

Table Talk

January 1, 2018 (Issue #70)



Editors
Mark Oettinger
Ingi Agnarsson

Editor's Message (Mark Oettinger)

Reaction to our October 1, 2017 issue of *Table Talk* has been favorable. Several *Letters to the Editor* have been received, some of which are reprinted, at least in part, in that feature below. This is the best way for the readership to influence what we produce. If you want to read more of the types of content that you value, let us know what you like!

I have been working my way through a number of hard-copy past issues of *Table Talk*. Thanks to those of you who have shared copies with me. The Vermont Bridge Association's website has an archive of *Table Talk* issues from June 2008 to January 2014 (the last 18 issues prior our October 2017 resumption of publication) at www.vermontbridge.org/tt_archive. While that's a wonderful resource, the January 2011 issue of *Talk Talk* lists 58 prior issues, dating back to July 1991. The two lists overlap on 8 issues, so unless someone can submit evidence that more issues were published, it appears that our October 1, 2017 issue was actually Issue # 69...which makes this Issue # 70. Quite an impressive history. Of the issues prior to June 2014 (when the VBA website's archive picks up), I only have 13 of the 53 issues, and particularly few before June 2004. So, if you have issues prior to June 2008, please let me know, as I would love to preserve copies in our Vermont bridge archives.

We are hoping to develop a stand-alone online *Table Talk* presence. That will take a URL, a host, a website...and time. For the moment, see <http://www.markoettinger.com/table-talk> for the October 1, 2017 issue. I plan to add this issue to that online site as well, but this is just a temporary solution. More news on our progress as developments warrant.

Many old issues start with an article about a Vermont bridge luminary, and sometimes even a bridge-playing couple, or a family with multi-generational bridge history. Is this something that the readership would like to see return in the future? If so, feel free to suggest individuals to be featured, and feel free to suggest someone to write the article, whether the featured individual him or herself, or a third party with a connection to the individual. Either way, let us know. Always keep in mind, however, that your communications will be fair game for publication in the *Letters to the Editor* column, unless you specifically request otherwise. Your wishes regarding publication (or not), if expressed, will be honored, and published communications may be edited for style or length;

A large portion of past issues was devoted to Sectional and Regional tournament results. Since this information is now readily available online, and since many clubs post their local results online as well, your present editors are less inclined to focus on publishing tournament results, and more inclined to post more informative content instead. In that respect, winners of Flights A, B and C from the recent Greensboro event are mentioned in the write-up of a hand from that event below. Again, readership reaction is solicited; and

Speaking of Sectionals, it is worth mentioning that there were 254 tables in play at the Fall 1996 Sectional in Killington. By comparison, the average table count at 2017 Vermont Sectionals was roughly 85. Hmmm. Articles regarding bridge courses, programs for new members, and the like, are solicited, and can be expected in future issues.

Vermont's 2017 Sectional Masterpoint Winners

Spring Sectional

Total masterpoints awarded: 305.28 masterpoints earned by 80 players.

Total attendance: 75 tables.

1. 21.85 Philip Sharpsteen, Jericho VT
2. 21.85 Ingi Agnarsson, South Burlington VT
3. 15.69 Peter Allen, Plattsburgh NY
4. 15.69 Michael Rogers, Ticonderoga NY
5. 14.01 William Dubay, Voorheesville NY
6. 14.01 Judy Dubay, Voorheesville NY

Summer Sectional

Total masterpoints awarded: 380.28 masterpoints earned by 96 players.

Total attendance: 96 tables.

1. 17.17 Philip Sharpsteen, Jericho VT
2. 17.17 Ingi Agnarsson, South Burlington VT
3. 14.81 Frank Hacker, Fort Myers FL
4. 14.39 Richard Tracy, Sharon VT
5. 14.39 Mark Oettinger, Burlington VT
6. 13.82 Rudolph Polli, Barre VT

Fall Sectional

Total masterpoints awarded: 322.20 masterpoints earned by 74 players.

Total attendance: 75 tables.

1. 16.05 Michael Farrell, South Burlington VT
2. 16.05 Gerald DiVincenzo, South Burlington VT
3. 12.63 Mary Savko, Tequesta FL
4. 12.63 Ellie Hanlon, Tequesta FL
5. 12.04 Wayne Hersey, Montpelier VT
6. 11.73 Rudolph Polli, Barre VT
7. 11.73 Jackie Kimel, South Burlington VT

Winter Sectional

Total masterpoints awarded: 378.90 masterpoints earned by 98 players.

Total attendance: 89 tables.

1. 17.68 Jonathan Greenspan, The Villages FL

2. 17.68 Jean Ludwig, New York NY
3. 17.66 Patricia DiVincenzo, S Burlington VT
4. 17.66 Judith Donald, Montpelier VT
5. 13.20 Peter Allen, Plattsburgh NY
6. 13.20 Michael Rogers, Ticonderoga NY

Overall 2017 Sectional Masterpoint Winners:

1. 58.90 Philip Sharpsteen, Jericho VT (**Tiernan Trophy**)
2. 58.90 Ingi Agnarsson, South Burlington VT (**Tiernan Trophy**)
3. 48.62 Michael Rogers, Ticonderoga NY
4. 47.93 Peter Allen, Plattsburgh NY
5. 35.55 Mark Oettinger, Burlington VT
6. 33.25 Richard Tracy, Sharon VT
7. 31.20 Wayne Hersey, Montpelier VT
8. 30.65 Gerald DiVincenzo, South Burlington VT
9. 25.89 Patricia DiVincenzo, South Burlington VT
10. 23.72 Michael Farrell, South Burlington VT

Aborn Trophy (non life-master) leaders

1. 16.45 Winner Margaret Fanning (**Aborn Trophy**)
2. 15.89 Kim Likakis
3. 12.19 Denny Lystra
4. 11.19 Carol Slesar
5. 8.54 Linda Aaronson

Conventions Corner

In the *Conventions Corner*, we illustrate the basic principles and uses of some common (and some not-so-common) conventions that we feel are helpful. We subdivide the highlighted conventions into Basic, Intermediate and Advanced, cognizant that each convention requires a certain amount of memorization. Each

convention, when properly used, will assist its users in arriving at superior or optimal contracts. The offsetting cost of using the convention, of course, is the loss of the “standard” meaning of the bidding sequence. An effective convention is one which gains more than it loses, and the effective use of any convention requires the partnership to establish, remember, and consistently apply, the necessary bidding agreements. There is nothing more counterproductive than trying to use a convention without adequate advance discussion and agreement.

We encourage readers to submit articles (which can be brief) on their favorite conventions. We also welcome requests to feature specific conventions (or to address specific bidding challenges) that may be of interest to our members at any level. This issue includes a significant number of articles on bidding. The following are a few conventions that we plan to feature in upcoming issues:

Basic:

Roman Key Card Blackwood;
Forcing Notrump Auctions; and
Requirements of an Opening Hand.

Intermediate:

Maximal-Style Doubles;
Support Doubles and Redoubles;
Jacoby 2N and Splinters;
4NT as Blackwood, and as Quantitative; and
Mixed Raises.

Advanced:

Lebensohl;
Hexan;
Minorwood;
12-14 1NT Opener;
Italian Cuebids;

Kickback Roman Key Card; and
2-way Game Tries (aka Long- and Short-Suit Game Tries).

As we develop a sufficiently comprehensive collection of bidding articles, and once we have an online presence, we will be posting a series of “standard” convention cards. They will reflect basic, intermediate and advanced versions of what seem to be the consensus bidding systems around Vermont at the current time. These card will evolve through feedback from readers, and will be available for download (with or without adaptation) by interested partnerships.

This feature, and others that we envision for *Table Talk*, will require a more sophisticated technological platform than we currently have available. Our current publication is simply a pdf attached to emails for distribution. When we have a dedicated server, domain name, URL, and web host, we will post fillable forms along with continuously evolving content and archives. Volunteers with ideas, technology skills and available time are urged to step forward!

Jacoby Transfers (Majors Only) Versus Four-Suit Transfers and Pre-Accept (Suggested for Intermediate Players) (Mark Oettinger)

Most players use Jacoby Transfers. The basic structure is as follows:

1N P 2♦*...

...which says that responder has at least 5♥, and requires opener to rebid 2♥, thereby “accepting the transfer.” [1N-P-2♥*... is the parallel sequence for Spades.] How many high card points does responder promise? Most would say “none,” since it is almost certainly better to play in the guaranteed 7-card major suit fit (opener has to have at least 2♥ for his opening 1N bid), even at the 2-level, than to play in 1N. Consider a typical worst-case hand for such an auction:

♠ xxx
♥ 10xxxxx
♦ xxx
♣ xx

♠ AKx
 ♥ Qx
 ♦ Kxxx
 ♣ Kxxx

In 2♥, you will probably take 2♠ tricks, one of your Kings, and at least 2♥. Down 2 is never pleasant, but in 1N, with good (i.e., “passive”) defense, you could easily be held to your 2♠ tricks, for Down 5. Don’t lose sight of the fact that you and your partner only have a combined total of 15 high card points. In other words, the opponents have 25 high card points. They can therefore almost certainly make 3N, which would be -400 or -600 for your side, so going -100 or even -200 is likely to be a pretty good score.

Before we transition into considering *four*-suit transfers, let’s consider the concept of super-accept. When you open 1N and partner “Jacoby Transfers” (2♦* or 2♥*), many partnerships agree that opener should accept the transfer by jumping a level if he (opener) has a maximum (normally 17 HCPs and 4-card trump support). Again, let’s look at the worst-case example:

♠ xxx
 ♥ 10xxxxx
 ♦ xxx
 ♣ xx

 ♠ AKx
 ♥ Qxxx
 ♦ KQxx
 ♣ Kx

Yes, responder will inwardly cringe when opener “super-accepts,” but the Law of Total Tricks (LoTT) provides that we are usually “safe” playing for the number of tricks that is equal to our combined number of trumps. We know that we have at least 9 trumps, so we should be safe committing to the 3 level...which requires 9

tricks for success. NOTE: I am not saying that we will necessarily *make* 3♥, but if we go down, we are likely to suffer a smaller minus than if we had let the opponents play (and make) their partscore at the 2- or 3-level. The LoTT is a bit beyond the scope of this article, but will be the subject of future articles in *Table Talk*, and is an indispensable part of the repertoire of all aspiring players. The seminal works on the subject are Larry Cohen's classics entitled *To Bid or Not to Bid* and *Following the Law*. I commend them to you.

So...we turn to 4-Suit Transfers, which start with the following sequences:

1N P 2♦*...showing ♥

1N P 2♥*...showing ♠

1N P 2♠*...showing ♣

1N P 2N*...showing ♦

Two considerations must kept in mind:

- (1) Since transferring to either minor suit gets us to the 3 level, we must have 6 cards in the minor suit to initiate the sequence; and
- (2) You will notice that the ♦ transfer takes away our standard 1N-P-2N...invitational to 3N. How then do we invite to 3N? The answer is that we first bid 2♣ (nominally, Stayman), and we then rebid 2N regardless of what opener rebids. Opener must then Alert responder's 2N rebid, and if asked, explain that "responder may *or may not* have a 4-card major."

One further (and very useful) extension of four-suit transfers is the concept of pre-accept. This concept has application beyond minor suit transfers, but *in the minor suit transfer context*, if opener does not immediately accept the transfer, but instead bids the suit between responder's transfer and the suit that responder is showing (thereby "*pre-accepting*"), opener is showing a good fit for responder's

suit...typically “Queen third or better.” The corollary of this principle is that when opener immediately accepts the minor suit transfer, he is showing less than “Queen third” in responder/transferor’s minor suit. Why does this matter? Because, in this way, the partnership gains in two situations: (1) When opener has less than Queen third, it is likely that 3 of responder’s minor will be the final contract, and in that event, opener (the stronger hand) will become declarer, will have his hand remain “closed,” and will have the opening lead come “up to” his hand (often gaining a trick or tempo); and (2) If responder has a 6-card minor with 2 of the 3 top honors, and opener pre-accepts, responder knows that we have 6 tricks in the suit if it splits normally, and that may give responder the information that he needs in order to place us in a point-shy but successful 3N contract. Consider the two following hands and their different auctions:

<p>(A)</p> <p>♠ J10x</p> <p>♥ xx</p> <p>♦ KQxxxx</p> <p>♣ xx</p> <p>♠ Axx</p> <p>♥ KQx</p> <p>♦ Axx</p> <p>♣ QJxx</p> <p>1N 2N*</p> <p>3♣** 3N</p>	<p>(B)</p> <p>♠ J10x</p> <p>♥ xx</p> <p>♦ KQxxxx</p> <p>♣ xx</p> <p>♠ AJxx</p> <p>♥ KQx</p> <p>♦ xx</p> <p>♣ KQJx</p> <p>1N 2N*</p> <p>3♦*** P</p>
--	--

In Hand (A), responder drives to game, knowing that the ♦ should be good for 6 tricks (90% of the time), whereas in Hand (B), responder is content to play in 3♦, since the ♦ suit will likely not run, and is a far greater resource as a trump suit...as opposed to a source of tricks in notrump. You will note that a one-round hold-up of the ♦A will limit declarer to one ♦ trick in 3N.

CAVEAT: No convention works in every situation, and every convention usurps the otherwise natural meaning of the sequence. That said, bridge is a game of

probabilities, and when a convention (if fully understood and properly used) produces a greater probability of a better result, it is worthwhile on balance.

Texas Transfers, Delayed Texas Transfers, and the Principle of Captaincy (Mark Oettinger)

Before we leave the topic of transfers, we should mention Texas Transfers. In their simplest form, these are the following sequences:

(A) 1N P 4♦*...showing game-going strength and 6 or more ♥...

and...

(B) 1N P 4♥*...showing game-going (or greater) strength and 6 or more ♠.

Opener is required to accept the transfer by bidding 4 of responder's implied suit. Note that responder is the "captain" of the auction, and makes the decision as to whether to explore slam or to pass and leave opener in the major suit game. Why is responder the "captain," and what is this concept of "captaincy?" The concept of captaincy, which applies in many sequences, is as follows: The partner of the first member of the partnership to limit his or her hand, is the "captain." **Once captaincy is established, the captain decides the final contract, because he is the first to know the narrow limits of partner's hand, and is therefore in the best position to judge where the partnership should play.**

One of the many sequences in which one partner limits his hand is a sequence in which he opens 1N. By doing so, opener shows 15-17 high card points (some systems use a different range, but the range is always narrow...3 high card points). Opening 1N also shows "balanced" distribution. Typical distributions are 4-3-3-3, 4-4-3-2, and 5-3-3-2. Partnerships differ on whether a 1N opener can include a 5-card major, and on whether (and if so, under what circumstances) opener's distribution can be 5-4-2-2. Yes, there is a fair degree of variation among 1N

openers, and “limiting one’s hand” is a relative concept, as are so many things in bridge...and life. All of that being said, consider following sequences:

(C) 1♣ P 1♥...

Opener has 12-21 high card points, a 10-point range...not (very) limited. Responder should have a minimum of 5 high card points, but could have far more than that. He could have a slam-going hand...and again, is functionally “unlimited.” At this stage of this auction, no captain has been established. Distinguish the following hands:

(D) 1♣ P 1♥ P
2♣...

Opener is first to limit his hand when he rebids 2C. Most would agree that he has 6+ Clubs and 12-16 HCP. On this auction, responder is therefore the captain.

(E) 1♣ P 1♥ P
1N...

Again, opener is first to limit his hand, this time by rebidding 1N. Most would agree that he does not have 4♠, and that he has 12-14 HCP. On this auction, therefore, responder is again the captain.

(F) 1♣ P 1♥ P
1♠ P 1N...

This time, it is *responder* who is the first to limit his hand, by rebidding 1N, and by thereby denying 4♠ and showing 6-9 (maybe a bad 10) HCPs. Opener is therefore captain in this sequence.

Discuss this principle with all of your regular partners. As a general proposition, once captaincy has been established, the captain is free to set the contract, and partner should respect that decision. On the other hand, if the captain keeps the

bidding open, his partner should endeavor to further describe his hand within the context of what he has shown thus far. A retreat to an agreed or previously-mentioned trump suit tends to be weak, while the mention of a new suit tends to show extra values in the context of what has been shown thus far.

Getting back to Texas Transfers, it should now be clear what is meant when we say that responder is captain in hands (A) and (B) above. Opening 1N immediately limits one's hand, thereby making responder the captain. Responder is well-positioned to either put opener in 4 of his major (which should be passed), or to explore slam either by means of cue bidding or Blackwood, as best suits the responder/captain's need for information in order to accurately judge whether to subsist at the 5-level, or to drive to slam, and if so, in what strain (6 of the major, or 6N).

Before we leave the topic of Texas Transfers, it is worth mentioning Delayed Texas. This is a handy way to show 6-4 in the majors, as follows:

(G) 1N P 2♣ P
2♦ P 4♦*...

This sequence shows game-going values with 6♥ and 4♠...

and...

(H) 1N P 2♣ P
2♦ P 4♥*...

Which shows game-going values with 6♠ and 4♥.

Why should responder look for the 4-4 fit in his shorter major when he knows that the partnership has at least an 8-card fit in his 6-card major? Because playing in the 4-4 fit will potentially give declarer *multiple* discards on the 6-card major after the trumps have been drawn, whereas the opposite is not true.

Smolen (Suggested for Intermediate Players) (Mark Oettinger)

This is a convention of limited utility, but when it comes up, it is very handy. It is a normal extension of Stayman, and is part of most modern partnerships' toolbox for describing the various major-suit-oriented hands opposite a 1N opener. The two basic sequences are:

1N P 2♣ P
2♦ P 3♥*...

and...

1N P 2♣ P
2♦ P 3♠*...

Responder (who is 5=4 or 4=5 in the majors, and has a game-going hand...10+ HCPs) starts with Stayman, and if opener rebids 2♦ (denying a 4-card major), responder jumps to either 3♥ to show 5♠ and 4♥, or to 3♠ to show 5♥ and 4♠. It may seem counterintuitive to bid the major suit of which you have fewer, but since opener denied a 4-card major when he rebid 2♦, you know that he does not have 4-card support for your 4-card major, so what you are doing is determining whether partner has 3-card support for your 5-card major, failing which, you will play in 3N. And if opener *does* have 3-card support, he will be the one to first bid the trump suit, having the effect of a transfer, "right-siding" the contract more often than not, keeping the stronger hand hidden, having the opening lead "come up to" the strong hand, and often gaining tempo.

A related issue to discuss with partner is how "extensions" or "continuations" of the basic Smolen sequence are to be understood. For example in the following auction:

1N P 2♣ P
2♦ P 3♥* P
?...

What does 3♠ mean? Maximum 1N opener with 3+♠ (under the principle of slow arrival)?

What about 3N? Only 2♠?

What about 4♣, 4♦ or 4♥? 3-card trump support for responder's 5-card major? Ace of the indicated suit, denying a lower Ace? Italian-style cuebid?

What does 4♠ mean? Minimum 1N opener with 3+♠ (under the principle of fast arrival)?

I have posed a few possible interpretations, but different treatments are equally supportable. What is important is that you and your partner have clear understandings wherever you can, and general "rules of construction" for when the inevitable "undiscussed" sequences arise. Two useful "rules of construction" are:

Rule of Construction # 1: If it's undiscussed, it should be assumed to be natural;

and

Rule of Construction # 2: If you think that partner might misconstrue your bid, assume that he will...and bid something else.

A Comprehensive(?) Approach to Finding (or Ruling Out) a Major Suit Fit After Partner Opens 1N (Mark Oettinger)

As we examine Stayman-related auctions (searching for a major suit fit after a notrump opener), it may be helpful to ask ourselves how responder differentiates hands that have one or both 4-card majors, or are 4=5, or 5=4, or 4=6, or 6=4. Add to the mix the ability to differentiate between invitational hands and game-forcing hands, and ideally, even the ability to use "garbage stayman," and things get a bit complicated. Let's try to envision these permutations through a chart. The following structure is offered as a coherent system. It is by no means the only

solution. As always, it matters less what system you play than that you and your partner are in agreement. When partner opens 1N, responding hands with 5-4 or 5-5 in the majors are the most problematic.

	1 or both 4-card majors	4=5 or 5=4 in the majors	5=5 in the majors	6=4 or 4=6 in the majors
Weak 0-7 HCP* *Consider inviting with Max hands and good suits	Garbage Stayman if 4=4=4=1 or 4=4=5=0	Transfer in 5-card suit; then pass	Transfer in your better 5-card major; then pass	Transfer into 6-card major; then pass
Invitational 8-9 HCP* *According to some top level players, you should push to game with almost any 9...	Stayman; then invite (3M or 2N)	With 4=5, use Stayman; then bid 2♠ if opener rebids 2♦. With 5=4, transfer to ♠; then bid 3♥	Transfer to ♠; then bid 2N	Transfer into 6-card major; then invite
Game-Forcing 10+ HCP	Stayman; then bid game (4 M or 3N) or new suit (with 4+). Splinter in short suit with 4=4-4-1 or 4=4-5-0.	Use Stayman; bid 4♥ or 4♠ if opener bids a major; bid your 4-card major over 2♦ (Smolen)	Transfer to ♠; then bid 3N	Stayman; accept 4-4 major fit, or use delayed Texas over 2D

Puppet Stayman (Suggested for Intermediate Players) (Mark Oettinger)

Puppet Stayman evolved from the emergence of the practice of opening 1N with a 5-card major. The two basic sequences start as follows:

(A) 1N P 3♣*...

And

(B) 2N P 3♣*...

In both cases, responder is showing sufficient strength to force the partnership the game, while posing the question, "Do you have a 4-card or 5-card major?" Opener rebids as follows:

3♦...I have one or both 4-card majors;

3♥...I have 5♥;

3♠...I have 5♠; and

3N...I have no 4-card or 5-card major.

One additional nuance arises when opener rebids 3♦ (showing one or both 4-card majors), in that responder now bids the major that he does not have. That allows the opener to bid the other major when the partnership has a 4-4 fit which, just like in the case of a Jacoby Transfer, tends to right-side the contract, making the stronger hand declarer, and allowing for the opening lead to "come up to" the stronger hand, often resulting in a trick and/or an advantage in tempo. The following two sequences are illustrative:

(C)	1N	P	3♣*	P
	3♦**	P	3♥***	P
	3♠****	P	4♠	P
	P	P		

* = Puppet Stayman

** = I have one or both majors

*** = I have 4♠
 **** = So do I

Note # 1: The principle of fast/slow arrival (fast is weaker than slow, allowing for more game or slam exploration) suggests a maximum 1N opener point-wise, lest opener would have bid 4♠ directly at his third turn to call.

What if responder has *both* majors? Then the sequence goes as follows:

(D)	1N	P	3♣*	P
	3♦**	P	3♥***	P
	3N****	P	4♥*****	P
	P	P		

* = Puppet Stayman
 ** = I have one or both majors
 *** = I have 4♠
 **** = I don't have 4♠; I have 4♥
 ***** = I have 4♥ too

Note # 2: In sequence (♦), we don't get the benefit of the transfer. One solution is for the partnership to agree that responder can bid 4♣ or 4♦ at his third turn to call, to allow opener to bid 4♥, thereby right-siding the contract after all. That's a bit of a "memory hog," and not for the unpracticed partnership. That said, if you did adopt this variant, it would give you the opportunity to convey additional information through your choice of 4♣ or 4♦. Logically, you would choose the better of your two holdings, since natural/descriptive bidding is preferred when not systemically contraindicated.

Note # 3: If responder has both majors, should he always show one of them (e.g., Hearts) first? I see no intrinsic advantage, so I would recommend a different rule. Responder should show his better major first, which increases the chance that we will play in the better quality suit when we have 4-4 fits in both majors.

Note # 4: Some players initiate Puppet Stayman with 2♣ (not 3♣) after a 1N opener. In my view, that leaves more room for game-forcing auctions, and allows the partnership to sometimes find a 5-3 major suit suit even at the partscore level. We may explore this variant in a subsequent article, but in the meantime, give it a try.

Note # 5: When multiple world champion Allan Graves recently fielded a question on the topic of Puppet Stayman at the October 2017 White River Junction Sectional, he offered the opinion that Puppet Stayman gives the defenders too much information. In that respect, he sang the praises of a good old 1N - P - 3N - P - P - P sequence, as it keeps the defenders in the dark. Who am I to argue with Allan Graves, but I offer the following additional thought. When you play at his level, your opponents are well-positioned to use every bit of information at their disposal to their advantage. When you play at a less stratospheric level, on the other hand, I wonder how often your ability to play in the objectively better contract will outweigh the information that is imparted to the opponents. If you use Puppet, please let me know what you conclude.

Exclusion Roman Key Card Blackwood (intermediate-advanced players) (Ingi Agnarsson)

I am personally very grateful for Sunday games, as I have a hard time making 'day-games' during the week. And, it seems, nice hands get dealt on Sundays. Maybe there is a God after all. To highlight the value of Sunday games, I'll try to take examples from a Sunday game in every Table Talk from now on!

In any case, on October 22nd in the Burlington Sunday club game, an interesting hand came up that excellently illustrates the utility of the "Exclusion Roman Key Card" convention. Hence, I take the opportunity to introduce it here. This convention is used in suit contracts by a hand that has a void to ask for key cards in the remaining suits and is also sometimes called "Exclusion Blackwood" or simply "Voidwood."

Let's say ♥ have been agreed upon as the trump suit at the 3 level. Now a jump to the fifth level, for example, 5♣ asks partner how many keycards she has outside the ♣ suit. The answers are exactly the same as after 4NT RKC. With my partners I use 0314, 2 without the queen of trump and 2 with the queen of trump. Simply, the first step promises zero or three key cards, the second step promises one or four key cards, the third step promises two key cards without the trump queen, and the fourth step promises two key cards with the trump queen. After a 5♣ RKC, for example, 5♥ would be one or four KC outside clubs, 5NT would be two with the trump queen, etc. This convention doesn't come up very often, but when it does it can be crucial, and it's not like most people use jumps to the 5 level for anything else. It's a freebie.

Sunday's hand:

	♠ AK105	
	♥ –	
	♦ KQ5	
	♣ AK10654	
♠ 2		♠ 93
♥ A7632		♥ KQ1085
♦ 9643		♦ 10872
♣ 872		♣ J9
	♠ QJ8764	
	♥ J94	
	♦ AJ	
	♣ Q3	

On my table I sat West and observed the opponents--very good players--bid: 2♠-P-4NT (RKC)-P-5♦ (one KC)... Now what?

After a 2♠ opening by South, North really is aiming for a slam and should be fairly hopeful about 7♠. All North really needs is the ♦A, and to be 100% sure, the ♠Q, although even without that, 7 is a strong favorite, as the contract will only fail when the trumps are 3-0. And if partner has the decency to hold at least the J9

leading her powerhouse suit, 7 will only fail when East has all three trumps (an 11% chance, per odds (see next issue). Presuming South holds the promised 6♠, you have six trump tricks, three ♦, two ♣, and two ♥ ruffs in dummy...for 13. Or, in the actual hand, you can also get your 12th-15th tricks in ♣. At my table, after a standard RKC auction, North knew that partner had one ace, but did not know which one, and therefore did not risk bidding 7. In fact, no pair reached this laydown grand slam contract.

If I had opened the South hand with 2♠, my partner would have bid 5♥ (Voidwood!), perhaps after first forcing by 2NT to hear more about my hand. My response would have been 5NT (one or four KC outside ♥), and now partner knows that I have the ♦A, and without hesitation can bid the grand-slam for an easy top.

There is no excuse not to have Voidwood in your arsenal.

What Does a Double of 3N Mean? (Mark Oettinger)

On September 23, 2017, the Barton Bridge Club hosted a wonderful two-session charity game at the Highland Lodge in Greensboro. Amazingly, \$18 bought 2 sessions and bridge and lunch, with the profits going to charity. The weather was ideal, with early foliage adorning the drive. A 10:00 a.m. start time, and a delicious onsite lunch, allowed participants to be home before dark. The field was 10 tables for each session. In the morning session, Fred & Judy Donald were 1st in A, Joe & Susan Wood were 1st in B, and Judy Doerner and Donna Griffin were 1st in C. In the afternoon, Wayne Hersey and Rick Clark were 1st in A, and Janet Long and Janet Savage were 1st in B and C.

Among the many interesting hands was the following. East was Dealer, and both sides were vulnerable. I was South, holding the following collection:

♠Jxx
♥AQJx
♦xx

Fred Donald opened 3NT in first seat, alerted by Judy. I passed, Judy passed, and my partner doubled. Fred passed, and I asked Judy what the 3NT opening had shown. Her response was, “17-21 HCPs and a long minor.”

Point of law. One may only ask about the meaning of an opponent’s bid when it is one’s turn to call. I had not asked what Fred’s bid had meant when it was my first turn to call. Why? Because it would not have affected my choice of call. I was going to pass no matter what his bid meant, and it is improper to ask about the meaning of a bid for *partner’s* edification. See Law 20(G)(1) of the *Laws of Duplicate Bridge*. Interestingly, partner did not ask either before he decided to double, so presumably, it would not have affected his choice of call either.

Point of ethics. For you directors and other rules experts out there: is it ethical for me to draw inference from the fact that partner did not ask about an unusual and facially ambiguous bid...or is that unauthorized information? I think that the information is “authorized,” but I will be glad to receive (and share) views to the contrary.

Point of tactics. Even if the meaning of an opponent’s bid *might* affect your call, you may not want to ask. Why? Because the opponents may be having a misunderstanding, and if they are, you do not want to draw their attention to that fact. In this case, there was little chance of that, considering the fact that Fred and Judy are regular partners. If they were an inexperienced partnership, however, and/or if their auction and/or affect implied confusion, it would often be better *not* to ask.

But, back to the problem at hand. What should I do? Should I leave in the double, or should I do something else. The only “something else” that presented itself was a bid of 4♥. Looking at my hand, I guessed that Fred’s minor was diamonds. I also assumed that partner had both majors, lest he have simply bid 4 of his major if he only had one. Preempts are highly effective, and they force difficult choices by the non-preempting side. I uneasily subtracted 17 from 40, and concluded that we could have as many as 23 HCPs between us. We have all seen

game make with fewer, and although I was pretty unhappy about it, I bid 4♥, and it went Pass, Pass, Double(!), Pass Pass, Pass. This had been the auction:

E	S	W	N
3N*	P	P	X
P	4♥	P	P
X	P	P	P

Unfortunately, this was the entire hand:

	♠AKQxx	
	♥xx	
	♦xxx	
	♣QJx	
♠xxxx		♠x
♥xxx		♥Kxxx
♦xx		♦AKQxxx
♣xxxx		♣AK
	♠Jxx	
	♥AQJx	
	♦xx	
	♣Jxxx	

The contract failed by several tricks. Partner’s first reaction was: “Doubles of 3N are always for penalties.” That’s a good understanding for an established partnership to have, and advanced texts on the topic support this position. Unfortunately, we had not discussed it, and in the heat of battle, I did not retrieve it from memory. Had I done so, and assuming that Judy had left it in (which she said she would have), I would have been on lead. What would I have led?

As previously mentioned, I had assumed that Fred’s long minor was ♦, but since it was possible from my hand that it could be ♣, I could at least narrow down

my lead to the majors. But, which one? During the somewhat extended postmortem, Partner modified his original comment and said: “Doubles of 3N call for a *Spade* lead.” This is a workable understanding with which I had not been familiar. On the other hand, I did recall having read that “Doubles of 3N call for an unusual lead,” and that “Doubles of 3N call for the lead of dummy’s first bid suit.” These last two aphorisms evoke Lightner Doubles (see *Table Talk*, October 1, 2017, Pages 13-14).

We also bandied about a rule that provides that “Doubles of 3N call for a lead of dummy’s first bid suit, unless dummy never bid a suit, in which case they call for the lead of a Spade.” Another possibility is that, “A double of 3N calls for partner to “do something intelligent.” “DSI doubles,” in a broader context, are periodically discussed in the literature, often with disfavor, largely because they fail to establish a rule of *any* sort. I am not sure which solution is best, but without question, any frequent partnership should establish a clear understanding on this point.

Back to my hypothetical leading dilemma. After all of this analysis, a ♠ seems obvious, and as you can see, it would have resulted in a 2-trick set. The astute reader might ask, “Which Spade?” On the actual layout of this hand, any ♠ works, but starting with the Jack may be critical if one defender has four ♠ to the 10.

Last point. Remember “Ace asks for Attitude; King asks for Count?” Before I lead a ♠, I can also lead the Ace of ♥, and get a discouraging attitude signal. That turns +500 into +300, and costs 1 matchpoint (there were 2 other +300s), as you get only 1 ♥ trick instead of 2.

The Burlington Strip Club (Ingi Agnarsson)

There are many kinds of ‘clubs’ around, all aiming for some kind of procrastination. Perhaps to the uninitiated the concept of a bridge club and a strip club are orthogonally opposed. Bridge builds character while the other kind of club

is a bit less constructive, to say the least. One thrives in Burlington (<http://www.bridgewebs.com/burlingtonacademy/>) while the other is (as far as I know) absent, for many excellent reasons. But, to those that long for a ‘strip tease’ in the Burlington area, I’m happy to announce that the Burlington Bridge Academy instead offers ‘strip squeeze,’ among its other myriad of wonderful bridge adventures. Both could be characterized as exciting, while the squeeze is also genuine.

What is a strip squeeze? It’s basically a kind of squeeze (forcing opponents to throw away tricks) where the defender has to abandon winners only to be thrown in and make a winning lead for the declarer. A nice example of this kind of squeeze occurred at the Burlington Bridge Academy, and I suppose across the country, in the November 21 Tuesday’s “charity pairs” game. On Hand 25, West was dealt a nice hand, given an opening 1♣ by partner:

♠ K 10 2
♥ K 10 9 7
♦ A 8 6 5
♣ Q 9

Naturally, you are going for game. After a standard 1♥, partner bids 1♠, and it seems reasonable to jump to 3NT, as I did. The lead is a favorable ♣, and this is the whole deal:

171121BBC2

Board 25
North Deals
E-W Vul

♠ 8 3
♥ A Q J
♦ 10 7 3
♣ K J 8 6 4

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

♠ 9 7 6 5
 ♥ 8 6 5 4 2
 ♦ 9 2
 ♣ 3 2

You duck and win the trick ‘cheaply’ with the 9 of ♣. You have ten top tricks (4♠, 4♦, 2♣) that everybody will get, and your matchpoint goal must be to get the 11th trick for a good score. Scoring either the king of ♥ or an extra ♣ would do the trick. You could play right away towards the king of ♥, and that works as long as South has the A, but this line could get you into serious trouble if North has the A. Instead, you should think about ‘stripping’ some of the options away from the opponents. A simple plan would be to take the four ♦ tricks, and then the four ♠ tricks, before leading a ♣ towards the Q and the likely ♣K in the North hand. However, this does not work as North can simply exit with a ♥, giving you the extra ♥ trick, but denying you access to dummy’s ♣A. I played West and, such as life is, did not find the best play. It is best to take all the ♠, and then three rounds of diamonds, before leading a low ♣ to the Q and North’s A. Now, if North started with 3 or fewer diamonds, he is endplayed, and has to give away a ♥ trick or a ♣trick, an extra opportunity for declarer that I simply missed.

Regardless, I made 5 by executing a simple strip squeeze. I played my four ♦, and then led a ♣ towards my Q. North took the trick and exited with a ♠. I now

took my four ♠ tricks, ending in dummy, with 10 tricks having been played. North has to discard to the last ♠, coming down to 3 cards. He can either discard a ♣ (keeping the ♣K and the ♥AQ), in which case the ♣A10 become tricks 10 and 11; or, as he did, he can discard the ♥Q and be endplayed with the ♥A to play ♣ through dummy's A10. There is no defense. All that is needed is that declarer pays some attention to the discards. The 'strip squeeze' gave us a 100% matchpoint score in our club game, and helped us (playing with the infallible Phil Sharpsteen) to garner a comfortable win, notwithstanding several misplays, mis-bids, and awkward snack breaks by the author. Look no further, the Burlington Bridge Academy is the hottest club in town!

A Missed Opportunity for Lead Direction (Mark Oettinger)

It's a club game with a strong field. You are sitting South in first seat. The opponents are vulnerable. We are not. You pick up the following hand.

♠A7
♥AKQ4
♦1085
♣9863

You open 1♣. West overcalls 1♠. Partner bids 3♣ (preemptive). East raises to 3♠. What do you bid now? The vulnerability is a key factor in this hand. White against red gives you great incentive to sacrifice, as you can afford to go down 3 doubled *if their game makes*. Do you think that the opponents will compete to 4♠? Partner's jump raise is preemptive, and he could have very little aside from 5♣...especially at this vulnerability. And his face cards are odds-on to be in the club suit, likely leaving him with no tricks outside the ♣ suit.

If the opponents do bid 4♠, do you think that they will make it? It looks like you have 4 tricks in your own hand, but do you think that 3 rounds of ♥ will cash? I would doubt it, but even if they will, the opponents may well misjudge the situation and get too high and go down in 4♠ or even 5♠. This would result in

your side receiving a *plus* score...even better than a cheap sacrifice (with a minus score that is less than what the opponents would receive for bidding and making their ♠ game).

All things considered, it seems clearly right to bid on. But what's the right level? Do you bid 4♣, hoping that the opponents will leave you there (missing their presumed game)? Do you think that they will bid 4♠ over your 4♣, and if so, do you plan to bid 5♣ when it's next your turn to call? For the reasons discussed in the previous paragraph, I would think that the answer to both of these questions is "yes," so why not just 5♣ immediately over 3♠, making life difficult for the opponents? Decide what you would have done before reading on.

When I faced this problem, it looked to me like I could "have my cake and eat it too," by bidding just 4♣ initially, hoping that they might let us play there, and then bidding 5♣ if, as I fully expected, they were to compete to 4♠. So I bid 4♣. And sure enough, West bid 4♠. It went pass, pass back to me, and I bid 5♣. West doubled, partner passed, and East pulled the double and raised to 5♠. Pass, pass, pass. This had been the auction:

S	W	N	E
1♣	1♠	3♣	3♠
4♣	4♠	P	P
5♣	X	P	5♠
P	P	P	

Partner led the ♣K, and East tabled the following dummy:

♠KQJ4
 ♥10987
 ♦AKQ96
 ♣-

♠A7
 ♥AKQ4
 ♦1085
 ♣9863

I was initially distracted by the fact that Partner's lead of the King called for me to show "count." I love this defensive carding agreement, and I somewhat smugly played the 6, starting an "echo" (a high-low) to show an even number of ♣. My smugness was short-lived, however, when declarer won the ♣A in his hand and fired back a ♦ to the Ace on the board. He continued with the King and Queen of ♦, on which he pitched two ♥. He then drove out the ♠A, ruffed the ♥ return, drew the last trump, took a successful ruffing finesse in ♣, and claimed 12 tricks on a cross-ruff. This had been the complete deal:

♠5
 ♥J32
 ♦J732
 ♣KQ754

♠1098632
 ♥65
 ♦4
 ♣AJ102

♠KQJ4
 ♥10987
 ♦AKQ96
 ♣-

♠A7
 ♥AKQ4
 ♦1085
 ♣9863

The dust settled and my general sense of unease quickly evolved into the following internal dialog. "I never got *any* ♥ tricks." "If partner had led ♥, we would have gotten *two* ♥ tricks *and* the Ace of trumps." "That would have set the

contract by a trick...+100 instead of -680!” “Arghhh!” “Should partner have figured it out?”

The round was called, and as we left the table, through clenched teeth, we politely wished the opponents good luck. They made the usual wisecrack that they were sorry that we couldn't stick around for another board or two. I resolved to put the board behind me as I sat down and greeted our new opponents. One must not allow a bad board to affect the next board! As partner reached for his cards, he casually asked, “Why didn't you bid 4♥?”

The color drained from my face. What a great idea! Given that I was planning to bid 5♣ anyway, why not throw in a lead-directing bid of 4♥?! Yes, that would give up on the possibility of being left in 4♣, but that's probably a fantasy anyway. Partner would certainly be able to read my intent, and would correct to 5♣ when it was his turn, so that I wouldn't get left in 4♥. Then, regardless of the level at which the opponents ended up playing their ♠ game, partner would lead a ♥...and we would have gotten our three tricks. More internal dialogue: “Oh well, next hand.” “That just cost us 4%.” “*Next hand!*”

Declarer Play - What's the Best Line at IMPs? (Mark Oettinger)

South Deals

East/West Vulnerable

♠J104

♥AJ62

♦Q92

♣982

♠865

♥Q107

♦10874

♣J73

♠97

♥K9853

♦J3

♣AQ54

♠AKQ32
 ♥4
 ♦AK65
 ♣K106

The auction is simple:

S	W	N	E
1 ♠	P	2 ♠	P
4 ♥	P	4 ♠	P
P	P		

West leads the ♠6.

If the conditions of contest are IMPs (teams), the emphasis is essentially 100% on making the contract. Overtricks are all but irrelevant. You have 5 guaranteed ♠ tricks, 3 guaranteed ♦ tricks, and the ♥A for 9. How do you combine your chances in order to maximize your chances for taking a 10th trick? If the ♦ split 3-3 (about a 35% chance), the 13th ♦ will be your 10th trick. Even if the ♦ split 4-2, however, you can ruff your 4th ♦ if the defender who holds 2 ♦ started with 2 or fewer trumps. In order to succeed in this line, you must draw 2 rounds of trump before starting the ♦.

There's another step that you can take in order to "take all your chances" (footnote to Eddie Kantar), and thereby improve your likelihood of success even further. You can win the opening ♠ lead on the board and lead a ♣ toward the King. If the ♣A is onside, the ♣K is your 10th trick, and if the ♣K is offside, you can't lose more than 3 "fast" tricks, and you will be "back in" in time to draw a second round of trumps, cash the 3 top ♦, and ruff your 4th ♦ if necessary. My assessment is that this combined line has a likelihood of success calculated approximately as follows: 50% (the ♣A onside) + 35% (the likelihood of the ♦

splitting 3-3) + a few more percent (the likelihood of the defender with 4 ♦ also having fewer than 3 trumps...a combined total of probably well over 90%.

Did you notice yet another line? A dummy reversal is possible as well, as you can arrange to ruff three ♥ in your hand, and then draw trumps with the board. My intuition tells me that this line is inferior, as it fails if you do not get a 3-2 trump split...which happens roughly 35% of the time, making the success of this approach less than 65%. It also has some additional risk associated with a second- or third-round ♥ overruff.

Letters to the Editor (send email to markoettinger@gmail.com)

Hello Mark, Ingi and Dick:

What a brilliant job! It will really be something if you can sustain that level of effort over time.

As for the singleton K question, I believe playing the A would increase your chances by about 6.25%. The probability of a 3-1 split is just south of 50%, so let's call it 50%. The probability that the K (one of 4 possible singletons) is singleton is about 12.5%. If you decided to take the the heart finesse, the singleton K would pop up instantly, so you really gain just when it's off side, about 6.25% of the time.

Regards to all,

Hurricane Survivor Frank (Hacker)

* * * * *

Mary Ann Young asked for a clarification of the auction on the Honors Bridge Club hand from New York City.

These were the hands:

♠63
♥AJT542
♦8
♣AQ74

♠AJT94
♥Q96
♦AQ9
K9

This was the auction:

S	N
1N	2♦
2♥	3♣
3♥	4♣
4♦	4♥
4♠	4N
5♠	6♥

And here's what the bids were intended to convey:

1N = 15-17

2♦ = Jacoby Transfer (5+ ♥)

2♥ = Accepting the transfer to ♥

3♣ = Second suit (♣); forcing to game

3♥ = 3+ ♥; accepting ♥ as trump; more positive than bidding 4♥ directly

4♣ = Cue bid, showing the ♣A

- 4♦ = Cue bid, showing the ♦A
- 4♥ = Willing to play in 4♥
- 4♠ = Cue bid, showing the ♠A
- 4N = Roman Key Card Blackwood
- 5♠ = 2 "key cards" and the ♥Q (trumps) (Note: "key cards" are the 4 Aces and the ♥K)
- 6♥ = Setting the final contract

Upcoming Unit and Nearby Events

President's Cup
Williston, VT (Burlington Bridge Club)
May 13, 2018 (Mother's Day?)

Vermont Spring Sectional
Manchester VT (Eagles Club)
May 25, 26 & 27, 2018

Vermont Sectional
Williston, VT (Burlington Bridge Club)
July 14, 15 & 16, 2018 (3rd weekend???)

Vermont Sectional
Williston, VT (Burlington Bridge Club)
September 14, 15 & 16, 2018

Vermont Sectional
White River Junction, VT (Wilson Hotel)
October 26, 27 & 28, 2018

Vermont and Nearby Clubs

Lyndonville Bridge Club

70 Depot Street
Colby Library
Lyndonville, Vermont 05851
Jeanie Clermont; (802) 684-2156
Saturday, 1:00 p.m.; semi-monthly; stratified

Manchester and Mountains DBC

3624 Main Street
Multi-Purpose Room
Manchester Village, Vermont 05254
Bob Smith; (802) 362-4224
Pat Homes; pathomes@comcast.net
Monday; 12:15 (12:30?) p.m.; June, July, August, September, October; stratified
Friday; 12:15 (12:30?) p.m.; open; stratified
Website: www.bridgewebs.com/manchestermountains/

Manchester Equinox Village Open

49 Maple Street
Manchester, Vermont 05254
Elizabeth VonRiesenfelder; (802) 362-5304
Tuesday; 1:00 p.m.; 0-200 MPs
Tuesday; 1:00 p.m.; open, stratified
Sunday; 2:00 p.m.; February, March; open; stratified
Multiple sites; call first; reservations requested

Taconic Card Club

2282 Depot Street
Manchester, Vermont 05255
Kim Likakis; (802) 379-1867
Thursday; 12:45 p.m.; open; reservations requested

Apollo Bridge Club

115 Main Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602
Wayne Hersey; (802) 223-3922

Friday; 6:30 p.m.; open

Newport Club

84 Fyfe Street

Newport Center, Vermont 05855

Eric McCann; (802) 988-4773

Wednesday; 1:00 p.m.; exc. Jan, May, Oct, Nov, Dec; open; stratified

Barton Bridge Club

34 School Street

Orleans, Vermont 05860

Linda Aiken; (802) 525-4617

Monday; 12:30 p.m.; open; stratified

Rutland Duplicate Bridge Club

66 South Main Street

Christ the King Church

Rutland, Vermont 05701

Raymond Lopes; (802) 779-2538

Monday, 12:00 Noon; open; stratified

Tuesday; 6:00 p.m.; open; stratified

Thursday; 6:30 p.m.; open; stratified

Multiple sites - call first

St. Albans DBC

75 Messenger Street

St. Albans, Vermont 05478

Marsha Anstey; (802) 524-3653

Monday; 7:00 p.m.; open

Burlington Bridge Club

600 Blair Park Road

Williston, Vermont 05495

Phil Sharpsteen; (802) 999-7767

Monday; 6:30 p.m.; 0-500 MPs; stratified
Tuesday; 7:00 p.m.; open; stratified
Wednesday; 9:15 a.m.; open; stratified
Wednesday; 1:30 p.m. 0-20 MPs; strat'd; *may resume Fall; pre-reg. & part. req'd*
Friday; 9:15 a.m.; open; stratified
Sunday; 1PM; open; semi-mo. exc. May, June, July, Aug; strat.; *call/check web*
Website: www.bridgewebs.com/burlingtonacademy/

Norwich DBC

43 Lebanon Street
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Michael Morris; (401) 215-4135
Tuesday; 6:30 p.m.; open; stratified

Eastman Bridge Club

57 Hanover Street
Knights of Columbus Hall
Lebanon, New Hampshire 03766
Jane Verdrager; (603) 865-5508
Tuesday; 1:00 p.m.; open; stratified; singles welcome/partner guar'd (Tues only)
Wednesday; 1:00 p.m.; open; stratified (partner not guaranteed for singles)
Friday; 1:00 p.m.; open; stratified (partner not guaranteed for singles)

Keene DBC

Elks Lodge
81 Roxbury Street
Keene, New Hampshire 03431
Anne McCune; (603) 352-2751
Monday; 12:00 Noon; open; stratified (partner available)
Thursday; 12:00 Noon; open; stratified (no partner guaranteed)

Ticonderoga (New York) DBC

109 Champlain Avenue
Ticonderoga, New York 12883
Michael Rogers; (518) 585-3322
Monday; 12:30 p.m.; open; stratified; reservations requested

Thursday; 12:30 p.m.; open; stratified; reservations requested

Plattsburgh (New York) DBC

5139 North Catherine Street
Plattsburgh, New York 12901
George Cantin; (518) 563-6639
Tuesday; 6:45 p.m.; open; handicap
Thursday; 6:45 p.m.; open
Friday; 12:30 p.m.; open

Useful & Fun Links

ACBL	www.acbl.org
District 25	www.nebridge.org
Unit 175	www.vermontbridge.org
Bridge Base Online	www.bridgebase.com
OKBridge	www.okbridge.com
Bridge Guys	www.bridgeguys.com
Pattaya Bridge Club	www.pattayabridge.com
Larry Cohen	www.larryco.com
Mike Lawrence	https://michaelslawrence.com/
Marty Bergen	www.martybergen.com
Baron Barclay Bridge Supply	www.baronbarclay.com
Michael's Bridge Sanctuary	www.mapiano.com/bridge.htm
Power Rankings	www.coloradospringsbridge.com/PR_FILES/PR.HTM

+++++