

Bridge News

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

by Robert Shore



The Agenda

Our next District Board meeting will take place on Saturday, November 16, at the site of, and just after, the Pomona-Covina Unit Game. Game time is 11:00 a.m. so I estimate the meeting's starting time will be roughly 2:30. There will be a number of decisions to make so I don't anticipate a quick meeting.

My usual preference is to move meetings along out of respect for the participants' time. However, this time around I intend to err, if necessary, on the side of making sure people have the chance to say their piece. I do ask Board members to consider, before speaking, whether their point has already been made earlier. I intend to front-load the agenda with action items so that Board members who are less interested in various committee reports need not remain for them if they're not so inclined.

The Bridge News

The first issue for discussion will be the future of the *Bridge News*. Although we are able to produce the paper much more cheaply than most other Districts, given the District's financial condition the outlay is still significant. It's been made possible only by our Units, which (with one exception) are providing a voluntary contribution of \$1.80 per Unit member. A number of Units, although willing to make the outlay this year, have questioned whether the value created by the *Bridge News* is worth the price.

This is, of course, a reasonable question. I hope to have usage statistics available at the meeting, measuring unique hits both from within the District and from outside it. It's also worth asking whether the District's current financial condition makes it possible to bear more of the costs without requesting help from

PRESIDENT continued on page 2

District Director Report November 2019

by Kevin Lane

"Bridge is a game and should be fun."

San Francisco NABC



The San Francisco NABC starts in less than a month. Southern Californians should relish the opportunity to attend an NABC they can drive to!

The initial feedback for San Francisco has been positive despite the high costs related to all-things San Francisco.

Follow-up from last month's column

I received a number of positive comments about my column last month. I continue with related comments. Cecil Cook, the late D23 District Director from the 1990's, advised me of the long-standing bitter board politics of the ACBL. I, myself, consider the ACBL's duties important enough – and serious enough – that District Director duties should transcend politics. Sadly, this has not proven true. The ACBL will prosper soon after the board starts working together – teamwork! – to address critical problems.

My diagnosis is that board members are swayed by political considerations. As such, I favor

DIRECTOR continued on page 3

Inside This Issue	
Director's Chair	page 3
Rank Changes	page 5
Around the Units	page 6
Unit Board Meeting Minutes	page 11
Problem Solvers' Panel	page 12

PRESIDENT continued from page 1

the Units. And a related question is the appropriate response by the District when a Unit chooses not to make the voluntary contribution.

Some Units wonder whether we can trim costs still further. For some historical context, the price paid by the District to produce the paper used to be significantly higher. The prior administration was able to significantly lower costs, and passed some of those savings along to the Units; we used to request \$2.00 per Unit member. I'm skeptical whether substantial additional savings are available, but it's certainly a question worth exploring. Another possible option is trimming (i.e., removing) some of the long-standing features from the *Bridge News* to shorten and simplify the task of preparing it.

Back to School

The next action item will be to establish a policy regarding District schools that qualify for the Collegiate Championships. This is one of the first issues that confronted me after my election. Harvey Mudd College qualified for the 2019 Collegiate Championships. Most of its players come from District 22, and that District provided financial support. However, because the College itself is in our District and one of its players is from our District, we were asked to provide support as well.

It was a bit of a scramble but the Scholarship Committee (headed by John Jones) was able to locate a source of funds. This time. But I really think the District should have a policy on this issue. We support our District's representatives in the Grand National Teams event and we supplement ACBL's payments to our District's representatives in the North American Pairs, so it seems reasonable to support our local colleges as well.

But even if we decide to do so, there are additional questions to consider. Do we simply provide a lump sum for the team to handle as it sees fit? Do we support all colleges in our District or only those with players from District 23? Do we provide a per-player stipend, and if so, again, do we provide it to all players or only players from District 23? Given the number of decisions to be made, I think there's a lot to talk about. I hope Board members give the issue some thought prior to the meeting. And I will ask our newly appointed Education Chair, Alex Kolesnik, to kick off the discussion with his recommendations.

Regional Issues

I think the two items above will take up the bulk of our time, but there are a number of other items to report and some additional decisions to be made. I devoutly hope that our flyers for Bridge Week, the Summer's Best Regional, are out the door by the time of our meeting. I want to discuss whether it makes sense to apply for trademark protection for terms such as Bridge Week, a phrase we've been using for decades. We may also want to consider additional branding initiatives. In theory these are all (I think) good ideas but our financial resources sharply constrain our options.

We are still coordinating with District 22 in an effort to achieve mutual benefit. We are still talking to them about holding a joint regional. In addition, I've broached the idea of jointly sponsoring some sort of a trophy. The idea is to award the trophy to the player, anywhere in ACBL, who wins the most points combined in a particular collection of our regionals. District 22 seemed receptive to the idea, which I hope will help traveling pros and their clients choose our regionals over some of our competitors.

We'll report on the schedule for the regional. We received a specific request from pros who have long supported us to revise our schedule for the tournament's first couple of days. It was harder than it looks, but we think we've found a way to accommodate that request, so we'll report on both the issue and our solution. We also will report in detail on how we have adjusted to the retirement of our former equipment supplier. In summary, following recommendations of a committee chaired by our Treasurer, Stan Holzberg, recommendations that the ExComm approved, we made a significant purchase of equipment for future use. We also located a low-cost storage option. We will be more than happy to rent this equipment to our Units, and even to outside Units, at a reasonable price. We also can discuss the purchase of new decks of cards for the (metal) boards used in our team games.

Finally, we will discuss the feasibility of adding a new Regional to our schedule. The Torrance South Bay Unit recent voted to extend to the District a very generous offer to reduce our financial losses, if any, if we can add a new Regional to our schedule that is reasonably convenient to its players. I hope that by the time of the meeting some of our other Units may join that offer. In either event, I am happy to add to the agenda a discussion of the feasibility of adding a

regional. In addition to the “full” regional discussed here, there’s also been discussion of adding a short 499er regional to our schedule. Such a regional probably would not require a hotel commitment, and would give our local junior players opportunities to collect gold points.

Last Call

I’m currently contemplating two final agenda items (other than routine reports). First, although our meeting is the day before our North American Pairs District Final, I am hoping MoJo (our NAP coordinator) will have a good sense for the event’s financial performance this year. Ideally we’ll be in position to make a decision about continuing to supplement ACBL’s financial support for the District’s representatives in the event. Second, I’m informed that many Districts allocate money to be used at the President’s discretion. For obvious reasons that seems like a good idea to me, but that’s a decision to be made by the Board as a whole.

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

DIRECTOR continued from page 1

the significant reductions in expenses for Board President that we passed a couple years ago. Generally, the ACBL will improve as the ACBL President’s prerogatives are narrowed.

Upcoming San Francisco Issues

A number of motions are proposed for San Francisco to eliminate waste/inefficiency in board operations. I welcome this trend. Several board members – including me – have advocated for the board to address big issues while minimizing time spent on bureaucratic and small issues that don’t merit full-board attention.

I continue to work with other board members to advance these important ideas.

Regional Card Fees

In Las Vegas, additional expenses were proposed that make it more expensive for ACBL Districts to conduct regionals. I anticipate these fees will mean an increase in District 23 regional card fees. Now, D23 has not raised fees in several years, so a fee increase is reasonable, but I’m disappointed that a D23 fee increase will largely go to the ACBL – rather than D23 – to pay for increased tournament costs.

Feel free to contact me at klaned23@gmail.com

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

For many years it has been a not-infrequent occurrence for players to make an opening bid of 1NT with a semi-balanced hand (2254) or indeed an unbalanced hand (1435). In the last couple of years, the ACBL has attempted to clarify the issues surrounding an opening bid of 1NT. The initial edict stated that it was legal to open 1NT with a singleton Ace, King or Queen, PROVIDED the hand did not also contain a doubleton. When this change was introduced, it, in my view, probably created more problems than it solved. Players, on occasion, still opened 1NT on a disallowed shape. After all, what would YOU bid if this was your hand: ♠J, ♥AQ5, ♦A753, ♣AJ654? My guess is that a good number of players would have chosen to open with a bid of 1NT, because of the difficulty of finding an appropriate re-bid if they opened 1♣ and partner responded 1♠. When the ACBL introduced this “change” to the permitted shape of 1NT, there was no prohibition on an occasional psyche in which a player might perhaps open 1NT on the type of hand shown above. There was no provision for protection for the non-offending side, provided that such non-approved bids happened very infrequently.

Matters surrounding acceptable 1NT shapes, and point ranges, were clarified in November 2018 with the issue of new ACBL Convention Charts. On all Convention charts that apply to Club play, a 1NT opening bid is legal if it satisfies the following criteria:

- The hand contains no voids, no more than one singleton, which must be an ace, king or queen, and does **not** contain 10 or more cards in any two suits combined. (*This means that the only “allowable” shapes for a 1NT opening bid are 4-3-3-3, 4-4-3-2, 5-3-3-2, 6-3-2-2, 5-4-2-2, 4-4-4-1 and 5-4-3-1.*)
- The hand contains at least 10 high card points and the range of points is **not** greater than five. (*This means that 1NT opening bids may have, say, an opening range of 10-14, 11-15, 12-16 and so on. BUT a pair playing a 1NT opening*

that has a 5-point range may NOT open 1NT that does not fall within that range.)

What is the task of the Director when he is called to the table, by a player whose opponent has opened 1NT, with a hand that does not fit either of the shape or point range requirements specified above?

The 2018 Convention Charts provide this statement: “If an agreement would be disallowed unless it satisfies a specific high-card or shape requirement, a player may not use judgment to include hands with fewer high-card points or a different shape”. This effectively means that a deliberate “psych” of a 1NT opening bid that does not adhere to both the shape and point-range requirements is now an illegal bid!!

If there is an illegal 1NT opening bid the Director has to adjudicate two issues

- Would the offending pair have reached the same, or similar, final contract if all of their bidding had been “legal”? If the answer to this question is in the affirmative than no adjustment to the score is warranted. If the Director is convinced that a less advantageous contract would have been reached then an adjusted score may then be allocated.

- Have the defenders been adversely affected by the illegal opening bid? If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, again the Director may allocate an adjusted score.

It should be noted that a player may claim that they opened an “illegal” 1NT because they missorted their hand! Yes, indeed there are occasions when hands are missorted. Such claims of “missorted” require careful consideration by the Director, particularly if the player concerned has a history of bids that are somewhat “strange”.

There should really be no automatic penalties for opening a 1NT bid that does not fit either of the two requirements previously mentioned. A penalty should certainly be allocated against a player who opened 1NT, KNOWING that what he was making an illegal bid. In such a situation a Procedural Penalty of, say, 25% of a top, would be appropriate.

Much of this article has been adapted from an excellent piece by Matt Smith on pages 30-31 in the October ACBL Bridge Bulletin.

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

District 23 Rank Changes September 2019

Junior Master

Kent Carlsen
Ray Ishaik
Christopher Oliver
Susan Smith

Club Master

Mikie Alpert
Marilyn L. Conzonire
John A. Kilmer
Melanie M. Smothers

Sectional Master

Ted J. Dowe
Janice U. Fischer
Nava Grutman
Susanne Hollis
Susan E. Johnson
Karen Krull
Ronald A. Lu

Sectional Master

Marjorie Preston
David Scholler
Julie E. Spore

Regional Master

Gay Gipson
Joanna Jones-Reed
I. D. Patel
Morton L. Shatzkin

NABC Master

Al W. Appel
Brian Fielding

Life Master

William L. Dilks
Sharyn J. Miller
Ernest A. Ross
Kathleen K. Shinkle
Roy J. Tomooka

Bronze Life Master

Robert Johann

Silver Life Master

Harold S. Koletsky
Alan P. Olschwang
Jojo Sarkar
Diane L. Schmitz
Harish Singh
Murat E. Veysoglu

Ruby Life Master

Andrew G. DeSosa

Gold Life Master

Michael L. Clemens
Richard L. Plumer

Diamond Life Master

Om Chokriwala

A Note from the District 23 President

The West Los Angeles Unit has informed the District that it was declining to provide its share of the financial support for the Bridge News that is requested of all Units. That is the Unit's right. But all of the other Units have made their requested contribution, and there's an obvious unfairness in providing the same level of service to West Los Angeles as we are providing to the Units that contributing to the paper's financial support.

In consultation with the District's Executive Committee and the editor-in-chief, we have concluded that an appropriate response includes omitting from the list of District 23 Rank Changes any members of the West Los Angeles Unit. We apologize to the 33 players who have been affected so far, and to those who will be affected in coming months, but our hand has been forced. I requested that the West Los Angeles Unit defer its decision until I'd had an opportunity to address their concerns. The Unit declined to do so.

West Los Angeles Unit members who wish to be included in this list in the future should consider officially changing their Unit membership with ACBL. Unit members who would like the Unit Board to reconsider its decision should contact the Board's members.

Around the Units in District 23



Long Beach by Jon Yinger

www.acblunit557.org
www.LongBeachBridge.com

Sept 22 Unit Game: Overall results: 1st in A Linda and V Jay Tipton, 2nd Chiye and Bruce Horiguchi 3rd Peggy Waite/John Crabtree, 4th Sherman Gao/Robert Micone, 5th Kim Wang/Louis Shen, 6th John Petrie/Steve Sturm. In the B flight overalls Hanefi Erten/Oliver Yildiz were 2nd, Eva Mroz/Penny Wentworth 3rd, Betti Harris/Kiyo Nagaishi 4th, Wayne Rapp/Kay Tseng 5th, Dalia Hernandez/Joyce Henderson 6th. In the C flight overalls Rosalie and Bob Cuccias were 1st, Sandra Schollosser/Fred Willbanks 2nd, Kiran Kumar/Hanan Mogharbel 3rd, Alan and Barbara Olschwang 4th, Mark Singer/Paul Chen 5th. And in the 199er section Elain Bok/Toshie Bergan were 1st, Beth Byrne/Bill Cray 2nd, Freda Main/Pamela Haskins 3rd, Charlotte Roush/Allene Buchanan 4th. Congratulations to all!!

70% GAMES Sept 16 through Oct 15: In supervised play games: Sept Sept 17 (morning) Ardis Laine/John Jones had 76.98% and in the evening Alleen Buchanan/John Melis had 73.44%. In open games: Sept 17 Rich Wasser/Mike Welsh had 75.24%, Sept 18 Judy Cook/Frances Gross had 82.25%, Oct 4 Bill Cray/Joanne Armenia had 75%, Oct 7 Ted Dowe/Joanne Armentia had 76.40%. And in the Sept 22 Unit Game 199er section Toshie Bergan/Elaine Bok had 74.51%. Congratulations to all eight pairs!

BIG MASTER POINT AWARDS Sept 16 through Oct 15: Sept 17 Kim Wang/Mark Tang won 3.06mp for 1st. Sept 18 Larry Slutsky/Carol Murakoshi won 3.50mp for 1st. Sept 19 Suzy and John Hand won 3.79mp for 1st. In the Unit Game Sept 22 Linda and V Jay Tipton won 4.81mp for 1st, Chiye and Bruce Horiguchi 3.61mp for 2nd. Sept 23 Betty McClellan/Jon Yinger won 3.94mp for 1st. Sept 25 Kiyo Nagaishi/Wayne Rapp won 3.65mp for 1st.

Oct 1 Rich Wasser/Mike Welsh won 4.81mp for 1st, Greg Tapia Les Rawitt 3.61mp for 2nd. Oct 2 John Petrie/Sankar Reddy won 3.94mp for 1st. And Sept 15 John Petrie/Louis Shen won 5.44 for 1st, Robert and Richard Bakovic 4.08 for 2nd, Betty McClellan/Steve Rowe 3.06mp for 3rd. Congratulations to all!

NEW CLUB MEMBERS: Darryl Manson, Jane Manson, Aida Porteneuve, Dale Whitney. Welcome to the club!

STATUS CHANGES: New Jr. Master: Tracey Whitney. New Regional Master: Charles Laine. New Ruby Life Master: Christine Frumen. Congratulations to you all!

GET WELL: Phyllis Parker, Peggy Waite

UP-COMING EVENTS AT THE CLUB:

Oct 21-27 Bridge Brigade Auction ends 5 minutes after Unit Game
Oct 27 (Sun) 12:30 Unit Game \$8 card fee, dessert served
Oct 31 Instant Matchpoint game and Halloween pot luck \$3 extra Extra points
Nov 4-10 Club Championship week. Extra points, regular card fee
Nov 9-10 NLM Sectional
Nov 11-19 District 23 STaC week. Extra points, \$11 card fee
Nov 17 Eight is enough--Swiss Teams 12:30pm
Nov 18 Birthday Monday Play for \$5 on your November birthday
Nov 25 Pro-Am game 9:30-11:30 Pros Free, Ams \$5
Nov 28 Thanksgiving Day. Club closed
Nov 28-Dec 8 NABC in San Francisco
No November Unit Game

NEWS FROM LEISURE WORLD

BRIDGE CLUBS

Judy Carter-Johnson

CLUB CHAMPIONSHIP— Clubhouse #1
September 14: Barbara and Alan Olschwang 1 in A, 1 in B. Marilyn McClintock/Mark Singer 2 in A, 2 in B. Dorothy Favre/Bud Parish 3 in A. Sue Boswell/Kar-Yee Nelson 4 in A, 3 in B, 1 in C. Sylvia Kaprelyan/Russ Gray 5 in A, 4 in B, 2 in C.

SWISS TEAM--EIGHT IS ENOUGH--

Clubhouse #3 September 23: Tied for 1/2 S Fardette, M Ullman, N Krueger, E Kice tied with P and R Adams, M and A Reddy. 3rd L Slutsky, M Singer, K Nelson, W Dilks. Tied for 4/5 F Dunbar, M McClintock, H Weiss, F Gross tied with J Carter-Johnson, R Preece, M. Nelson, H. Smith.

UNIT RATED GAME--Clubhouse #3

October 14: Chie Wickham/Alan Olschwang 1 in A, 1 in B. Judy Cook/Larry Topper 2 in A, 1 in B. Sue Fardette/Larry Slutsky 3/4 in A. Monica and Paul Honey 3/4 in A, 3 in B, 1 in C.

Jeanette Estill/Marilyn McClintock 4 in A. Bill Linskey/Rob Preece 5 in A. Joan and Ted Wieber 6 in A, 4 in B, 2 in C. Judy Carter-Johnson/Mark Singer 5 in B.

Nancy Lichter/Richard Norris 3 in C. Linda Nye/Ted Cooper 4 in C.

On a personal note, your reporter wishes to thank all my bridge friends for their support this last four months since the untimely deaths of my daughter Linda and son in law Brad.

Any news for next month's column, please e mail me @ jcj90740@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 November 16,
11:00 a.m., Glendora
Individual: No game this month

SPECIAL NOTE: We *strongly* urge you to make a reservation for the Unit game this month, if you plan to play. Why? Our District is holding a Board-of-Directors' meeting after the game ... and we've invited potential attendees to come and play. However, those of you familiar with our playing site

know that we can only fit in so many tables. 11 tables will fit in comfortably, and maybe, just maybe, one more. That's the limit, however, even if we set up some tables on the back patio. Again, why? Simple: we only have 12 Bridge Mates. Yes, we could go back to using travelers. I'm sure *that* would be popular.

As an added attraction, we will be supplying hand records for this game. AFTER the game, I mean.

Gino Barbieri tied with Clint Lew for first place in the October Individual game, scoring 57.29%. Hanan Mogharbel tied with Penny Barbieri for third; Art Weinstein was fifth, and Steve Mancini took the sixth and final spot on the leader board.

The October Unit game was captured by Al Lax – Kurt Trieselmann, with a 62.04% game. Fredy and Lulu Minter took second, Roger Boyar – Yours Truly were third, Bill Papa – Vic Sartor fourth.

The games were very competitive in October, with no one reaching 70%. Quite a few people did crack 65%, most of them seemingly Roger Boyar! Topping the list was Roger Boyar – Steve Mancini, with 68.23%. Next best effort was Hanan Mogharbel – Claudia Cochran, 65.83%. Fredy and Lulu Minter scored 65.74%. Rogar hit 65.10% playing with Fredy Minter; Bill Papa – Vic Sartor also scored 65.10%; and Roger hit 65% on the nose playing with Herb Stampfl.

Other winners: Marjorie Preston, Kathy Malovos, Sofi Kasubhai, Linda Stuart, Ho Ming Yim, Chris Clautice and Your Correspondent.

I'm going to hold off reporting the masterpoint leaders this month, because there are still two games to play as we go to press. Sorry! (Well, not really!) I'll report in full next month.

In the promotion department, we find that Marjorie Preston is now a Sectional Master, and Harish Singh has climbed up to Silver Live Master. Congratulations to you both!

La Fetra will be hosting STaC games at the regularly scheduled times on Tuesday, November 12, Thursday, November 14, and Friday, November 15. Entry fee for these games is \$8 – a bargain!

Once again, our hand of the month is a wild freak. Appropriate, just before Halloween, no? Sitting in third seat, both vulnerable, you find yourself looking at this semi-balanced hand:

♠ 6 ♥ QJ973 ♦ AKJ1072 ♣ none.

7-5 in the red suits, 1-0 in the blacks; that's semi-balanced, isn't it? Anyway, what's your opening bid, after two passes? 1♥ might be right; 1♦, then planning to reverse into 2♥ after partner's expected 1♠ response, maybe? Only 11HCP, Walter, but *enormous* playing strength if you can find a red-suit fit. Whatever you decide to do, you will be off to the races soon, as partner has

♠ Q8 ♥ AK1042 ♦ 743 ♣ 1084.

6♥ is cold, and so is 6♦ (the ♦Q drops doubleton). Amazingly, in a five table game, *no one* got to either slam! Results were +680 in 4♥, +620 in 6♦, +500 (the opponents sacrificing in 5♠x) ... and two – count 'em – TWO +170 scores. Apparently two people regarded that 7-5 hand as worthy of a preemptive diamond bid, which silences partner. Go figure!

Quote for the month: "During an election campaign the air is full of speeches and vice versa." (Henry Adams)



Santa Clarita- Antelope Valley by Beth Morrin

Unit 556 Board Nominations

Are you looking for adventure of a new and different kind? Unit 556 is seeking members who are interested in serving on the Unit Board in 2020. This is an opportunity to give back to the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley bridge community, meet new friends, and have an impact on changing things for the betterment of Unit bridge players.

If you wish to self-nominate, please contact Ruth Baker (rbaker1243@sbcglobal.net) or Beth Morrin (morrin@sbcglobal.net).

Nominations must be received by January 1st.

Results of the ACBL-wide Senior Pairs Game:

Friday, October 4th:

1 st	Roshen Hadulla–Paula Olivares	64.06%
2 nd /3 rd	Carol Provost–George MacDonald	59.90%
	David White–Charles Morrin	59.90%
4 th	Kay Aiken – Rosalee McEntyre	57.30%
5 th	Henry Roediger – Beth Morrin	55.21%

Election of Board of Directors for Santa Clarita and Antelope Valley:

The Unit 556 Board election will be held in January at the annual "After the Holidays Party" (location and date will be announced next month).

Upcoming Events:

Unit 556 will participate in the Southern California Fall STaC games during the week of November 11-17, 2018. We will hold games at the following times:

Tuesday, Nov. 12th at 5:00 PM at the Sports Complex in Castaic

Thursday, Nov. 14th at 10:00 AM at the Sports Complex in Castaic

Friday, Nov. 15th at 12:30 PM at Joshua Tree Bridge Club in Lancaster

Sunday, Nov. 17th at 12:30 PM at Joshua Tree Bridge Club in Lancaster

Next Board meeting: TBA



San Fernando Valley by Linda Silvey

November 30: Unit 561 Holiday Bridge/Dinner

Unit 561 will host its Annual Holiday Bridge and Dinner Party on Saturday, November 30, at The 750 Bridge 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 Bridge Club, or by mail to Rochelle Lotto at 1071 Terrace Hill Circle, Westlake Village, CA 91362 (nanalotto@yahoo.com). Note: There will be no on-site ticket sales on November 30.

Unit 561 Board Nominations

Unit 561 is seeking members who are interested in serving on the Unit Board, beginning January 1, 2020. This is an opportunity to give back to

the San Fernando Valley bridge community, meet new friends, and have an impact on changing things for the betterment of U561 bridge players. If you wish to self-nominate, please contact Marcia Broderick at marciabroderick@gmail.com or sign up at The 750 Bridge Club. The Unit Board election will be held at the November 30 Holiday Party.

September 21 Unit 561 Game Report

A very successful Unit 561 “Fall Festival” luncheon and bridge game was held on Saturday, September 21, at The 750 Bridge Club in Woodland Hills. Following a delicious buffet luncheon, organized by Rochelle Lotto (U561 Hospitality Chair), a special celebration occurred honoring Bill and Terry Morton. The Mortons retired from “active bridge duty” on September 30 (see below for more details). The 750 Bridge Club is now under the capable owner/management skills of Alan Curtis, who plans to continue the Club under the pre-existing player-friendly guidelines.

An Open bridge game of 30 tables, ably directed by Mike Fierman, was held after the luncheon and celebration. Winners in the bridge game were: NS – Margaret Bissell-Gabriella Amadeo 63.95%, Martin Hurwitz-R Gasway 61.96%, Mary Young-Barbara Ann Haas, 54.03%, Beverly McLeod-Anne Hurwitz 53.70%, and Noel Purkin-Tammy Purkin 53.41%; EW – Sin Orensztin-Mark Peters 64.43%, A Fradkin-Aimee Deiter 63.09%, Robert Shore-Kevin Lane 62.65%, Sheila Singer-John Clark 61.89%, and Bud Bates-Deborah Levinson 61.55%.

The Mortons’ Retirement Celebration

At the September 21 Unit Game, Marcia Broderick, U561 President, presented Bill and Terry Morton with gifts from Unit 561, including a photo memory book which Frona DeCovnick is putting together to be presented at a later date. Special guests were Robert Shore (ACBL D23 President) and Kevin Lane (ACBL D23 Director) who brought greetings from ACBL. He also congratulated and thanked the Mortons for all their efforts furthering access to duplicate bridge games for beginning and intermediate players in the San Fernando Valley and increasing membership in ACBL.



Bill Morton

Terry Morton

Ilene Feinstein, U561 Secretary, presented a beautiful proclamation from The Los Angeles City Council to the Mortons. The proclamation was arranged through Councilman Bob Blumenfeld’s office, Council District 3 (South West Valley). This proclamation honored the Mortons for their contributions to San Fernando Valley bridge players, the business community, and their fund raising activities on behalf of the Alzheimer’s Association and the West Valley Food Pantry in Woodland Hills. Note: Thanks to Frona DeCovnick for the above pictures.

Special Congratulations

World travelers, Michael and Nancy Klemens, recently returned from a European vacation where their travels included Ankara (Turkey) where they played bridge twice, and Athens (Greece). While in Athens they played bridge outdoors in a tournament sponsored by the Greek Bridge Association. To their great excitement, they came in first in the tournament game!

September Top Ten Masterpoints at The 750 Bridge Club were Helle Wengrow 12.52, Ravnesh Amar 12.24, Tammy Purkin 11.91, Noel Purkin 10.56, Ray Primus 10.49, Susan Raphael 9.64, Martin Hurwitz 9.62, R Gasway 9.52, Jerry Goodman 9.25, and Gary Baxley 8.91. The following pair earned a 70% game: Jojo Sarkar-Doug Timmer 73.21%.

November 19: Braemar Dinner/Bridge Night

The next Braemar Dinner/Bridge Night will be held Tuesday, November 19. 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.

November Events at The 750 Bridge Club

Club Championship week will be held Monday-Friday, November 4-November 8, at The 750

Bridge Club. This is an opportunity for players to earn extra points for no extra fee! The Club will be closed on Monday, November 11, due to work on the parking lot at the Church

The 750 Bridge Club will hold D23 STaC games Tuesday-Friday, November 12-November 15. Players will be able to earn silver points and the fee will be \$1.00 extra. The 750 Bridge Club will be closed on Thursday, November 28 for the Thanksgiving holiday. A regular game will be held on Friday, November 29.

Calendar

Friday, November 1, Ticket sales begin for the U561 Holiday Bridge/Dinner Party. See details above.

Monday-Friday, November 4-8, Club Championship week will be held at The 750 Bridge Club. See details above.

Monday, November 11, The 750 Bridge Club will be closed due to work on the parking lot.

Tuesday-Friday, November 12-15, D23 STaC week will be held at The 750 Bridge Club.

Tuesday, November 19, Braemar Dinner/Bridge Night starting at 6 p.m. See details above.

Tuesday, November 26, is the last day to purchase tickets for the U561 Holiday Bridge/Dinner Party.

Tuesday, November 26, Self-Nominations are due for the 2020 U561 Board Election.

Thursday, November 28, The 750 Bridge Club will be closed for the Thanksgiving Day holiday.

Friday, November 29, A regular 11 a.m. game will be held at The 750 Bridge Club.

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

Downey – Whittier submitted by Linda Eagan edited by Liz Burrell

Downey-Whittier Bridge Club (DWBC) has now purchased Bridgemates! We have been using them for the past few weeks (with a couple of bumps in the road) and we are loving our new toy. But the most amazing event happened: two members of Downey Bridge volunteered to pay for them in full. ID

Patel and Ernie Wong are two very special members of the Downey-Whittier Bridge Club and we are humbled, amazed and ever grateful for their generosity.

We look forward to seeing you at DWBC in November. Scheduled games are as follows:

Unit	Nov 6
STAC	Nov 13
Unit	Nov 20
Unit	Nov 27

December 18, 2019 is DWBC Potluck Holiday Party. If you are coming, please contact Liz Burrell at 562-972-2913 to make your reservation and to let us know what you would like to bring. This is also a Unit game so grab your partner and join the festivities. Good food, challenging bridge and holiday cheer...it's sure to be a great day and space is limited.

Game of note: Ernie Wong and Walter Schafer had an excellent 63.10% game on October 2. Not only is Ernie a kind, generous man but he's also a fine bridge player!

There is another great Unit 564 bridge game in Whittier on Thursday nights at 6:30 pm at Friendly Hills Country Club. Please contact Steve Sturm at 562-217-1705 or stevesturm123456@gmail.com for more information.

Editor's Note:

The West Los Angeles Unit has elected not to make the requested financial contribution to support the Bridge News, so the District has decided that the West Los Angeles Unit column will not be included. We are informed this decision was taken by secret ballot, so we are unable to inform you of which West L.A. Board members voted to cut off funds. The members of the Unit Board (as of this writing) who can vote to reverse this decision are: Jordan Chodorow, Bob Shore, Roger Clough, Lee Hausner, Peter Benjamin, Michele DiLorenzo, Chris Dowson, Marcia Fisher, Chuck Fonarow, Carolyn Taff, Stephanie Young.

Unit Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Editor's Note: *Because of the early deadline this month, some Units who participated last month, may not have held their BOD meeting yet. If so, there's always next month.*

Unit 551 Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

October 12, 2019

- I. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 10:18 a.m. by Vic Sartor at the Knights of Columbus Hall in Glendora, CA.
- II. Roll Call: Those present – Vic Sartor, Tom Lill, Penny Barbieri, Linda Tessier, Roger Boyar. Absent – Clint Lew
- III. Reading and Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the September 21, 2019 meeting were read and approved with one correction, --- The Membership Report should contain information on promotions and membership status. It is not necessary to include information on renewal bills.
- IV. Treasurer's Report:

Balance on 09 - 30 – 2019	\$5663.73
M.T.D. net loss	-\$179.40
Y.T.D. net income	\$367.19

Penny Barbieri will write a check to reimburse Clint Lew for the cards bought for Richard Patterson and Ken Bloomfield.
- V. Membership Report: We have 110 members. We had two transfers out of our unit – Carol Kramer and Howard Leukhardt. David Van Fleet is now inactive. Sue Aspley is now a Club Master. Ho Ming Yim is now an Advanced NABC Master.
- VI. Club Manager's Report: The October Individual Game was held on October 05, 2019. Gino Barbieri and Clint Lew tied for first and second, Hanan Mogharbel and Penny Barbieri tied for third and fourth, Arthur Weinstein was fifth, Steve Mancini was sixth. There will be NO Individual Game in November. The December, 2019 Individual Game will be at Tom Lill's house. The January, 2020 Individual Game will be at Penny Barbieri's house. Depending on attendance, Tom

Lill will decide whether to renew the sanction for the Individual Game.

There were 41 $\frac{3}{4}$ tables of games at La Fetra in September, 2019.

Tom Lill will be leaving for Europe on October 26, 2019. Roger Boyar will run the games for two weeks until Tom returns.

- VII. Hospitality: A bill of \$30.00 was submitted.
- VIII. Education: Tom Lill has three students. For new students, he is using the book, "Bidding in the 21st Century." For the intermediate students, he is using reference material on hand.
- IX. Disciplinary: There was nothing new to report.
- X. Publicity: The Southern California Bridge News can be found in the District website. If you wish to receive it, please let Tom Lill know and he will add you to his distribution list. Those Units not contributing to the Bridge News will not be included in it.
- XI. Old Business: A meeting will be arranged with Jane Pace from Unit 516 concerning a Joint Sectional with us.
- XII. New Business:

The current Unit Board of Directors officers will remain in their positions.

To encourage others to join the Board of Directors it was decided that we would offer those interested three months of free Unit Games.

Because of extra attendance at the November, 2019 Unit Game, it will be necessary to sign up to attend it. The sign-up sheet will be posted at all La Fetra games, or contact any Board member.

There will be StaC games on November 12, 14 and 15, 2019. There are also StaC games scheduled for December 9-16, 2019. Tom Lill does not plan to register for the December StaC Games because they conflict with the Rancho Mirage Regional.
- XIII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m. by Vic Sartor.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Tessier, Secretary.

Problem Solvers' Panel

Moderator: John Jones

Panelists are Gerry Bare, Leo Bell, David Sacks, Mike Shuster, and Jon Wittes.

<h1>1</h1> <p>IMPs None Vul</p>	<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
	pass ???	1♠	2♣	1♥ 2♠#
# Shows four spades				
You, South, hold: ♠A102 ♥KJ8763 ♦A72 ♣6				
What call do you make?				

Wittes: 3NT. Should be our best chance at a game. Partner probably has at most three major suit cards. He should have six or seven very good clubs and an outside card, since he didn't bid an unusual 2NT and didn't preempt in clubs.

Bare: 3♣. Partner is short in both majors, and he should have good clubs. *[This looks weird to raise with only one club, but partner must have good clubs. This might be best.]*

Shuster: 2NT. I expect partner to bid 3♣ next (which I will pass.) What is partner's shape? He has at most two spades and two hearts, but that minimum shape would leave LHO with 4-0 in the majors! More likely, LHO is 4=1=5=3. RHO is 4=5=2=2 or 4=5=3=1. That makes partner either 2=1=4=6 or 2=1=3=7. So it appears the opponents won't have a source of tricks, but we might. Neither opponent rates to hold four clubs, and they won't be able to score a fifth spade. Those are all positive for 3NT, but it isn't enough. I need partner to have sufficient values that we can establish and run the clubs before they cash five tricks. Partner won't often have enough strength to raise to 3NT, but if he does, we rate to make it.

By the way, even if 2NT isn't expressly agreed as forcing here, it is forcing as a practical matter. If partner has strength, he will raise. If he is weak, he will always have long enough clubs to remove to 3♣. *[I agree. He'll raise to 3NT, signoff in 3♣, or possibly make a move towards 5♣, but virtually never pass.]*

Bell: Pass. If the auction continues, I may well enter the fray, but it's premature at this point. *[The sneaky dog quietly lies in the weeds waiting to get all the food. I can see him salivating; "Just one more bid, please one more bid and I'll go red!"]*

[Yet another brave soul!]

Sacks: Pass. I will bring axe if they bid again (unlikely), but it's just a bit too rich to double them not vulnerable at IMPs at the two level. *[Is double here really penalty?]*

[I like double. Surely partner won't play me for a spade stack and should know I have hearts. If partner infers short clubs, a heart stack, good controls and good defense, I'm very close to the mark.]

<h1 style="font-size: 4em;">2</h1> <p>IMPs None Vul</p>	South	West	North	East
	1♣	2♦	2♥	5♦
	???			
	You, South, hold: ♠AK108 ♥7 ♦75 ♣AK9853 2a) Is pass forcing? 2b) What's your call?			

This a tough problem, but hinges on whether pass is forcing.]

Bare: a) No.

b) Double.

Shuster: a) No, but it should be. *[He means double isn't forcing in expert standard, but it should be. This problem is another commercial for 2/1 in competition creating a force if the opponents bid (especially if they preempt).]* A two over one in comp does not establish ownership of the hand, so does not create forcing pass auctions. However, I prefer to agree that if 4th hand jumps to 4♠ or higher, it does create a forcing pass situation. As a practical matter, 4th hand does not jump like this expecting to make, so we should have our best tools available to judge the 5-level.

b) Double. I have short hearts and two diamonds. Yes, partner rates to hold no more than one diamond, but that isn't guaranteed. However, even when I catch my guy with a stiff diamond, he is not guaranteed to hold club support. So, given equal vulnerability, I'll just take my number rather than risk a hopeless 6♣ contract.

Wittes: a) Yes. Pass would surely be forcing if we were vulnerable. It probably should be forcing non-vulnerable as well, since even though 2♥ isn't 100% game forcing in competition, it still should show at least an invitational hand. The opponents are at the five level in an auction where we definitely have the preponderance of high cards.

b) Double. This is a very tough problem, and once again shows how preempts are so difficult to defend against at a high level. Partner almost surely has a stiff

or void diamond. If he has a solid heart suit or a club fit, we probably have a slam. I have so many controls in the black suits, it's going to be difficult for partner to carry on with some type of minimum opening bid. On the other hand, slam is no guarantee, and we should surely get 5♦ doubled for at least 500, very possibly 800 or 1100, even if the opponents have some distribution. So even if a double is wrong, we will still lose very little, if anything, against our possible slam. However, if a slam is not making, bidding on could be very costly. Also, if partner has a diamond void, and a good hand for either hearts or clubs, he can still bid over the double.

Sacks: a) Yes. It should be forcing. If my red suits were reversed I would pass.

b) Double: The only slam we may have is in clubs (if partner has both majors he should start with negative double). We have four primes but no known fit. A singleton diamond from partner is not guaranteed.

Bell: a) Yes. When the opponents are clearly preempting, pass should be forcing at the four level and higher.

b) Double. I think pass should imply some fit with partner or a hand where I can bid my suit after partner's action.

[My personal preference is that forcing passes are established by invitational auctions, especially when they preempt, so for me this would be a forcing pass. If pass here is forcing, I still think I would double. Hands with a stiff diamond and solid hearts or a club fit may produce 12 twelve tricks, but partner isn't through.]

<h1 style="font-size: 48px; margin: 0;">3</h1> <p style="margin: 0;">IMPs None Vul</p>	<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
		1♦	2NT	pass
	3♣	pass	3♦	pass
	3NT	pass	4♥	pass
	???			
	You, South, hold: ♠K654 ♥102 ♦K742 ♣Q83 What call do you make?			

Bare: 6♣. May not be cold for 6♣, but should at least have a play.

Shuster: Pass. Partner is bidding to make and knows we have at most a doubleton heart. One cover card is not enough to look for slam.

Wittes: Pass. Partner should have six very good hearts and five good clubs, and probably a diamond void. My kings are not very well located, so we rate to have two losers.

Bell: Pass. Partner shows a very good hand with at least six hearts. The ♣Q is my only working card. I don't think that's enough to bid more.

Sack: Pass. And pass the Advil.

[My kings are not well placed. Marshall Miles used to argue that hands that bid Unusual NT or Michaels and then voluntarily bid again could not have the major longer than the minor. If that agreement is in place, then I like correcting to 5♣. If partner has ♠xx ♥AKJxx ♦void ♣AKJxxx, then 5♣ will play better than 4♥ if it runs into control issues.]

<h1 style="font-size: 4em;">4</h1> <p>IMPs Both Vul</p>	<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
				1♦
	Pass	pass	1♥	pass
	2♦	pass	2♥	pass
	???			
<p>You, South, hold: ♠1072 ♥AQ5 ♦A102 ♣A862</p> <p>What call do you make?</p>				

Bell: 4♥. Just in case it makes.

Shuster: 3NT. Partner can pull with enough shape. Even if we are off the spade suit, neither opponent rates to hold five of them, and we could easily have the rest.

Wittes: 3♥. I don't want to punish partner for balancing, but my good trumps and controls surely warrant one more try.

Bare: 3♥. I could hardly be better after passing.

Sacks: 2NT. I might have bid 2NT last time. East is unlikely to have four spades as he/she would have bid one spade over 1♥ on most hands, I'm thus less likely to get a spade lead.

[I think any further action on this hand is flirting with danger. If partner has something like ♠Kxx ♥KJxxx ♦xxx ♣Jx, even 2♥ isn't cold. I want partner to protect aggressively, so I won't hang him. If I were going to make one further try, 2NT seems best].

5

IMPs
N-S Vul.

South	West	North	East
1♣	1♦	1♥	pass
???			

You, South, hold: ♠AQJ ♥AJ10 ♦3 ♣AK10742

What call do you make?

Bare: 2♦. First priority is to ascertain if partner has five hearts. Second priority is finding out about a club fit.

Shuster: 3♦. This shows short diamonds and a good hand. 2♦ doesn't accomplish much, as it would be a forced choice with ♠AKJ ♥Qx ♦xxx ♣AKJxx. I'll wind up spending the next two rounds of the auction trying to clarify my hand, probably without much success. I'd rather let partner know I have short diamonds, heart support and interest in bigger things.

Wittes: 3♦. This should show a very good hand with three hearts and imply a long good club suit (if I had four hearts, I would be bidding 4♦). Slam is not out of the question, though the overcall behind me would tend to favor any missing cards being poorly placed for us.

Bell: 2♦. This should show a very good hand without heart support.

Sacks: 2♦. Rarely do I pass up the opportunity to bid a three-card suit, but here I have an easy force.

[I think 2♦ would be the consensus expert bid. However, I prefer the 3♦ call with the singleton diamond. It's a thoughtful way of getting across a description of the hand.]