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## Louisiana Bridge Association August 2016

## Editor John Liukkonen email: jrdbl@cox.net

## President's Message August 2016

Thanks to all who participated in the mentoring team game on June 29th. I have received many favorable comments about this game. Nearly everyone who played won points. I expect mentoring games will be part of our future schedules. We may alternate between team games and pairs games. We may decide to have some games on a Tuesday instead of a Wednesday. Our next mentoring game will be a pairs game on August 31st. Anyone with constructive suggestions on this subject should feel free to express them to any board member or put a note in the suggestion box. This board is here to serve the membership.

Thanks to everyone who helped to make our Independence Day game and our Wes Busby tournament successful. Congratulations to the winners.

On August 12th at 11:20/11:30 our resident professional expert Mr. Drew Casen will give a short seminar on bridge etiquette. Learn the bridge do's and don'ts. The seminar will conclude prior to the noon game and will be structured for our newer players but many of our experienced players could benefit. Everyone is invited.

Labor Day is September 5th and marks the beginning of a week of special games for member appreciation. There will be extra points but no extra costs. We usually provide food at the Labor day game. This requires volunteers willing to shop or do some work in the kitchen. Anyone willing to help should speak to me or any board member.

## Larry Federico

## August Events

Aug 4 - NAOP Qualifier* Thurs Night \$7
Aug 8-14 Club Champ. Week Mon- Sun**
Aug 16 - NAOP Qualifier* Tues Night \$7
Aug 18 - NAOP Qualifier* Thurs noon \$7
Aug 27 - NAOP Qualifier* Sat \$7
Aug 31 - Mentoring Pairs Game** Wed
Mentors play free

* = extra points
** $=$ extra points, no extra fee

WELCOME NEW MEMBERS<br>Joan Oppenheim, Albert Solomon

## Wednesday Grand Slam Jackpots

Jul 27 Jim Thornton \& Jean Faia—Red Hailey
\& Juanita Heidingsfelder

In Memoriam<br>Alice Wedekind

## Busby Sectional firsts <br> Thurs AM

Open Jean Talbot \& Joan Van Geffen-lype Koshy \& Chuck Pitard (tie); Cappy Mclver \& Pat Ellis FIt B
299er Hope Read \& Susan Guarisco; Carolyn \& Edward Trapp FIt B; Susan Thompson \& Carolyn Abaunza FIt C
0-20 Alfred Arnold \& Gail Marie Arnold
Thurs PM
Open Frances Schenk \& Dana Hastings; Cappy Mclver \& Pat Ellis FIt B
299er Judith Rowley \& Betty Norton; Ronald Ocmond \& Gary Bergeron Flt F

## Fri AM

Open Frances Schenk \& Janice Henderson; Sally Toups \& Leah Miciotto FIt B; Molly Fraser \& Irma Dearie FIt C
299er Om Garg \& Lallie Garg; Earl Wattigny \& Janie
Wattigny Flt E; Ronald Ocmond \& Raynell Bourgeois FIt F
Fri PM
Open Rick Logan \& Susan Hinton; David Williams \& Toby Young Flt B
299er Mary Hanni \& Bruce Hanni
Sat AM
Open Carson Arnett \& Dave McDonald; David Woods \& Stephen Kishner FIt B; Sherrie Goodman \& Carol Bagalman Flt C
299er Om Garg \& Lallie Garg; Margaret Shirer \& Bernard Vanderlinden FIt E; William Sewell \& Elizabeth Sewell Flt F
Sat PM
Open Carl Merlin \& Nonie Leavitt; Doug DeMontluzin \& Lynn Giordano FIt B; JoAnn Ippolito \& Karen Dugan FIt C
299er Earl Wattigny \& Elaine Wattigny; Janice Wattigny \& Margaret Cooney FIt E
Sun Swiss lype Koshy-Wayne Weisler-James Bush-Larry Federico; Jim Thornton-David Wolf-David Williams-Toby Young Bkt 2

## RANK ADVANCEMENTS

NEW JUNIOR MASTERS
Janet Bean, Patricia Newman, Heather Russell NEW CLUB MASTERS
Ellen Manshel, Joan Quinlan, Ellaine Wilson NEW SECTIONAL MASTERS
Barbara Boegel, Kathy Gilmore, Ronald Ocmond NEW REGIONAL MASTERS
Myra Groome, Mary Hanni, Mercedes Wells
NEW NABC MASTERS
Margaret Ellis, Theresa Federico, Ada Havener
NEW ADVANCED NABC MASTER
Gail Fayard
NEW BRONZE LIFE MASTER
Karen Dugan
NEW SILVER LIFE MASTERS
Lawayne Eberhart, Madeline Tonti

## Other Tournament Achievements

## First in Baton Rouge Sectional

Swiss Flight X Vicki Willis et al [inadvertently omitted from July Kib -Sorry!] First in Crystal Springs Regional, 2nd Side Series Bill Beaushaw

## Know the Director's Ruling <br> by Jennie Flynn Sauviac

## Legal and illegal changes of call

A bid placed on or nearly on the table is considered played. What could be simpler? However use of the bidding boxes complicates matters.
Let's start with mechanics. You are required to decide upon a bid before you touch a card in the bid box. To touch a card in the top tier and then bid from the bottom tier, or vice versa, is improper, and directors may treat such actions as passing unauthorized information. Think about it. You reach for a card from the top tier and then after a moment's hesitation pull a pass card. Partner knows you were close to bidding and any action your partner takes will be suspect.
Now suppose you take a card out of the bid box and place it on the table, only to discover that it is not the call you intended. Laws allow you to change your call provided partner has not yet called but penalties may apply. You may change your call if your call was inadvertent and the change was made without pause for thought, and partner has not called. If there is some question about this the director should be called, and complications ensue, including possible bid and lead penalties.

PAUL'S DEAL OF THE MONTH. The consistently successful teams in lengthy IMP scored high level knockout events are often those most proficient in handling the occasional slam hands. This follows from two significant facts---(1) At the international and national levels almost all of the players are relatively equally skilled in bidding, playing and defending part score and game hands, whereas slam bidding methods, such as those some forcing 1C bidders and relay partnerships enjoy, can provide an advantage to those players; and (2) It is the amount of gain on the big hands which is so significant in IMP scoring, even though the IMP scale somewhat diminishes the impact of a large gain when compared to total point scoring. In club level matchpoint duplicate events it is the pairs which best handle competitive bidding who are consistently successful. This is because it is the frequency of gain, not the size of an individual gain on any single hand, which is most significant in matchpoint scoring. But a good result on the infrequent slam hands can sometimes make a difference in duplicate games. Here is a recent example experienced when I held $\uparrow A x x \vee A K x x * x \in J x x x$ and heard my partner open $1 N T$, showing 15-17 hcp and relatively balanced distribution. Although holding 15 points, my hand was not strong enough to justify an immediate slam bid. So I tried Stayman. The auction proceeded 1NT-2 $2 \boldsymbol{A}$, reaching an early critical point. Partner's bidding denied a heart fit. I lacked a spade fit. The combined hands were slightly short of sufficient high cards to justify a blast into 6 NT but were too good to only make a slam try. What to do? The answer was to explore for a club fit, while not bypassing $3 N T$, which might well be the limit of a making contract if the hands did not fit well. So I bid $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$, which is game forcing and slam invitational in most partnerships. Partner's hand was $\uparrow K x x x \in x \leftrightarrow A K Q x$ Axx. He correctly chose to raise to 4e, a natural bid showing an adequate club fit, justifying further slam exploration. Well, now, there was no need for additional complex conventional or natural bidding. Having bypassed 3 NT , which would predictably make about four or five on sheer combined hand power, my bidding 5C would have been a poor matchpoint choice. There were insufficient values to consider bidding a grand slam, so my obvious choice was to bid without further ado. The opening lead was the Q . The hand diagram is below left.


## Unit 134 Midyear MP leaders

no stars = Ace of Clubs leader

* = Mini-McKenney leader
** = leader for both Ace of Clubs and
Mini-McKenney

| 0-5 | Meryl Rosenbloom** |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5-20 | Lloyd Armstrong, Steven Plotkin* |
| 20-50 | Ronald Ocmond** |
| $50-100$ | Mary Hanni** |
| 100-200 | David Williams** |
| $200-300$ | William Weed** |
| $300-500$ | Jacob Karno, Cindy Lewis* |
| $500-1000$ | Susan Sommer** |
| $1000-1500$ | Helen St.Romain, Nelson Daigle* |
| $1500-2500$ | Don Daigle, JF Lowenstein* |
| $2500-3500$ | Paul Freese, Jeffrey Juster* |
| $3500-5000$ | Julius Rosenfield, Paul Deal* |
| $5000-7500$ | Larry Federico, Bob Bowers* |
| $7500-10000$ | Judy Katz** |
| $10000+$ | Jean Talbot, Drew Casen* |



TAKE ALL YOUR CHANCES! Here is a board from a recent club game where simple careful bridge would get you an $83 \%$ board. In fact, a little imagination got one pair a top. In third seat you hold АAQ86 『AK9 AK103 A8 and pard holds $\uparrow$ KJ3 $\uparrow 73$ Q87 KQ642. One pair was in 7NT making. Six pairs were in a NT game contract or a failing club slam. Of the 9 pairs in $6 \mathrm{NT}, 4$ made seven but 5 made only six.

But EVERYONE in 6NT should make seven. You have 12 tricks on top: 4 spades, 2 hearts, 3 diamonds and 3 clubs. You want one more trick from diamonds or clubs, and of course you do not want to risk the cold 6NT you already have. So if you want to finesse against the $\downarrow$ you must do so before unguarding any other suit. But you should reject that line. It is a $50 \%$ play, while the probability of dropping the $\$>$ is $52 \%$, and added to that are the possibilities that your LHO will show out on the first or second round of diamonds, giving you a marked finesse for the $\$ \mathbf{J}$, or that clubs will divide 3-3 even if diamonds don't work out. So you should try the running the diamonds and then the clubs. The probability of this compound line working out is much more than $50 \%$.

But there is one additional chance you should cater to, and on the actual layout that chance is critical. Namely, even if neither the club suit nor the diamond suit work out individually, it may be that one opponent holds both the long diamonds and the long clubs. To take advantage of this possibility you should play off all six major suit winners right away, before going after the diamonds and clubs. Neither opponent will be able to hold onto more than 7 minor suit cards. So if either opponent started with at least 4 cards in both minor suits, that opponent will be forced to come down to 3 cards in at least one minor suit. In such a case his partner started with fewer than 3 cards in the suit so that suit will run for you when you try the minor suits.

Thus the recommended line of play is: run off your six major suit winners, play $\diamond A, \downarrow$, to see if a marked finesse for the $\diamond$ has shown up. If not then try the $\forall K$ to see if the diamonds break $3-3$. If not, try the clubs to see if they break 3-3. None of these possibilities excites, but they do add up.

Here are the success probabilities, based on initial deal probabilities. The probability that the diamonds break, or the diamond jack drops, or a marked finesse against the diamond jack shows up is $60.9 \%$. The probability that the diamonds don't work out but the clubs break is $13.7 \%$. The probability that neither of these minor suit situations occurs but someone holds length in both minors is $7.9 \%$. Adding these up gives a probability for making seven no trump of $82.5 \%$ ! With a very straightforward line of play.

Looks like complex math? In fact you do not have to figure out all the probabilities or to be a squeeze expert, to find this line. You do need to recognize that the probability of bringing in the diamonds or clubs without a risky finesse is way over $50 \%$. So you should know to try the minor suits in turn. But before trying the minor suits, run all your major suit winners. That cannot cost, and it might be that an opponent will be forced to make a fatal discard or just blunder. And on the actual hand, your LHO started with 4 diamonds including the $\$$ and 5 clubs, so does have to make said fatal discard.

