believe it or not. The dates? Hard to say at this time! Obviously we need full tables for this to work, no half tables. Stay tuned and check out the Unit web site, I'll think of something ... either advance signups, or catch-as-catch can.

With one exception, the games this month were pretty competitive. Six pairs managed to reach the magic 65% mark, one of them twice. David Ochroch – Herb Stampfl blew away the field one evening with a monstrous 73.92% game. Bill Papa – Vic Sartor scored 68.75%, Herb Stampfl – Joe Unis managed 66.31%, Fredy and Lulu Minter scored with 66.07% and 65.97%, Ho Ming Yim – Herb Stampfl had a 65.48% game, and Hanan Mogharbel – Linda Stuart just snuck over the bar with 65.10%. (It appears that if you'd like a good score some time, you should give Herb a call!)

Others winners: Penny Barbieri, Roger Boyar, Steve Mancini, Kurt Triesellman, Paul Chrisney, Linda Tessier, Clint Lew, and Yours Truly.

41 players won a total of 88.66 masterpoints in club games within the Unit. This total does not include the STaC games. The top 5 masterpoint earners in July were Penny Barbieri (4.82), Fredy and Lulu Minter (4.56), Roger Boyar (4.53), and Don Logsdon (4.47).

Hanan Mogharbel not only got the gold she needed for Life Master in Long Beach, she's now a Bronze Life Master. Congratulations!

Our hand of the month this time is just pure fun. You surely won't learn anything from it ... except, perhaps, "better lucky than good." (But you already knew that, didn't you?) This deal, kibitzed by Your Correspondent, brings back memories of Victor Mollo's Rueful Rabbit. Sitting South, R.R. picked up this hand ... or so he thought:

♠ A4 ♥ AK432 ♦ KQJ87 ♣ 8.

A normal looking 1♥ opening right? Sure. The auction proceeded, with the opponents maintaining a respectful silence: 1♥ – 1♠; 2♦ – 4♥. The opening lead was a club, and the dummy was faced:

♠ K9862 ♥ 985 ♦ none ♣ A10763.

Declarer won the ♣A, cashed the ♠K and crossed to the ♠A. Now R.R. proceeded to play diamonds, so as to flush out that Ace. The opponents stubbornly (!) held off, RHO finally ruffing the fourth round. Placing declarer with 5-5 in the reds and *knowing* declarer had a diamond loser, RHO cashed ... the ♥A! That's right, R.R. bid the hand and played 6 tricks without noticing that the ♥A was really the ♦A. Needless to say, now 4♥ is cold. Well, as it turns out, with both spades and hearts 3-3, and diamonds 4-3, not to mention the ♥A being on side, it was always cold, on any lead. Strangely enough, no one else got there. Evidently the other players holding R.R.'s cards eschewed the 2♥ reverse over partner's 1♠, given the poor heart spots, and played 3♦, making 4 for +130 and a shared bottom.

Of course, 3NT is also cold, if played by R.R. (or by either partner if, as is the case here, the ♥K is behind the Ace), but it's hard to get there. 4♠ is makeable on the lie of the cards, if declarer plays only one round of spades, keeping a trump in dummy to guard the clubs.

Go figure!

Quote for the month: "Advice: the smallest current coin." (Ambrose Bierce)

☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺

He may bid and he may not. I believe that covers all the possibilities. (Edgar Kaplan, commentating on Vu-Graph)



Santa Clarita- Antelope Valley by Beth Morrin

This year's **Magic Mountain Sectional** will be held on September 21st and 22nd at the Friendly Valley Auditorium, 19345 Avenue of the Oaks, Santa Clarita, 91321. For more information, contact either of the tournament's co-chairs, Gay Gipson (gegipson@gmail.com) or Roy Ladd (royr.ladd@gmail.com).

For Reservations, contact Paula Olivares (paula@pacbell.net).

The Saturday game will be Stratified Open Pairs and Limited MP Pairs at 10:00 AM and 2:30 PM. The Sunday game is a play-through Stratified Open Swiss Teams and Limited MP Swiss Teams at 10:00 AM. Lunch is included in card fees on both days.

An ACBL number is required or the player will be charged \$8 one-month membership fee.

Unit Game Results, Friendly Bridge Club, Monday August 5th:

North/South:	
First with 61.32%	Sharry Vida – Beth Morrin
Second with 57.70%	Roy Ladd – Bert Stock
Third with 56.30%	Bill Brodek – Bob McBroom
East/West:	
First with 61.56%	Jackie Moor – Susan Smith
Second with 59.91%	George McDonald – Russ Buker
Third with 55.68%	Paula Olivares – Kathy Swaine

Western Conference STaC Results:

Monday Afternoon, August 19th, Friendly Bridge Club:

North/South:	
First with 60.89%	Roy Ladd – Bert Stock
Second with 59.07%	Bill Brodek – Bob McBroom
Third with 58.89%	Sharry Vida – Beth Morrin
East/West:	
First with 70.84%	Carol Provost – Roshen Hadulla
Second with 58.77%	Paula Olivares – Ruth Baker
Third with 55.70%	Russ Buker – Kathy Swaine

Tuesday Evening, August 20th, Valencia Bridge Studio (Castaic):

First with 60.0% Ruth Baker – Roy Ladd
Second with 58.75% Betty Pavey – Bert Stock
Third with 55.83% May Abagi – Hani Abraham

Thursday Morning, August 22nd, Valencia Bridge Studio (Castaic):

First with 62.5% Richard Stark – Lamonte Johnson
Second with 55.73% Bill Brodek – Bob McBroom
Third with 54.17% Ruth Baker – Anita Walker

Friday Afternoon, August 23rd, Strat. Aux. Pairs, Joshua Tree Bridge Club:

First with 65.97% May Abagi – Leah Levitt
Second with 63.19% Phoebe Evans – Beth Morrin
Third with 58.83% Russ Buker – David White

Sunday Afternoon, August 25th, Strat. Aux. Pairs, Joshua Tree Bridge Club:

First with 61.11% Kristi Kubo – Roshen Hadulla
Second with 60.42% Sharry Vida – Henry Roediger
Third with 53.47% Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky

Congratulations to Carol Provost and Roshen Hadulla who scored 3rd overall in the Western conference on Monday Afternoon’s game with 70.84%. They received 13.17 silver points.

Change of Address and Time for Tuesday Night Game (Valencia Bridge Studio):

Starting August 6th at 5:00 PM
Castaic Sports Complex (same place as Thursday AM)
Call Kathy for more information and reservations: 661-253-1105

Change of Address for the Joshua Tree Bridge Club:

2747 West Avenue L, Lancaster, CA 93536
Phone: 661-285-1779 or 760-505-3491

Change of Address for Friendly Bridge Club:

Santa Clarita Senior Center
27180 Golden Valley Road, Santa Clarita
Phone: 661-755-8543



Husbands and wives make poor partners – unless they happen to be someone else’s husband or wife. (Milton Ozaki)



San Fernando Valley
by Linda Silvey

September 21: Unit 561 “Fall Festival” Luncheon/Game

Unit 561 will host a “Fall Festival” Luncheon and Game on Saturday, September 21, at The 750 Club, 5700 Rudnick Ave, Woodland Hills. A catered lunch will be provided and served buffet style at 12noon, followed by an Open, Stratified game at 1 p.m. This is a special, free luncheon and game honoring all duplicate bridge players. Reservations will be required. A sign-up sheet is available at The 750 Club or email Marcia Broderick at marciabroderick@gmail.com for reservations or partnerships.

November 30: Unit 561 Holiday Bridge/Dinner Party

Unit 561 will host its Annual Holiday Bridge and Dinner Party on Saturday, November 30, at the 750 Club. An Open, Stratified Game will start at 2 p.m., followed by a festive dinner, catered by Stonefire Grill, at approximately 5:45 p.m.

The cost per person is \$35 and includes both bridge and dinner. Due to limited seating, reservations are required via purchase of non-refundable tickets by November 26. Ticket sales will begin November 1 at The 750 Club. Instructions for mail-in reservations will appear in the October issue of this newsletter article. Note: There will be no on-site ticket sales on November 30.

September 17: Braemar Dinner/Bridge Night

The next Braemar Dinner/Bridge Night will be held Tuesday, September 17. Dinner is \$20 per person and starts at 6 p.m. and the bridge is \$5 per person and begins at 7 p.m. This is an ACBL sanctioned game and the first place NS and EW winners will receive coupons for Braemar’s Wednesday night “Taste of Tuscany” dinner. For reservations and/or partnerships contact Nancy Klemens at nrklemens@aol.com or (818) 609-1071.

Special Congratulations

July Top Ten Masterpoints (for regular Club games) at The 750 Club were Ray Primus 10.72, Alan

Golden 9.19, Jerry Rose 8.03, Vera Mandell 7.97, Noel Purkin 7.87, Gary Baxley 7.57, Susan Raphael 7.45, Tammy Purkin 7.38, Bill Raff 6.54, and John Tickner 6.54.

The Top Winners in the North American Games in July were Ray Primus 10.19, Ron Malkin 7.82, Sue Bernstein 7.67, Bob Gasway 7.46, Yoshie Bell 6.65, Sin Orensztin 6.30, Gary Baxley 6.25, Joan Gray 6.19, Carol Winston 6.19, and Dan Strauss 5.81. The following pairs achieved 70% games: Roy Ladd-Albert Stock 72.87% and Carol Stein-Margaret Bissell 70.69%.

September Events at The 750 Club

The 750 Club will be open for the day game on Monday, September 2 (Labor Day) and closed for the night game. The 750 Club will be closed on Monday, September 30 (Rosh Hashanah) and Wednesday, October 9 (Yom Kippur). Club Championship Week will be held Monday-Friday, September 23-27. This is an opportunity to earn extra black points for no extra fee!

Calendar

Monday, September 2 (Labor Day), The 750 Club open for the day game, closed for the night game.

Tuesday, September 17, Braemar Dinner/Bridge Night starting at 6 p.m. See details above.

Saturday, September 21, "Fall Festival" U561 luncheon and bridge game will be held at The 750 Club. See details above.

Monday-Friday, September 23-27, Club Championship Week will be held at The 750 Club. See details above.

Monday, September 30, The 750 Club will be closed (Rosh Hashanah).

Wednesday, October 9, The 750 Club will be closed (Yom Kippur).

Saturday, November 30, Unit 561 Election for 2020 Board Members and Holiday Bridge/Dinner Party will be held at The 750 Club. **Please save the date and plan to attend!**

A Note from the Editor

Sadly, no one from West LA has stepped up to replace Bob Shore, the Unit 562 columnist for lo, these many years. We'll keep the space open. No special talent is required – see the Pomona-Covina column if you have any doubts – just an interest in keeping your Unit members informed, and hopefully, entertained.

Problem Solvers' Panel

Moderator: John Jones

Panelists are Wafik Abdou, Mark Bartusek, Tim Lolli, Mike Shuster, and Jon Wittes.

1

IMPs
N-S Vul

South	West	North	East
1♥	pass	1♠	pass
2♦	pass	3♦	pass
???			

You, South, hold: ♠AQ ♥K9865 ♦AQ86 ♣86

What call do you make?

[The problems from this set are hands that were played on the East Coast. This problem involves a difficult third bid. 15 HCPs looks like significantly too much to pass without significant risk of missing game. Which game is best? 3NT, 4♠, and 5♦ and maybe even 4♥ are all possibilities. Most of the panelists try 3♠, although it normally shows three card support. I was surprised at the number of panelists who said they would or might open 1NT (Bartusek mentioned it verbally, so every panelist except Wittes gave it some consideration). Despite the difficult third round bid we have encountered, I am of the opinion that opening 1NT with five hearts, four diamonds and a small doubleton is just unthinkable. You'll never get the distribution across and may have wrong-sided the contract.]

Lolli: 3NT. Hopefully partner can join in with some clubs. I wouldn't object to opening 1NT with this hand.

Shuster: 3♠. I expect partner to have a good diamond fit and about 10 - 11 HCP, often with a singleton heart. That

means that partner will nearly always show up with the ♣A or ♣K, so don't sweat the club control. If partner holds five spades and four diamonds, we will often belong in 4♠. If he holds five diamonds and four spades, then 5♦ will be our target. 3♠ seems the most natural continuation, catering to both contracts. By the way, I would have opened 1NT.

Abdou: 3♠. I'm end played into bidding it, although it normally shows 3 cards. However, nothing else is appealing. Why didn't I open 1NT?

Bartusek: 3♠. Probably doesn't guarantee three spades, since the obvious concern is a club stopper (a 5-2 spade fit might be the best spot). Note that if I held 3=5=4=1 with extras, I would probably jump to 4♠ here.

Wittes: 3♠. I know this tends to show three spades, but if partner doesn't have a club stopper, the 5 - 2 spade fit might be our best chance at game. My two spades are probably as good as any three spades partner might expect from me.

<h1 style="font-size: 4em;">2</h1> <p>IMPs N-S Vul</p>	<u>South</u> <u>West</u> <u>North</u> <u>East</u> ???
	You, South, hold: ♠AK8 ♥86 ♦A8 ♣AKQ1086 What call do you make?

[Nice hand, but Mark is correct that I should have asked the 2♣ bidders what their plan was.]

Bartusek: 2♣. This hand is much too strong to open 2NT, and 1♣ could easily miss a game. The posed problem should really have been what to rebid after opening 2♣. I play that a 3NT rebid shows a running minor with about nine tricks: if you go through Kokish and then bid 3NT, it shows a strong balanced hand (28-30) to break up the Kokish point range (2NT after Kokish being 25-27 or 31+). *[Mark's Kokish methods here are not expert standard, but I think his methods are a small improvement on what is more standard. I asked him to include his version].*

Lolli: 2♣. I have a good chance for nine tricks on this hand if partner has ♥JTxx without anything else. I wouldn't like 1♣ Pass Pass Pass.

Shuster: 2♣. I can make game opposite a balanced zero count, so any non-forcing opening is out. If we

get to game and it doesn't make, such is life. However, I am not willing to miss game with this monster.

Wittes: 2♣. I have too many tricks in my own hand to consider any other alternative.

[The above panelists all thought the chance of being passed out in 1♣ was too significant to risk. By contrast, Wafik thinks 2♣ is too clumsy to easily handle a smooth auction. I tend to agree. Holding six clubs, the chance someone bids is pretty high. I'd open 1♣, and over a 1♦ or a 1♥ response, I'd jump shift into 2♣. If partner responds 1♠ I would reverse into 2♦ and then support spades. The 1♣ bid is not only lower, but it is a natural bid, so it is significantly ahead in describing the hand.]

Abdou: 1♣. This hand is too good and positionally wrong for 2NT, and too cumbersome for 2♣, unless you play control responses. The problem is on the next turn after partner responds! I'll bid a fake jump shift into 2♣, or a fake reverse into 2♦ over a spade response.

<h1 style="font-size: 48px; margin: 0;">3</h1> <p style="margin: 0;">Matchpoints N-S Vul</p>	South	West	North	East
	1♠	double	redouble	1♦
	???			1NT
	You, South, hold: ♠A87642 ♥6 ♦AJ ♣KJ106 What call do you make?			

[What does the redouble mean? In my partnerships it normally would show Ax, Kx or Qx of partner's overcall. Regardless of what it means, are the backs of the cards all the same color? It certainly looks as if someone used a pinochle deck on this deal.]

Lolli: Pass. Partner is forced for one more bid, so I want to hear what he's about. If anyone is thinking this is a three card showing spade bid, I believe he/she is misguided.

Shuster: Double. Modern partnerships will have defined my partner's redouble. Lacking a special agreement, it shows values and desire to defend. I have extra values, so I'd like to encourage that game plan. If they wind up in a suit, we will destroy them with spade ruffs.

Wittes: 2♣. Even if partner has a reasonable hand with something like ♠Qx or ♠Jx, the texture of my spades could mean three trump losers in a spade

contract with the free 1NT bid in front of me (KJ10x or KQ10x for examples). If we have a game, 5♣ seems the more likely contract. If partner bids 2♠ over 2♣, I would not bid more than 3♠ despite the six card suit and good distribution.

Bartusek: 2♠. I play that partner's redouble specifically shows a doubleton spade with some values. Thus, 2♠ seems the spot to play which also stops LHO from bidding 2♦ or 2♥ (which could easily get raised by RHO). A 2♣ rebid doesn't interfere with LHO. Even if the redouble only showed something like honor doubleton of spades, 2♠ is probably the best tactical bid.

Abdou: 4♥/double. If redouble is support, I bid 4♥ as a self-splinter to clue partner in over the impending favorable sacrifice. Clearly 1NT is a joke. *[Quite likely!]* If redouble is power, I settle for a double for now. This is a 50 point deck?

<h1 style="font-size: 4em;">4</h1> <p>Matchpoints N-S Vul</p>	South	West	North	East
	2♥	5♣	1♠	2♣
	???		pass	pass
<p>You, South, hold: ♠K86 ♥AQ9865 ♦AQ6 ♣J</p> <p>What call do you make?</p>				

[It's critical to ascertain whether pass is forcing on this auction. Does the 2/1 force us to double or bid on? I think the answer is yes unless we are non-vulnerable versus vulnerable opponents who bid game. I think that vulnerability and level are even more important than form of scoring. I would always have an invitational sequence create a force at these colors. Mike spoke eloquently on this debate, so he gets first crack.]

Shuster: 5NT. Much hinges on whether partner's pass is forcing. While a 2/1 in competition doesn't generate a game force, I believe it ought to create a force when the opponents bid to the five level. However, recent panels on Bridgewinners [bridgewinners.com] show that my view on this aspect of partnership bidding is not standard. Regardless, I have a positive hand for slam and the opponents are blasting away in my shortness. Whatever partner holds is working, so I think we rate to have slam. I'll try 5NT to try to get to the stronger major suit fit.

[Mark is clearly in the non-forcing camp.]

Bartusek: 5♠. Vulnerable at MPs I think 5♠ is a fairly good description of the hand. Obviously partner's pass is non-forcing, so a 5♦ bid by me would be natural (not a cue bid). I don't think we'll get 5♣ enough to compensate for the vulnerable game. There is no way to make a slam try here.

[Jon's comment doesn't state specifically that he thinks pass is forcing, but it's clear he is in the "pass is forcing" camp].

Wittes: 6♣. Toughest problem in this set. Hopefully this implies some kind of spade fit, and we'll land in the best fit between spades and hearts. Preempts can be a bitch sometimes. LOL.

[Tim and Wafik discuss follow-ups by the passer, so they are also clearly in the "pass is forcing camp"].

Lolli: 5♠. This should be a very useful hand for partner, but just not quite enough to insist upon slam. If partner is kind enough to bid 6♣, I'll gladly bid 6♦ to probe for 7♥ or 7♠.

Abdou: 5NT pick a slam. A thoughtful partner would bid 6♣ with ♠AQ, ♥K and ♣A to allow me to bid a grand!

<h1 style="font-size: 4em; margin: 0;">5</h1> <p style="margin: 0;">Matchpoints Both Vul.</p>	South	West	North	East
		pass	1♣	pass
	1♠	pass	3NT	pass
	???			
<p>You, South, hold: ♠AK86532 ♥8 ♦A86 ♣86</p> <p>What call do you make?</p>				

[3NT differs significantly from 2NT in this auction. 2NT shows 18 to 19 HCP balanced. 3NT shows running (or almost running depending on partnership agreements) clubs, and frequently a singleton in partner's suit. 3NT has less HCP but more tricks than a 2NT bid would advertise. OK, the entire panel all knows what 3NT means, but where do we go from here? Is there a way to ask for aces? Do we insist on slam? Is it worth considering a grand?]

Lolli: 5♣. 4♣ is a slam try in clubs, so 5♣ is Super Gerber. *[I agree!]* Partner has seven solid clubs, so if he shows two aces, I'll bid the laydown 7♣.

Bartusek: 6♣. Partner should have solid clubs, red suit stoppers, and probably a stiff spade. I have no agreements with partners as to how I would ask for keycards here. Maybe 5♣ should be Super Gerber, with 4♣ forcing to game? *[That sounds right to me.]* Perhaps if I cue bid 4♦ and partner responded 4♥ I might be confident enough to blast 7♣?

Shuster: 4♣. I'm driving to 6♣, but want to bid key card along the way, in case we have a grand. The way

to do that is to set trump with 4♣ and then bid 4NT over partner's 4♥ cuebid. If partner tries 4NT over 4♣, then I'll give up on seven and just bid six. The heart ace and diamond king are enough for seven. Note that 6NT is safe opposite the ♥AK and no diamond king, so I'll be asking for specific kings and bidding seven myself if I find diamonds.

Abdou: 4♣. If partner has short spades, solid clubs and side stoppers as advertised, a club slam is odds on, and 4♣ will clue him in. I have a terrific hand with three quick tricks and a ruffing value. If he signs off in 4NT, I will have a difficult time not trying again, and will bid depending on the state of our game!

[Last word to the man who has played enough bridge to know that partner rarely produces the perfect hand.]

Wittes: 6♣. In a perfect world, partner should have a long running club suit, spade shortness and an ace or king in the other two suits. We could even be missing seven if partner has something like ♠x ♥Axx ♦Kx ♣AKQxxxx, but perfect hands seem to come up rarely.