Southern California **Bridge News**

Volume 61, #5 May 2024 Published by ALACBU

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

by John Jones

ALACBL Meeting May 11, Long Beach Regional July 1 – 7



There will be an ALACBU (District 23) meeting on May 11 from 9:30 AM to 11:30 AM. It will be a hybrid meeting. You may attend at the Long Beach Bridge Club (4782 Pacific Coast Highway, Long Beach, (562)-498-8113) or via Zoom. If you would like a Zoom invitation via email, please contact Lillian Slater, the district secretary at lilliands@gmail.com and request to be added. We will review the GNT results, including plans for the 2025 GNT, discuss the upcoming Long Beach regional, a report from Tom Reynolds on plans for a new type of electronic face-to-face tournament and more, and the 2026 regional. If you attend in person, you may stay and play in the 12:30 Royal STAC Open Game. Units, if you have changes to you rep lists, please inform Lillian.

Our July regional will be from Monday July 1 through Sunday July 7 at the Long Beach Hilton. There should be a flyer for the regional elsewhere in this newsletter. For more information contact Peter Benjamin at **ahoneydo@aol.com** **or Margie Michelin at** michelinonbridge@aol.com**.**

Event naming for the regional has ended. However, you can make general donations for the regional. Many players have already done so. Thank you!! For details contact Laura Gastelum at lauralgastelum@gmail.com.

There are nearby regionals in California that are coming up in other districts. D21 has a regional from May 27 through June 2 in Sacramento. I will be there.

I will again warn of online cheating. The

PRESIDENT continued on page2

Regional Director's Report

by David Lodge



As explained in my article last month, cheating continues to occupy a significant amount of time and energy by the ACBL management and the BOD. As we have more experience with EDGAR, the automated cheating detection program, we will make changes that in the judgement of the BOD are warranted. Three multi-hour meetings have been held over the last few weeks to discuss and agree on changes in procedures and updates to the Code of Disciplinary Regulations (CDR).

Previously, the player with the lower number of masterpoints in cheating pair, had only those avenues of redress available to the player with the higher number of points. As an example, a person with 100 points is playing with someone who has over 5,000 points. Because the higher pointed person was not eligible for Fast Track Discipline (FTD), the lower pointed person was likewise not eligible. Both parties could either enter into a Negotiated Resolution or go to arbitration with the Institute of Bridge Arbitration (IBA). We have changed our position on this issue. Effective immediately, each person will be treated separately. So, in our above example, excepting extenuating circumstances, the person in our example with 100 points will get a warning while nothing will change for the person with 5,000 points. Furthermore, we are making this "partially" retroactive to February 1st of this year, the date that we put EDGAR and FTD into use. "Partially" is explained thusly: the retroactivity will only apply to those individuals wherein both

DIRECTOR continued on page2

Inside This Issue

Grand National Teams ……. page 2
Non-Life-Master Sectional …..…… page 4
Bridge Week ……..……..……... page 5
Puzzle Page ……..…….…… page 7
Rank Changes ……..…….. page 8
Around the Units ……..……..…… page 9
Problem Solvers' Panel ……..…….. page 13

PRESIDENT continued from page 1

EDGAR program is now fully functional. EDGAR uses statistics to determine if online players are cheating. Be careful, according to members of the ACBL Board of Regents, the penalties for cheating are going to get stiffer.

Rita Vanlierop, our new webmaster, has reestablished our website. She has also established new email addresses for all the district officers. Mine is president@d23acbl.org.

Exit, stage left!

DIRECTOR continued from page 1

players had less than 2,500 points and were therefore eligible for FTD. Another example: Player A had 400 points and Player B has 800 points. Under the prior scheme, both fell in the category of 600 to 1,499points and both got the FTD of a 1-year suspension plus probation of 4 years and a loss of 20% of their masterpoints. Under the current scheme, nothing changes for Player B, but Player A, now falls under the range from 300 to 599 masterpoints and as a result, that punishment will be a 6-month suspension (no change to probation or loss of MP). I am in favor of extending this retroactive treatment to the 2 other groups of offenders, those who have entered into an NR and those who have chosen to go to arbitration. Unfortunately, I was in the minority when the BOD voted on this issue.

Keep in mind that statements contained in this article are not to be construed as complete explanations and that the CDR must be consulted for the complete set of rules. For instance, while generally, FTD is available to players with less than 2,500 MP, there are extenuating circumstances which prevent FTD from being used, e.g. player cannot be unit or district officer; player has never been previously disciplined for an ethical (cheating) violation; player has never been given an Official Warning for an ethical matter. Also be aware that the above punishments can be reduced by half if the offending party completes an Ethics Certificate Program and submits a Fair Play Pledge. Also be aware that during the entire time of player's probation, player may not play in an ACBL online game with any other player identified as complicit in the collusive cheating charge.

A management proposal, which I and a minority of my BOD colleagues support, has not received approval from most of the board. There are some players who have been determined to have cheated while playing online, that fit into a loose profile of being quite a bit older, and not advanced players. There is no question that they cheated and should be penalized. However, realizing that their face-to-face club experience represent a significant part of their social life and taking into consideration isolating them away from the bridge club might have a deleterious effect on their mental and physical health, the following proposal was offered: let them come back to F2F bridge after serving the greater of 6 months of their suspension or some acceptable percentage thereof. This would be at the option of the club owner. They could only play at their club with black MPs being awarded. They could not participate in NAP, GNT, STaC's, Unit wide games, etc. They would still serve their entire punishment for online play. Please chime in on this issue. I'd like to hear your perspective.

Briefly, although membership continues to slide a little, the league is doing fine from a financial point of view. Operating income (unaudited) for the 3 months ended March 31, was more than $400,000 which exceeded the budget by over $250,000. Next month we'll do a deeper dive into the numbers.

GNT Report
by John Jones

Our 2024 Grand National Teams competition was held on Saturday April 13 and Sunday April 14 at the Long Beach Bridge Club. New GNT coordinator Walt Schafer and returning director Brandon Sheumaker did a great job of handling setup, direction, refreshments and reporting. We had a total of 15 tables, which was more than some larger districts. We had 3 tables in Open (Super) Flight, 4 tables in Flight A, 5 tables in Flight B, and 3 tables in Flight C. The winners will get an opportunity to represent D23 in the July nationals in Toronto. They will receive a stipend from the ACBL to cover part of their travel expenses. Congratulations to all our winning teams.

Open Flight champions were: Walter Schafer of Long Beach, Alex Kolesnik of Los Angeles, Pete Knee of Canyon Country, Hemant Lall of Marina Del Rey and Ifti Baqai of Irvine.



L to R: Walt Schafer, Alex Kolesnik, Hemant Lall, Ifti Baqai (not pictured – Pete Knee).

The winning Flight A team included: Kevin Lane of Long Beach, Michael Piken of Torrance, David Peim of Torrance, and Neal Kleiner, of San Pedro.



L to R: Michael Piken, David Peim, Neal Kleiner, and Kevin Lane.

Flight B winners were: Jeff Grotenhuis of Redondo Beach, Giacomo Beretta of Redondo Beach, Bill Taylor of Rancho Palos Verdes, and Rob Corry of Palos Verde Estates.



L to R: Giacomo Beretta, Rob Corry, Jeff Grotenhuis, Bill Taylor.

Our Flight C winners were: Leo Dittemore of Long Beach, Melanie Smothers of Long Beach, Paul Chen of Long Beach and Michael Teng of Irvine.



L to R: Paul Chen, Leo Dittemore, Melanie Smothers, and Mike Teng.

Congratulations, all!

Long Beach Unit 557

Non-Life Master Spring Sectional



Saturday, May 18, 2024
Long Beach Bridge Club
4782 E. Pacific Coast Highway
(above Big 5 - enter in rear)

Card Fees
- Session Entry Fee $14 / Session
- Additional $4 Per Session for Unpaid Member

Stratifications for 500'er Pairs
Stratified by pair average
- 0 - 100
- 101 - 300
- 301 - 500

Players must be non-Life Masters and have 500 masterpoints orfewer.

10:00 a.m.	0-50 Pairs*
	0-500 Pairs
2:30 p.m.	0-50 Pairs*
	0-500 Pairs

Mini-Lesson 9:00 - 9:45 a.m.
Rob Preece

Silver Points!

Free Parking Free Coffee Free Snacks

TOURNAMENT CHAIR
Lillian Slater
714-287-3184
lillians@gmail.com

DIRECTOR
Sean Lui

ACBL Sanction# 2405367
*Stratification may be altered based on attendance



LOS ANGELES PRESENTS THE 88TH ANNUAL BRIDGE WEEK

The Summer's Best Regional

JULY 1 - JULY 7

TOURNAMENT HIGHLIGHTS

DAYLIGHT SCHEDULE! 299ER GAMES EVERY DAY!
PILE UP YOUR GOLD POINTS IN OUR GOLD RUSH PAIRS!
STAR SPEAKERS TUE-SAT! SATURDAY SPECIAL SHOW!

MONDAY JULY 1

** Free Bridge Workshop **
12:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.
Reception Gifts and snacks
11:30 a.m.

Marjorie Michelin
Grand Life Master
michelinonbridge@aol.com

PARTNERSHIPS

Liz Ryan - eryan311@gmail.com

ONLINE PARTNERSHIP DESK

signupgenius.com

HOSPITALITY

Laura Gastelum
lauralgastelum@gmail.com

TOURNAMENT MANAGER

Peter Benjamin
ahoneyda@aol.com
(310) 720-6050

DIRECTOR-IN-CHARGE

Ken Horwedel

DISTRICT 23 PRESIDENT

John Jones

REGIONAL DIRECTOR

David Lodge



HILTON LONG BEACH

701 West Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, CA

Parking will be available to guests attending for the day at a nearby parking structure. We offer offsite parking at 101 Magnolia (the court house parking structure), which is a 5 minute walk away. FREE Shuttles will be available at prime times.

Valet is available for $34.

Overnight self-parking is $10 for guests who are staying at the hotel and will have access to the hotel underground self-parking

Room rate is $154/night. The group code is 90P.

Guests may call Hilton reservations at 1 800 445 8667 and reference the code 90P, or use this link for reservations.

Card fees: $18 per player per session except Sunday.

Background Photo Credit: Long Beach Convention & Visitor's Bureau
Revised 3/17/2024

Sanction Number: 2240722



Monday, July 1, 2024

FREE WORKSHOP with 12:00 p.m.-1:30 p.m.
Marjorie Michelin Reception 11:30 a.m.
Gifts, coffee, snacks & fun

Marcia Brown
299er Pairs ..... 2:00 p.m.
Aft Side Series (1 of 6) ..... 2:00 p.m.

John Mills
Stratified Charity Pairs (1 session) . 2:00 p.m.
Charity Bracketed Teams ... 2:00 p.m. & 7:00 p.m.
Stratified Charity Pairs (1 session) ..... 7:00 p.m.

Tuesday, July 2, 2024

RICKY RADOVIC DAY
AM Side Series (1 of 5) ..... 10:00 a.m.
299er Pairs (1 session) ..... 10:00 a.m.

Elizabeth and Tom Lebbaus
Open Pairs ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Gold Rush Pairs ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Mini Soloway (4 sess) ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Qualifying event - top 4 play Wednesday
Guest Lecture ..... 2:15 p.m.
Aft Side Series (2 of 6) ..... 3:00 p.m.

Wednesday, July 3, 2024

UNIT 857/LONG BEACH BRIDGE CENTER DAY
AM Side Series (2 of 5) ..... 10:00 a.m.

Peggy Waite
299er Pairs (1 sess) ..... 10:00 a.m.
Open Pairs (2 sess) ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.

Larry Topper
Gold Rush Pairs ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Bracketed Teams ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Mini Solomay Finals ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Guest Lecture ..... 2:15 p.m.
Aft Side Series (3 of 6) ..... 3:00 p.m.

Thursday, July 4, 2024

PASADENA SAN GABRIEL UNIT 859 DAY
299er Pairs (1 session) ..... 10:00 a.m.
AM Side Series (3 of 5) ..... 10:00 a.m.
Open Pairs ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Gold Rush Pairs ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.

Marjorie Michelin
Firecracker Swiss ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Guest Lecture ..... 2:15 p.m.
Aft Side Series (4 of 6) ..... 3:00 p.m.

Friday, July 5, 2024

AM Side Series (4 of 5) ..... 10:00 a.m.
299er Pairs (1 session) ..... 10:00 a.m.

George James
Open Pairs ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.

Gerry Gustafson
Gold Rush ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Mini Solomay (4 sess) ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Qualifying event - top 4 play Saturday
Guest Lecture ..... 2:15 p.m.
Aft Side Series (5 of 6) ..... 3:00 p.m.

Saturday, July 6, 2024

AM Side Series (5 of 5) ..... 10:00 a.m.
299er Pairs (1 session) ..... 10:00 a.m.
Open Pairs (2 sess) ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Gold Rush Pairs (2 sess) ... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Bracketed Teams ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Mini Solomay finals ..... 10:00 a.m. & 3:00 p.m.
Special Show ..... 2:00 p.m.

Dan Logsdon
Aft Side Series (6 of 6) ..... 3:00 p.m.

Sunday, July 7, 2024

Fast Pairs ..... 10:00 a.m. & TBA

Matthew Mallory
AXY Swiss ..... 10:00 a.m. & TBA
0-2500 Bracketed Teams ..... 10:00 a.m. & TBA

Sunday Card Fees: $46 per person
Includes Buffet Lunch

AXY Swiss: 0-3000/3000-5000/5000+

Try the Mini Solomay Knockouts!

- This is a two-day, four-session, bracketed event
- Brackets are determined by the masterpoint average of the team
- Generally, there will be seven, eight, or nine teams in each bracket.
- The first day is a complete round-robin using victory point scoring
- The top four teams advance to the knockout phase on the second day.
- If knocked out after the first day, sign up for the next day bracketed teams.

Event Colors:

299ers: Orange Trainee Green Pairs: Blue

Final strats / brackets to be determined by the Director in Charge

Gold Rush	250 / 400 / 750
Open Pairs	0-2500/2500-5000/5000+

The Puzzle Page

Bridge Jeopardy
by John Jones

Category: Starting with R (each term begins with the letter R)

And the answer is …

$100 – The partner of the opening bidder.

$200 – Doubles the penalties and bonuses. It's a blue card in the bidding box.

$300 – Slang term for vulnerable, comes from the color in the duplicate tray.

$400 – Failure to follow suit as required, generally gets a one or two trick penalty.

$500 – A lead of the second highest honor on the opening lead.

☺☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺☺ ☺ ☺

Submitted by John Jones



"Do you think she uses upside-down signals?"

☺☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺☺ ☺ ☺

Play or Defend?
by John Jones

North
♠ A K 4
♥ J 10 5
♦ K 9 7 5 3
♣ 7 3

West
♠ Q 9 2
♥ Q 6 4
♦ A J 4
♣ K Q J 6

East
♠ J 8 7 6 5
♥ 2
♦ 10 6
♣ 10 9 8 4 2

South
♠ 10 3
♥ A K 9 8 7 3
♦ Q 8 2
♣ A 5

Contract = 4♥

Opening Lead = ♣k

All players can see all the cards. Do you play or defend?

(Solutions to these puzzles are on page 8. No peeking!)

Southern California Bridge News
Published monthly by ALACBU, Inc.
1800 Avenue of the Stars, 12th Floor,
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Phone: 310-440-4100
email newsletter@acblunit551.org
Editor/Designer. . . . . Tom Lill
Managing Editor. . . . . John Jones
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.

Solution to "Play or Defend?"

Answer: declare. This hand was played single dummy at the table by England's great Tony Forrester. He couldn't see all the cards, but was aided by the auction which included a strong NT opening by West and transfer to spades by East. He won the club lead and cashed one heart. He cashed the ace and king of spades and ruffed a spade before exiting with a club. Whoever won could not return either a club or a spade. A heart return from West allows the suit to be picked up with no losers. At the table, East won and returned the Ten of Diamonds. Forrester covered with the queen and subsequently finessed to the ♦9 in dummy. Nicely played!

Thanks to Julian Pottage for reporting this problem.

Bridge Jeopardy Questions

$100 – Who is responder?

$200 – What is redouble?

$300 - What is red?

$400 – What is a revoke?

$500 – What is Rusinow?

District 23 Rank Changes March 2023

Junior Master
Nancy Beck
Julianne Curry
Harris H. Hall
Mary S. Ohalloran
Mary Power

Club Master
Esteban Andryjowicz
Patricia Croshere
Dennis Higley
David King
Maureen A. Lapoint
Susan Morishita

Sectional Master
Marra Boada
Colleen Shinn

Regional Master
Raymond Boncato
Brian Jersky
Les H. Nakasaki
Mariann Nolan
Julianne R. O Connor
Albert K. Szeto
Melinda G. Wilson

NABC Master
Susan Lave

Life Master
Debbie Hamilton
Tim Lee
Betsy K. Nicassio
Zorina Pelant
Teresa Thurman

Bronze Life Master
Marianne S. Newman
William P. Taylor
Teresa Thurman
Jennifer Wellman

Silver Life Master
Ravnesh C. Amar
Brenda Schonfeld

Ruby Life Master
Robert C. Moest

Sapphire Life Master
Paul M. Ryan

Diamond Life Master
Wayne Karson

Around the Units in District 23



Pomona – Covina by Tom Lill

www.acblunit551.org

La Fetra Games: Tuesdays and Fridays, 8:45
Individual: May 4, 10 a.m., Ontario
June 1, 10 a.m., Ontario
STaC: May 7, 10, La Fetra
Club Championships: May 14, 17, La Fetra
Unit Game: May 18, 11:00 a.m., Ontario
Unit Board Meeting: 10:15 a.m. before the game
The Longest Day: June 21, La Fetra

The April Individual was captured by Linda Tessier, with 59.09%. Tied for second – just ½ matchpoint behind – we find Art Weinstein and Dan Robinson. Rounding out the leader board were Steve Andersen and Clint Lew.

In the April Unit Game, Vic Sartor – Bill Papa captured overall honors, with 63.89%. Close behind were Larry Shannon – Harrish Singh, then Tim and Eileen Finlay, Karen McCarthy – Karen Olin, and Nancy Stebbins – Baoding Chen.

I only saw one Unit member doing well down in the San Diego Regional: Clint Lew brought home 24.20 masterpoints, ranking 87th in the overall standings. He won two bracketed team events, winning bracket three on both Wednesday and Friday.

There were two rank advancements again this month. Julianne Curry is now a Junior Master, and Esteban Andryjowicz is a Club Master.

Roger Boyar has added beginner's lessons to his Wednesday teaching schedule at La Fetra. Lessons start at 1:30, and cost $5 per.

There were only two "big games" last month. Both were by Fredy and Lulu Minter: 68.75% and 66.33%. Well, at least we held them to only two this time. Others turning in a first place performance: Steve Andersen, Gary Atwell, Clint Lew, and Linda Tessier.

Ah, the joys of Swiss. A team consisting of Judy Mogharbel, Yours Truly, David Ochroch, and Peter Kavounas went to the Anaheim Sectional last month to compete. The good news? We won five of seven matches. The bad news? We managed to finish *fifth* in our eight-team bracket. We got slaughtered in the first two matches, winning only 5 VPs. We sucked it up, managed to pull up to even (60 VPs in 6 matches), and were poised to make a run for third or maybe even second. We waited for our final opponents to show up. And waited, and waited …. Finally our Captain went to the DIC. It turned out that our would-be opponents had rather poor time management skills, thought the event ended at five, … and had gone home! We "won" the match by forfeit, but that's only a 12-8 win, giving us 72 VPs. The co-winners had only 79, and third place had 75. Coulda woulda! Arrgh!

Meanwhile, a team with Linda Tessier and Steve Andersen was one of the co-winners of the event. (They lost to *us* by 11 IMPs by the way. Couldn't resist *that*!)

Interesting hands were rare last month, but here's one that cropped up at the last minute.

South deals. North – South are Vulnerable

	♠ K J 7 2 ♥ K 9 8 6 ♦ A K ♣ 10 8 3	
♠ 9 6 4 3 ♥ Q 2 ♦ Q 6 ♣ K J 6 5 4		♠ Q 10 8 5 ♥ J ♦ 9 5 4 2 ♣ A Q 9 2
	♠ A ♥ A 10 7 5 4 3 ♦ J 10 8 7 3 ♣ 7	

First of all, do you open that South hand? Walter the Walrus counts 11 HCP, but look again: it's a 6-loser hand with 2 quick tricks and a convenient rebid! Even if South opens 1♥, you will probably settle in game, with only 25 HCP between the two hands. But here's one possible route to the slam: (Yes, as the cards lie, 13 tricks are inevitable, but stopping in six would still garner all the match points, since no one bid a slam on these cards.

South	North
1♥	2NT*
3♣**	4NT***
5♠****	6♥

* Balanced forcing ♥ raise, 4 card support. You know, Jacoby 2NT.

** Club shortness

*** RKC Blackwood, what else?

**** 2 key cards and either the ♥Q or extra trump length.

Simple! For 12 tricks, all you need is any one of three things: 2-1 trumps, ♥Q singleton, ruff out the ♦Q, or drop the ♦Q in one or two rounds. I'd hate to calculate the percentages, but it has to be odds-on, doesn't it? And as the cards lie, you make them all, unless you have a TIA and play a low card from both hands at some point.

But even if South doesn't open, game is going to be bid. But it will be a lot harder to find the slam.

Quote for the month: "If at first you don't succeed, try again. If that doesn't work, look for a better solution. (Kelvin Throop III)



Santa Clarita-Antelope Valley

by Beth Morrin

Unit 556 Annual Meeting and Election of board members for 2024 was held on Saturday, April 6th. Board members for 2024: May Abagi, Ruth Baker, Don Dachner , David Khalieque, Jan Ladd, Roy Ladd, Beth Morrin, Paula Olivares, Rand Pinsky, and Harry Randhawa.

Our Face-to-Face game is being held at the Newhall Community Center in Santa Clarita. Reservations are required as our space is limited.

Please contact Ruth Baker (rbaker1243@sbcglobal.net) or Paula Olivares (paula@pacbell.net) for more information.

The game is usually held on Friday mornings at 10:00 AM but occasionally we move to Saturday mornings to accommodate the Center's schedule.

Winners of the Saturday F2F game:

Apr. 6
N/S
Aggi Oschin – Beth Morrin 65.89%
E/W
Tomoko Stock –Paula Olivares 66.45%

Winners of the Friday F2F game:

Mar. 29
N/S
Jerrod Mason – David Khalieque 60.71%
E/W
Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky 60.41%

Apr. 12
N/S Donna Davidson – Bill Langlois 59.42%
E/W
Barbara Jones – Tom Jones 65.18%

Apr. 19
N/S
Donna Davidson – Bill Langlois 56.25%
E/W
Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky 61.01%

Virtual Game Schedule

Monday:	12:15 PM	Open game
Tuesday:	6:15 PM	Open game
Thursday:	10:15 AM	Open game
Sunday:	12:30 PM	Open game

Contact our club manager at virtualclub@bridgemojo.com for reservations. ACBL has increased the minimum entry fee to $5. Virtual games are now available to all BBO players. Invite your favorite partner to play with you in one of our games.

Big Virtual Club Games (65+%):

Thurs. Mar. 21
Rand Pinsky – Robot 67.59%

Sun. Mar. 24
Bud Kalafian – Stephen Licker 71.18%
Greg Vernon – Robot 65.97%

Mon. Apr. 1
Kathy Swaine – Rand Pinsky 69.79%

Thurs. Apr. 11
Eva Landy – Robot 65.83%

Mon. Apr. 15
Rae Murbach – Gerard Geremia 71.57%
Kiran Kumar – Robot 65.51%

Thurs. Apr. 18
Bill Brodek – Robot 66.67%

Mon. Apr. 22
Carolyn Cohen – Diana Borgatti 66.32%

Tues. Apr. 23
Bill Brodek – Robot 71.76%

Next Board Meeting: TBA

Pasadena – San Gabriel

by Morris "Mojo" Jones

bridgemojo.com



The Arcadia Bridge Center must have been the longest continuously operated bridge club in the United States. I can't imagine another, but it might be out there.

Diane made sure that her players would have a place to play before closing the doors for good on April 30. Despite always shunning attention, she has been celebrated this past month, and been gracious in accepting the good wishes. Now we're all delighted to see her playing the game that was her life with friends and partners, and never again having to heft a water bottle, clean up a spill, order supplies, or cut bits of sausage.

The community will see to it that Diane is cared for and always surrounded by her people. Thank you Diane!

The Pasadena Bridge Club is now offering daily weekday games at 11:00, and so far all have been well attended. The Saturday afternoon novice / intermediate game is being paired with an open game for a while, until the next series of Saturday morning classes are complete. We don't have a start date yet, but in a couple of months we'll have a separate Saturday morning 299er game, so it doesn't have to share the space with the regular afternoon open game.

At the Pasadena Bridge Club, all games May 6-11 will be Royal STaC games (except the Tuesday evening novice pairs). The week of May 20-25 will be Club Championship week. Masterpoint awards that week will be big, and overalls will be awarded.

New classes will be starting in mid-May:

- Introduction to Declarer Play, Wednesdays 7:00, starting May 15
- Two Over One Game Force, Thursdays 7:00, starting May 16
- Bridge Basics 2 - Competitive Bidding, Saturdays 9:30, starting May 18

Unit Championships will be held on Sunday, May 5, and Sunday May 19 (first and third) at 12:30. We'll serve pizza from Blaze at about noon. Make your reservations with Miriam Harrington (626) 232-0558 miratpf@aol.com.

The April games were well attended, with 12.5 tables on April 7, and 13 on April 21. Here are the winners each direction:

- April 7, N/S Joan Mesias, Jeanette Deverian, E/W Amr Elghamry, Dominique Moore
- April 21, N/S Karmen Armoudjian, Jan Wickersham, E/W Rae Murbach, Jerry Murbach

Congratulations to new Regional Masters Ray Boncato and Mariann Nolan, new Life Masters Tim Lee and Teresa Thurman, and new Bronze Life Masters Marianne Newman and Teresa Thurman.

I'd also like to recognize the winners of the 2023 masterpoint races. I know I'm late, but it still deserves to be here:

The Mini-McKinney for most total masterpoints won:

Starting masterpoints	
>10,000	John Jones
5000-7500	Connie Kang
3500-5000	Milt Kalikman
2500-3500	Joan Mesias
1500-2500	Fredy Minter
1000-1500	Sandy Rucker
500-1000	Paulette Burkitt
300-500	Hanna Zhuang
200-300	Tracee Dezzutti
100-200	Ming Hu
50-100	Nina Huang
20-50	Sherry Warmuth
5-20	Hsing Fang
0-5	Robert Jennings

The Ace of Clubs award for most points won in club games (black points):

Starting masterpoints	
>10000	Lulu Minter
5000-7500	Dominique Moore
3500-5000	Milt Kalikman
2500-3500	Joan Mesias
1500-2500	Fredy Minter
1000-1500	Sandy Rucker
500-1000	Sadika Elewy
300-500	Gloria Rommel
200-300	Tracee Dezzutti
100-200	Stephen Guerrero
50-100	Ray Boncato
20-50	Stuart Soldate
5-20	Hsing Fang
0-5	Robert Jennings



Long Beach
by Lillian Slater

www.acblunit557.org
www.LongBeachBridge.com

COMING ATTRACTION!!

Unit 557 will be hosting a Silver-Points sectional for non-Life Masters with 500 or fewer masterpoints. There will be Pairs sessions at 10 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. for $14/session. Mark your calendars to join us!

Saturday, May 18, 2024
Long Beach Bridge Center
See the flyer elsewhere in this issue.





Good cards, good chow, and good company were enjoyed by all participants in our April 9th Master-Am Tournament. The club sponsored a breakfast of eggs, stuffed French toast, fruit, and orange juice. April Berg catered the yummy breakfast. Lillian Slater and Jenny Ernest orchestrated the event and the random assignment of Am's to Master. Rob Preece directed the 26 tables!

Problem Solvers' Panel

John Jones is moderator. Ifti Baqai, Mark Bartusek, Mitch Dunitz, Ross Grabel, David Grainger, Daniel Korbel, Rick Roeder, Mike Shuster, and Jon Wittes are panelists.

As always, panelists are playing 5-card majors, 15 - 17 NT, and 2/1 GF. Beyond that, except where indicated, panelists may use any reasonable methods.

1

Matchpoints
Both Vul

North	East	South	West
1♦	pass	???	

You, South, hold: ♠ QJ2 ♥ 2 ♦ 10543 ♣ K6432

What call do you make?

Panelists were instructed to assume Inverted Raises, thus a 2♦ raise would show a hand worth a limit raise. I allowed pet methods though. So, no panelist bid or considered a 2♦ call.

Wittes: 3♣. With most of my partners I play 1♦ - 3♣ and 1♣ -2♦ show a mixed raise, not good enough for a limit raise, but too good for a weak raise. I wish my diamonds were a little better, but I think this hand meets that criterion.

Another way to make a mixed raise:

Shuster: 3♦. In my preferred methods, 3♦ is a mixed raise. There is overlap between a mixed raise and a weak raise, and this hand is an example of such. I also like to play coded minors, so that 1♦ would always either deliver 18-19 or real diamonds - which renders this hand type a non-problem. In a standard context, I'd still risk 3♦. *If I understand Shuster's suggested system correctly, the determination of which minor to open (on balanced hands) is based not on the relative length of each of the minors, but on the number of HCP in the hand. I think this system has merit.*

Korbel: 3♦. Screw it, I have a singleton heart. If it goes bad, sorry partner.

Bartusek: 1♠. This seems like the most natural choice on the hand. My hand looks very suit oriented, so let's take the first step in aiming to play a suit contract. I'll show my diamond support on the next round if appropriate. Spades could easily be the best denomination - just read all the articles recently in The Bridge World about excellent Moysian (4-3) fits! Assuming that we play inverted minor suit raises I see both 2♦ and 3♦ as too great a distortion. Finally, 1NT could be right, but it just makes me ill thinking of the possible consequences. I hope partner is not 3=4=5=1, but we may still survive a 3-3 trump fit.

Dunitz: 1♠. Welcome to the dark side.

Baqai: 1♠. Three potential choices: 3♦, 1♠, 1NT, and none of these are particularly appetizing as 3♦ should have better suit quality - otherwise you could be -200/300 even undoubled; 1NT is tempting but with heart shortness you expect opponents to find their 8+ card heart fit and your meager values preclude your taking another call. So, the last reasonable choice is to bid 1♠ as it allows for a possible 4-3 (or 3-3) fit that may do okay.

Grabel: 1♠. I've rarely had a bad result on this kind of auction.

Now for a panelist who has responded in a 3-card suit often enough to observe how the defenders handle it.

Roeder: 1♠. If we get to play 2♠ in our 3-3 fit, cool! The opponents never get the defense right in such scenarios. Since this is a family-oriented publication, I cannot truthfully tell you what I think of 1NT.

Several panelists opted for bidding a 3-card major, allowing for the possibility of playing in a 3-3 fit. When I played with the late Mike Pudlin, he would always respond 1♠. It worked more often than not. However, David presents the argument against this:

Grainger: 1NT. 1♠ works really badly when raised. *It sometimes works especially poorly when 2♠ doesn't end the auction.*

One call that no panelist discussed was Pass. It isn't normal to pass with 6 HCP, but with no attractive call, Pass doesn't seem terrible.

2

IMPs
Neither Vul

North	East	South	West
1♠	2♥	pass	pass
X	pass	???	

You, South, hold: ♠ void ♥ Q1073 ♦ 106 ♣ AJ97643

What call do you make?

I'll start with a panelist who makes an extremely good observation: knowing how partner normally handles reopening situations is very important. If partner reopens with a double only with shortness in the opponent's suit or with significant extras, it is very different from a partner who reopens with a double on almost any hand (allowing for a penalty pass).

Grainger: Pass/3NT. Knowing partner's tendencies matters. If partner frequently reopens with 5251 hoping you can pass (intending to convert clubs to diamonds, bidding 3♦ over a 3♣ response) then I pass. If they always have something resembling normal takeout shape, 3NT.

Roeder: 3NT. Love that heart ten!

Dunitz: 3NT. I'm too good for 3♣. 3NT could be ugly, but that is where the money is.

If we bid clubs now, do we go low or high?

Grabel: 3♣. I'm not quite good enough to bid 4♣. If partner rebids spades, I will bid 4♣.

Wittes: 3♣. I'm a little too good for this bid, but with a void in partner's first bid suit, treading lightly seems the right approach.

Shuster: 4♣. In my experience it is better to give up on 3NT on very shapely hands in order to focus on the quality of our fit.

Bartusek: 4♣. I have a massive hand opposite club support and short hearts. My second choice would be a conservative 3♣ if partner is allowed to make this reopening double without some club tolerance. *(This is another ramification of the observation Grainger made).*

Baqai: 4♣. It would be difficult to justify not bidding your 7-card suit after partner makes a re-opening double even when partner has a doubleton in your suit. I think the real question here is how high you should bid? I'll cut partner some slack and settle for 4♣.

Korbel: 4♣. Seems perfect. If partner is 6=2=4=1, well ... sorry partner!

3 Matchpoints E-W Vul	West	North	East	South
	2♥	X	pass	???

You, South, hold: ♠ K63 ♥ K963 ♦ 932 ♣ A65

What call do you make?

On this problem, I instructed the panelists that they were playing Lebensohl. Thus, I avoided any panelist bidding 2NT with a comment such as "What's the problem?"

Some panelists want to get out cheaply.

Korbel: 2♠. If this is a 3-3 fit, sorry partner! I'm detecting a theme to my answers this month. *A pretty sorry theme, Danny! I thought maybe he was going to publish a "Sorry, Partner!" podcast.*

Wittes: 2♠. I would love to be able to bid 2NT natural, but it's Lebensohl. 2♠ seems like the least of all evils. If partner bids over 2♠, I will make the most encouraging bid possible.

Dunitz: 2♠.

Some panelists bid more, but get to bid in their preferred strain.

Grainger: 3NT. More upside than 2♠.

Roeder: 3NT. I briefly though about 2♠, but I do not want to make a habit of playing 3-3's after #1. As the sages opine, "We may be too high but at least we will be in the right strain."

Some panelists think their best chance is defending!

Shuster: Pass. With game anything but certain, excellent defensive prospects, favorable vulnerability, and matchpoint scoring, it seems that all the stars are aligned - good here.

Bartusek: Pass. I don't see a sure-fire game available; so, I'll take a likely plus score. I suppose my second choice would be 2NT Lebensohl followed by 3NT. I'll take the magic 200 at MPs (or a likely 500 if we have a NV game available).

Baqai: Pass. Let's look at potential bids: you don't have a 4-card suit and bidding a 3-card suit risks playing a 3-3 fit and associated minus score; bidding 2NT is likely to be construed as a Lebensohl response requiring partner to bid 3♣ complicating life; bidding 3NT (after an initial 2NT bid) should promise a stronger hand that you don't have. Now there is a choice to pass that requires you to assume that your hand will provide about three defensive tricks and your partner to produce at least three defensive tricks. At matchpoints, that appears to be your best option. (You hope that partner didn't make a takeout double with a shapely 10/11 HCP hand!)

Grabel: Pass. I'm guessing the best way to go plus. 2NT is Lebensohl and partner will need a good hand to make 3NT.

This hand was played in Australia and was used in an Australian panel. I don't care for the call (I'm with the passers), but one Australian panelist made the point that a 3♣ response would show values (which is exactly what we would want if we really had clubs).

4

IMPs
N-S Vul

East	South	West	North
2♠	4♥	4♠	pass
pass	???		

You, South, hold: ♠ 5 ♥ AKQ9863 ♦ K ♣ AK76

What call do you make?

Wittes: 5♥. Tough problem, but I need too little to be able to make 5♥ - the queen of clubs and the queen of diamonds are probably enough.

Grainger: 5♥. Partner can't know all I need is ♣Qxxx.

Baqai: 5♥. You are looking at a three-loser hand and it would be difficult for partner to evaluate ♠Jxx ♥xxx ♦Txxx, ♣Qxx and compete to 5-level. My rule of thumb is that if you need a queen or some doubleton with a fit, then save partner from having to guess and bid, so I'm a 5♥ bidder.

Grabel: 5♥.

Roeder: 5♥. I can't defend when a double game swing is a possibility. Double is a torture bid since partner will think a small doubleton heart is good for defense.

Dunitz: 5♥. Interesting thought - what would 4NT followed by 5♥ correction show? This would often be construed as a slam try - but not possible here as we were willing to play 4♥. Answer - just another fine way to torture partner. 😬

OK, let's hear from the torturers (who make my bid).

Bartusek: 4NT. The general rule is to bid one more at IMPs to avoid a double game swing. The 4NT call shows a good 4-card minor suit so we can back into a great club fit when available. If I double partner won't always know when to pull.

Korbel: 4NT. I think I'm allowed to take a gamble on the 5-level. Partner will know I have long hearts with a 4-card minor. If this goes wrong... sorry partner!

Shuster: 5♣. If partner won't double them, then I'm not doubling them. And I have a second suit to bid. 4♥ was an underbid.

5

Matchpoints
N-S Vul.

South	West	North	East
1♦	pass	1♥	3♣
???			

You, South, hold: ♠ AQJ8 ♥ AQ43 ♦ J9742 ♣ void

What call do you make?

I strongly suspect I have used this problem in the past. I copied it from a database of possible problems. I believe I remember bidding it at the table. I bid 4♣ and we almost got too high, landing in 5♥, which partner made. Here we see panelists who wanted to go low with 3♥, medium with 4♥, and high with 4♣.

Baqai: 3♥. The crux of this problem is that in competitive auctions where you might have responded at the two-level, it's frequently okay to take the push and bid at the 3-level if opponents preempt. The same logic can be applied here; that you probably would have bid 3♥ had there been no 3♣ preempt but should you take the push now and bid 4♥ to show extra values? It's a close decision and I can live with 3♥.

Grabel: 3♥. I'm heavy, but not outrageously so. Certainly, my club void looms large but 4♣ is a big overbid. 4♥ may be the winning call depending on partner's hand.

Bartusek: 3♥. Sure, we could have a game with a perfect fit opposite a minimum from partner; but I'm worried that partner will hang me if I jump to 4♥. Additionally, I doubt that the auction is over since I only have 14 HCPs with a void in the opponent's suit. It's likely that partner will be able to work out that I'm short in clubs as the auction progresses (and I'll probably get the opportunity to bid hearts again).

Shuster: 4♥. My poor diamonds are a concern here if partner decides this might be a slam deal, so I'm going to refrain from calling 4♣. Note that the competition renders 4♥H wider-ranging than it would otherwise be.

Dunitz: 4♥. Nothing is perfect. 4♣ may get me too high.

Grainger: 4♥. I have to imply some extras.

Wittes: 4♣. My diamonds are a little lacking in quality, but my hand is way too strong to make any other bid.

Roeder: 4♣. Since the right 6-count produces a great slam, I can do no less. Partner might have: ♠Kx ♥Kxxxxx ♦x ♣xxxx.

Korbel: 4♣. If partner drives to slam how bad can it be? Pretty bad? Sorry partner!! *I would tease Danny about his "sorry" answers, except that I like most of them!*

==========

Do you think bidding like a bridge expert is easy? On this set of problems, we had 9 panelists, so 5 matching answers would constitute a majority. On how many problems did we reach a majority response? Only two problems received a majority answer: #1, in which 5 panelists responded 1♠ on a 3-card suit, and #4, with six panelists competing to 5♥. Good luck agreeing with your partners!