

TABLE TALK

A publication of the Vermont Bridge Association
Editor: Frank Hacker

September 2008
email: frhac@charter.net



Jane Grewcock, Karen Haines, Jennifer Feltes and Debbie Crisfield have attended the Vermont Spring Sectional for several years AND

They live in New Jersey. See their story below

In May of 2004, all it took was five master points (and the exciting new designation of ACBL Junior Master) to launch four Jersey girls on a road trip to Killington for the Vermont Spring Sectional. Giddy from a third place finish in a novice event at a NJ sectional (and happy to take advantage of a free condo), Jane, Jennifer, Karen, and Debbie left behind four husbands and eight children for a fun weekend of bridge, wine, and spa treatments. They had no inkling of the challenges and memories that awaited them.

It doesn't take an advanced degree in geography to realize that NJ is more densely populated than Vermont, but that concept had never been tied directly to bridge before. When the four women were told there would be no novice event due to lack of novices, they were flabbergasted—a NJ sectional usually drew two sections of novices. In Vermont, they were going to be thrown in with the sharks. “Not to worry,” said directors Dave and Jim. “It’s the best way to learn.” 100% true, but Dave and Jim got a little lesson as well, finding out that what’s good for the goose is not necessarily good for the gander, as they essentially had to follow the four women around the room. But Karen learned she couldn’t pause to think for three minutes. Jane was taught that she couldn’t pull a variety of cards out of the box before deciding on her bid. Debbie found out she had to say “could be short” with only two clubs. And Jennifer learned she wasn’t supposed to make small talk when she was the dummy.

It was a humbling experience, but the Vermonters couldn't have been nicer or more supportive. At every table, the players were helpful, friendly, and excessively complimentary (especially the one who asked what college the women were from), and despite horrifyingly awful performances, the four women were determined to return the next year (the wine and spa part helped, too).

And so, the tradition was started. 2005 was a vast improvement, and in 2006, there was a novice (four tables!) Swiss Team event that gave the fearsome foursome their first victory and a Vermont Bridge Champion mug—a treasured memento. The Jersey girls were officially hooked on Vermont bridge!

Five years have passed, and now that they're all in their forties, no one will ever again mistake them for college students, and many wonderful traditions have been born—Dove chocolates, the Angel of Failure, and team t-shirts—but the Jersey girls know that that it's the welcoming smiles and familiar faces of all the wonderful Vermonters that every year draw them northward for their favorite weekend in May.

Vermont On The Tournament Trail

Many Vermonters have done well (10 points or more) recently at the Las Vegas Nationals and at a number of regionals.

Here is a list of recent Vermont successes

<u>Las Vegas Nationals:</u>	Don Sondergeld	66.53	James Gordon	21.74
	Mary Savko	41.93	Courtney Nelson	14.82
	Ellie Hanlon	41.93	Jean Seward	12.71
	Andy Avery	28.93		
<u>Sturbridge:</u>	Don Sondergeld	18.17	Bryant Jones	11.81
	Bonnie Clouser	11.81		
<u>Halifax:</u>	James Gordon	45.47	Frank Hacker	23.26
	Ellie Hanlon	24.80	Mary Savko	23.26
<u>Montreal:</u>	Ellie Hanlon	117.30	Don Sondergeld	22.41
	Mary Savko	117.30		
<u>Nashua:</u>	Mary Savko	61.88	J. Peter Tripp	11.08
	Ellie Hanlon	61.88	Pierce Smith	11.07
	Phil Sharpsteen	56.41	June Dorion	10.60
	Frank Hacker	56.41	Wayne Hersey	10.60
	Penny Lane	11.08		

TOURNAMENT ATTENDANCE

by Phil Sharpsteen

With regard to tournaments, we've had a turbulent time in 2008. Cortina Inn barely opened in time for our May tournament and then went out of business a few weeks before our July tournament. The Holiday Inn in Rutland stepped up and did a great job for us on very short notice and it appears we'll be using that facility for two tournaments next year.

One of the effects of all this has been a drop in attendance at both the May and July tournaments. It's always hard to understand the ebbs and flows of tournament attendance. When there's a competing tournament (as there was in July – Schenectady) or a regional or national tournament in the immediate past or future, bridge players plan their attendance at our sectionals accordingly. But I wonder if some players didn't come out because of the health scare at Cortina (Legionnaires' disease), the location change or just because of the upheaval.

Our Vermont Fall Sectional is coming up and will be held at a new site. We'll be playing in Castleton and staying at The Edgewater properties/Trak In located in Bomoseen. These are each attractive and well established operations three miles apart and the combination will provide us with a good tournament. But...

We need you to come out and support the tournament. Please put together your partners and teams, make car pooling arrangements and encourage others to attend. I ask club managers to encourage their club players and especially their newer (beginner) players to come out to support the separate events arranged just for them.

As the crow flies, the tournament location is 13 miles west of Rutland. See Dave's article about the tournament for directions. A road map of the Castleton/Bomoseen area with directions is available at the Burlington Club.

I hope to see you there!

WHAT WOULD YOU BID

In fourth seat you hold, S AKQJ109xxxx H void D Ax C x. Neither side is vulnerable. The auction is 1D --- 4H --- Pass to you. Now what. Partner has bid 4H, the suit of your void. Can he cover either of your losers after a 1D opening bid by the opponents. Should you gamble 6 spades or be content to play the hand of a lifetime at the 4 level? It turns out 6 spades is a winner as partner holds S void H QJ1098754 D K652 C 7.

You will make 6 if the opponents take their club trick on opening lead. Otherwise you make 7, since the opening bidder has 5 diamonds and the AK of hearts and can't protect both suits when you avalanche him in spades.

NEW ENGLAND BRIDGE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

by Wayne Hersey

The Vermont Bridge Association (Unit 175) is one of 8 units in New England that comprise District 25. Each of the New England States, with the exception of Massachusetts, is represented by one unit. Massachusetts holds the distinction of being represented by three units: the Eastern MA Bridge Association (EMBA); the Central MA Bridge Association (CMBA); the Western MA Bridge Association (WMBA).

District 25, together with 24 other districts nationwide, comprise the American Contract Bridge League (ACBL). The Board of Directors, consisting of representatives from each of the 25 districts, provide oversight for ACBL activities. Richard DeMartino from the Connecticut Unit represents District 25 on the ACBL Board.

District 25 is managed by an executive committee consisting of elected officers of the district, together with representatives from each of the units. Our representative is VBA president, Phil Sharpsteen.

In addition to the executive committee, each of the units appoints delegates who assemble at least twice a year at regional tournaments to discuss bridge matters. This delegate group also provides guidance to the district's ACBL Board representatives on issues brought before the Board. The three delegates from our unit are Frank Hacker, Phil Sharpsteen and Wayne Hersey. If you would like to serve the VBA as a delegate, please inform our president, Phil Sharpsteen.

Several committees have been formed at the District level to address various issues that arise during the year in the New England Bridge "World." These committees include

By Laws	Audit
Charity	Legal
Educational Coordinator	Scheduling
Disciplinary	KO seeding
Appeals	Strategic Planning
Nomination	

Although membership on these committees has been established for the current year, if you would like to serve on any of these committees in the future, please inform Phil Sharpsteen.

PARTNERSHIP EMPATHY

by Frank Hacker

I view good bridge to be in large part the solution of a succession of logical problems. The cards themselves supply needed data, but so do partner's and opponents' actions.

I particularly enjoy playing with good partners, because it is possible to draw logical inferences from their bids and plays. With weak or inexperienced partners, one tends to lose this part of the game, unless, of course, one is a true genius who can figure out what irrational thing partner has done and why he has done it. Here are two problems for you.

I shall, in each case, provide the entire hand up front, but ask that, in each case, as you try to solve the problem, you cover up the hands that should be hidden.

1.

		S	6		
		H	J942		
		D	AKQ74		
		C	Q103		
S	KQ98742			S	A5
J	7			H	A8653
D	6			D	953
C	J972			C	864
		S	J103		
		H	KQ10		
		D	J1082		
		C	AK5		

South was the dealer. The auction was

South	West	North	East
1D	3S	D	P
4D	P	5D	all pass

North's double was negative. Clearly, South bid 4D over this, because there were no other palatable choices. Put yourselves in East's position. Partner leads the 7 of hearts. You win the ace, and declarer follows with the **queen**. You cash the spade ace, on which partner plays his 2. What now?

2.

		S	7		
		H	AQ74		
		D	83		
		C	AQ9763		
S	K1062			S	AJ983
H	863			H	J95
D	Q1064			D	J92
C	54			C	J2
		S	Q65		
		H	K102		
		D	AK75		
		C	K108		

You are playing against a strong pair using a complicated relay system. The English translation of this is that no way are you going to figure out what they have from their bidding.

North was the dealer. The auction was

<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>
2C	P	2D	P
2H	P	3N	all pass

The opponents tell you that North has clubs and hearts and that South's bids didn't reveal much about his hand. You lead the 2 of spades. Partner wins the ace and returns the 8. Declarer plays the Q to your K and you are back on lead. What now?

Both solutions are obvious looking at all 4 hands, but neither was obvious at the table.

Hand 1. East decided that, on the bidding, partner was unlikely to have a trump and that partner's 2 of spades asked for a club return. Declarer now wrapped up 5 diamonds. West should have played a higher spade. East's position, however, doesn't make a lot of sense.

Why would partner lead a heart except to get a ruff? He must have a trump. I suppose it's possible that partner has three hearts to the king. Why would lead a heart from three to the king instead of his own spade suit? Even if his spade suit were not that strong, he would probably lead that suit instead of a heart from three to the king in an auction where one of the opponents has made a negative double showing hearts. Most telling, however, is the fact that, even if partner has a club trick, he will eventually get it whether you lead a club now or not. The club trick, if you have one, is not going away.

Hand 2. West couldn't read the 8 of spades. If it were an honest card and declarer's 5 of spades were not a false card, the 8 could be from A83 or from AJ983. Either declarer has five spades or partner does. West decided that it was possible for partner to have both minor suit kings. That would probably require declarer to have all of partner's annoying jacks. In any event, partner switched to a diamond with disastrous effect.

Partner should know to continue spades. This is a very interesting inferential problem. West may not know whether declarer has three or five spades, but East knows. Not only that, but West knows that East knows. If declarer had the five spades, East would probably have switched to a diamond. After all, dummy only has two small diamonds. A diamond shift would look very attractive. While there are never any ironclad guarantees, East's spade continuation says to continue spades. By the way, one might argue that East might have returned something other than the 8. Every other card, however, has the potential to mislead partner in some way. I have found that playing normal cards and hoping for partner to figure it out somehow, is generally better than trying to be a master mind.

2009 SECTIONAL TOURNAMENT LOCATIONS

By Dave Shaw

We sent out a Request for Proposal to ten resort properties, a VFW hall and a large exposition location. Most responded and many of those have expressed great interest in hosting one or more of our tournaments. Each proposal was thoroughly considered for amenities, location, room and meals pricing, playing space pricing, parking and other items. Lots of resorts want our business in May and October as these are weak business weekends for them. None want our business in July 2009 when their business is booming, mostly with weddings. However, the Holiday Inn – Rutland has agreed to our 2010 July tournament.

While the Vermont Bridge Association Board has not given its blessing, members of the executive committee have and the tentative 2009 schedule is as follows:

April 3 thru 5, 2009	Burlington Academy of Bridge
May 22 thru 24, 2009	Holiday Inn – Rutland
July 10 thru 12, 2009	to be determined
Oct 30 thru Nov 1, 2009	Holiday Inn – Rutland

The Holiday Inn – Rutland has it all: a large, well lighted, modern, carpeted playing area; a very good restaurant; nice rooms which will be upgraded* in 2009 and 2010; a central location; and a very attentive and interested conference staff. Ted Bridges, a former manager of the Cortina Inn for several decades, knows our needs and actively solicited our business. The rate package Ted and Caryn Casey-Hurka have put together is attractive to the VBA and to you as attendees. The single greatest determining factor was location. Rutland is more central for our Vermont players and attractive to NY, NH and MA players who are loyal supporters of our tournaments.

The July 2008 tournament was held at the Holiday Inn – Rutland with very favorable comments from those in attendance. **EDITORIAL COMMENT:** The playing space may have been the nicest we have ever had.

* New bathrooms, new bedding and flat screen TVs for every room

DIRECTOR (Please)

by Jim Thomas

No law creates more havoc and misunderstanding than Law 16 concerning unauthorized information. Most players are upset when this law is enforced, as they are unaware that they have acted on unauthorized information.

The law defines unauthorized information as extraneous information from partner. “After a player makes available to partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or a play, as by means

of a remark, a question, or by unmistakable hesitation, unwonted speed, special emphasis, tone, gesture, movement, mannerism or the like,” the partner may not choose from among logical alternative actions, one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information. The most common actions at the table are: failure to alert, hesitations, fingering the bidding box before deciding what to bid (and changing one’s mind after starting to pull a bid) and misinformation. Misinformation includes wrong explanations (weak 2 or Flannery), wrong system (DONT vs. Cappelletti vs. Brozel), Roman Key Card Blackwood explanations, whether 4C is Gerber or not.

A common example is partner’s response to an opening 1NT after interference bidding. A point of contention is whether or not systems are on. So, if the auction is 1NT -2C- 2H, the 2H bidder is required to bid as if he does not hear partner’s explanation of his 2H bid. Some players consider the 2H bid to be a transfer to spades, others play the bid as natural. If partner bids over 2H, you must bid as if he bid correctly. This means, if 2H was natural and partner bids 2S after announcing transfers, you may not bid 3H unless you have a hand that clearly supports that bid.

In complicated auctions, when partner fails to alert your bid (such as Jordan 2NT), you are required to alert his response as if he had alerted your bid. There are two possibilities when partner fails to alert. One is that he forgot what system you are playing. The other is that he remembered the system and bid correctly, but simply forgot the alert. Because of the second possibility, you should alert partner’s response (if it is alertable) just as if he had alerted your bid. The argument is often advanced that your alert may “wake up partner.” In Jordan, partner is supposed to bid shortness and your failure to alert partner’s response may injure the opponents who might logically conclude that partner is bidding a real suit. YOUR failure to alert may require an adjusted score, while partner’s failure to alert is not damaging to the opponents.

The partner may not choose from among logical alternative actions one that could demonstrably have been suggested by extraneous information. In high level auctions, players have to decide whether to pass, double or sacrifice.

There was a ruling in Vermont involving me as a player. My partner said, “Oh, what the h....” as he doubled. I wanted to sacrifice at the 6 level (long suit – no defense). We played 6, but on appeal the bid was withdrawn and the score was adjusted back to their doubled contract.

A call or play may be withdrawn, and another substituted, either by the non-offending side after an opponent’s infraction or by the offending side to rectify an infraction. For the non-offending side, all information arising from a withdrawn action is authorized, whether the action is its own or the opponents’. For the offending side, information arising from its own withdrawn action and withdrawn actions of the non-offending side is unauthorized. A player on the offending side may not choose from among logical alternative actions one that could demonstrably been suggested over another by the unauthorized information. As you can see, the correction of unauthorized information may actually lead to more unauthorized information.

The best way to avoid unauthorized information is to keep conversation during auction and play to a minimum, have your convention card completely filled out, know your systems including what is alertable, and play with a poker face. It is **NOT** permissible to show either satisfaction or displeasure with your partner’s bids or plays.

I hope this sheds some light on what can be a very complicated situation. If you have any questions, please email me at mftjet@aol.com.

Editor: Phil Sharpsteen provides us with a recent situation relating to unauthorized information.

ACTIVE ETHICS

by Phil Sharpsteen

Active ethics is an important concept to understand in the game of bridge. It includes ‘bending over backwards’ to avoid benefiting from unauthorized information. During the bidding, this would apply to out-of-tempo actions by either opponent or partner. Bridge is a game that requires thought and this is allowed, but partner cannot take inference that you may have had a problem and try to gain from that information. Sometimes an inadvertent action by partner creates an ‘active ethics’ situation.

At the recent Nashua regional, I held a limit raise in clubs with a 4 card major. My partner opened 1 club. So I naturally constructed the auction I would pursue - bid the 4 card major followed by an invitational jump in clubs. What I failed to take notice of when it came time for me to stop/skip bid to 3 clubs is that RHO had just bid 2 diamonds!

Now my careless skip bid had conveyed unauthorized information. Had I seen the 2D bid and now bid 3C, this would show a willingness to compete to 3C. The skip bid information conveyed a better hand to partner, information he was not allowed to benefit from. Since partner had a very good club opener with a six card club suit, he could have bid at least 5C and perhaps looked for slam. He had to assume, however, that I had just bid 3C competitively, so he raised to 4C. I now had to avoid taking advantage of the situation I had created and although I had somewhat more than a competitive raise showed, I now passed.

When dummy came down, partner remarked, “This is embarrassing!” We were off one side suit loser and had to pick up the clubs missing king and one for six! Partner made the anti percentage play of finessing for the club king since we weren’t in six and we scored up our vulnerable +170! Well, in this case, virtue was rewarded. Our opponents were in 6C at the other table and made the percentage play to drop the club king for –100. We won imps on the board and also the match!

So remember, even though it is impossible to always bid like a robot, when you do pause for thought, you may place partner in an awkward position where active ethics may be involved. It also helps to double check that RHO put that green pass card out there and not assume it without looking!

EDITORS NOTE: Here are 2 articles from Mike Farrell. The intended audience is newer players. More experienced players may benefit as well. Mike is a great teacher. I always learn something when I read his material.

QUANTITATIVE RAISES OF NO TRUMP BIDS

by Mike Farrell

If partner opens the bidding with 1 No Trump we have learned several methods for responding. The methods that you may have learned about include Transfers, Stayman and Gerber. These devices may also apply if partner opens with 2 No Trump. Even after a strong artificial 2 Club opener followed by a 2 Diamond response and either a 2 or 3 No

Trump rebid, Transfers, Stayman and Gerber are all viable actions as responder's hand demands.

So what exactly are Quantitative Raises of No Trump bids?

You already know two of them. If partner opens the bidding with 1 No Trump and responder has 11 to 15 HCP and no 4-card major suit, responder bids 3 No Trump. If instead responder holds 9 or 10 HCP and no 4-card major suit, he would bid 2 No Trump. (If responder holds one or both 4-card major suits, he would use 2 Clubs Stayman first; then, if no major suit fit is found he would rebid as above.) You see that a Quantitative Raise of No Trump is simply a matter of adding your HCP to partner's HCP range, knowing how many HCP the partnership needs for game or slam, and deciding how much you should bid.

In No Trump 26 HCP usually produces game; 33 HCP usually produces a small slam and 37 HCP will usually produce a grand slam.

The following is a chart of Quantitative Raises:

PARTNER OPENS 1 NO TRUMP (15-17). RESPONDER BIDS:

2NT = 9-10 HCP. If opener has a good 16 or any 17, he bids game.

3NT = 11-15 HCP. Opener passes.

4NT = 16-17 HCP. Opener bids 6NT with a good 16 or any 17 HCP, and passes with the minimum 15. (This is why Gerber was devised. It frees the 4 NT bid.)

5NT = 20 – 21 HCP. This is forcing to slam. Opener bids 6NT with the minimum and 7NT with a good 16 and any 17 HCP.

6NT = 18 – 19 HCP. This bid is passed by opener.

7NT = 22 and more HCP, and obviously is to play.

If your partnership is playing 16 – 18 One no Trump openings, you should subtract one (1) HCP from each set of responder hands and add one (1) HCP to each holding by opener.

These methods will also work over a 2 No Trump opener by changing the responder sets.

PARTNER OPENS 2 NO TRUMP (20 – 22). RESPONDER BIDS:

3NT = 5 – 10 HCP. Opener passes.

4NT = 11 – 12 HCP. Opener bids 6NT with 21+ or any 22 HCP, and passes with the minimum 20.

5NT = 15 – 16 HCP. Opener bids 7NT with a maximum and bids 6NT with the minimum.

6NT = 13 – 14 HCP. Opener passes.

7NT = 17+ HCP. Opener passes.

Now, this looks like a lot of memorization work for hands that don't come up that frequently, but in reality all you need remember are the following:

Twenty-six (26) HCP will usually produce Game in No Trump.

Thirty-three (33) HCP will usually produce a Small Slam in No Trump.

Thirty-seven (37) HCP will usually produce a Grand Slam in No Trump.

You can do the math.

How many HCPs does partner's No Trump bid show?

Count your HCP, and add them to partner's HCP range. If you have a total that falls within the game range (26 – 32), bid game. If you have a total that falls within the small slam range (33 – 36), bid the small slam. If your total HCP are 37 or more, bid the grand slam. If you are not sure and need to know if partner has the Maximum or Minimum, then make the asking Quantitative Raise. I.e.,

1NT	2NT?	Asking
1NT	4NT?	Asking
1NT	5NT?	Asking
2NT	4NT?	Asking
2NT	5NT?	Asking

Some Suggestions:

- 1) Don't forget to use Stayman if you hold 4 cards in one or both Major Suits. Often 12 tricks are available in a suit contract but not in No Trump (due to ruffing values).
- 2) If you have a long suit and slamish range HCPs, use Four Clubs Gerber to check for Aces.
- 3) DO NOT PANIC about making these jumps IF your hand is in the slam range. REMEMBER "The One Who Knows.... Goes!"

BLACKWOOD HINTS

by Mike Farrell

Easley Blackwood created his convention “not to help partners get to slams; rather, to keep partnerships out of bad slams.” With this in mind, the following hints are offered to aid the less experienced player in knowing when NOT to use Blackwood.

If you can master these ideas you will have attained the “**DEANS List**” for Blackwood.

- D) DON’T** use Blackwood with a small **DOUBLETON** or three small cards in an unbid suit.
- E) ENOUGH** Aces in your hand to insure that no answer from partner can **EMBARRASS** you. For example, if Clubs are to be trump and you have only one (1) Ace: if you bid 4 No Trump, Blackwood, and partner responds 5 Diamonds showing (1) one Ace, you are already too high.
- A) AVOID** Blackwood with **A VOID**. If you use Blackwood with a void, *unless partner’s response* shows no Aces or all the missing Aces you will not know if his Ace(s) are in your void (bad ace) or in a suit that you have (good Ace).
- N) NUMBER** of Aces. Use Blackwood when you need to know the **NUMBER** of Aces NOT which Ace(s).
- A) STOP**. Do NOT use 5 No Trump to ask for Kings unless the partnership holds all four (4) Aces. ALL expert players **GUARANTEE THAT THE PARTNERSHIP HOLDS ALL THE ACES** whenever they ask for Kings. (The use of 5 No Trump commits the partnership to the slam, hence asking for Kings is normally a try for a Grand Slam. You probably shouldn’t be trying to contract for all thirteen tricks without all the Aces.)

These guidelines are equally applicable using Key Card or Roman Key Card Blackwood responses.

VERMONT FALL SECTIONAL

by Dave Shaw

Our Vermont Fall Sectional will be held at the American Legion Hall in Castleton, VT on October 24 to 26, 2008. Please refer to the tournament flyer elsewhere in this issue for details. Here are some highlights.

Jim Thomas lives in Bomoseen a few miles from the American Legion Hall where he is a member. He suggested the Hall for the playing space for our Fall tournament and further suggested the Edgewater properties along Lake Bomoseen as the place for lodging and

dining. The Hall is fairly new (young Jim is a charter member!) and provides very good playing space for our bridge games. It is located on route 4A about a half mile west of the junction of Routes 30 and 4A (not route 4 which is the limited access highway to Rutland). The distance between the Trak In and the Hall is about three miles.

The Edgewater properties include the Edgewater Resort, the Edgewater Inn, two Edgewater condominium buildings and the Trak In for dining. Please visit www.edgewatervermont.com for more details including pictures of the buildings along the water. I drove down to the Trak In in late August and had dinner. A huge salad bar was excellent and the menu was full of choices. The food was great. From Burlington, I took route 7 to 22A to 4 east to the route 30 exit. Go north about 2 miles. It took me 90 minutes.

Because there are very few lodging and dining businesses in the area, Jim asked the family that has run the Edgewater operation for the last 45 years to stay open an extra weekend for the bridge tournament crowd. Breakfast is 8:00 to 10:00 on Saturday and Sunday. A buffet style dinner will be served on both Friday and Saturday nights between sessions. As there are very few dining options, these buffets are a good choice and, as bridge players will be the only diners, it should be a fun time.

The Trak In has also agreed to provide a cold sandwich buffet on Sunday between sessions of the Swiss Teams.

As the Edgewater properties and the Trak In are staying open just for us, please patronize them. Thanks.

VERMONT SUMMER SECTIONAL RESULTS

**Rutland, VT
July 11-13, 2008**

Friday Afternoon Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C	Names	PCT
4.17	1			Melvin Marcus – Vincent Grande, Jr.	66.66
3.50	2	1		Edward Midgley – Laura Midgley	61.96
2.63	3			Ellie Hanlon – Mary Savko	60.86
1.97	4			Phil Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker	60.38
2.21	5	2		Gilda Katz – Samuel Silverman	59.64
1.17	6			Phyllis Bassen – Courtney Nelson	59.05
1.95		3	1	Roger Cooley – Anne Cooley	56.70
1.46		4	2	Stephen King – Susan King	54.16
1.10		5	3	Marilyn Dale – William Dale	52.94
0.70		6		Abraham Brown – Jean Brown	52.75
0.82			4	Wes Judd – Nancy Judd	51.52
0.62			5	Larry Rawls – Elizabeth VonRiesenfelder	49.26

Friday Evening Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C	Names	PCT
4.67	1			Gerald DiVincenzo – Michael Farrell	66.67
3.50	2			Melvin Marcus – Vincent Grande, Jr.	62.66
2.63	3			Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	61.22
2.95	4	1		Edward Midgley – Laura Midgley	60.58
1.48	5			June Dorion – Donald Campbell	59.29
2.21	6	2	1	Carl Langschmidt, Jr. – Sandra Langschmidt	58.01
1.66		3	2	Roger Cooley – Anne Cooley	56.57
1.24		4		Jane Harrington – Charles Harrington	54.49
1.10		5	3	John Newton – Sally Newton	51.92
0.72		6/7	4/5	Judith Ward – Linda Baker	50.80
0.74		6/7	4/5	Joe Burke – Mimi Burke	50.80

Saturday Afternoon Open Pairs

MP	A	B	C	Names	PCT
5.50	1			William Hunter – Murthy Ayyagari	64.41
4.13	2			Melvin Marcus – Vincent Grande, Jr.	62.66
3.09	3			Ellie Hanlon – Mary Savko	56.57
2.95	4	1	1	Larry Rawls – Elizabeth VonRiesenfelder	56.25
1.74	5			Kathleen Farrell – Patricia Di Vincenzo	56.09
1.31	6			Richard Saval – David Shaw	55.77
2.21		2	2	John Newton – Sally Newton	54.65
1.66		3	3	June Silverman – Ronald Silverman	54.33
1.24		4		Judie Muggia – Albert Muggia	53.37
0.93		5	4	Claire Gardner – Denise Olson	52.56
0.70		6		Alden Edwards – Jennifer Edwards	51.04
0.58			5	Donald Bly – Mary Squire	49.83

Saturday Afternoon 299er Pairs

MP	A	B	Names	PCT
1.41	1	1	Thomas Holmes – Zander Ponzo	66.67
1.06	2	2	Barbara Romanoff – Kay Fay	59.03
0.79	3	3	Barbara Varney – Linda Seright	50.69

Saturday Evening Flight B/C/D Pairs

MP	B	C	D	Names	PCT
2.68	1	1		Stephen King – Susan King	69.69
2.01	2			Alden Edwards – Jean-Guy Beliveau	62.25
1.51	3			Charles Harrington – Jane Harrington	61.00
1.13	4			Judie Muggia – Albert Muggia	59.11

0.85	5			David Miller – James Thomas	58.06
1.31	6	2	1	Mark Adair – Vivienne Adair	56.13
0.98		3	2	Judith Ward – Linda Baker	50.00
0.68		4		Ronald Silverman – June Silverman	43.88

Saturday Evening Flight A Pairs

MP				Names	PCT
4.17	1			Frank Hacker – Phil Sharpsteen	56.48
3.13	2			Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	55.09
2.35	3			Pierce Smith – Stewart Mackeigan	54.17
1.76	4			Ann Gordon – Judith Hofbauer	51.39

Sunday Open Swiss Teams

MP	A	B	C	Names	SCORE
7.25	1			Mary Savko – Ellie Hanlon	
				Melvin Marcus – Vincent Grande, Jr.	127
5.44	2			Fred Donald, Jr. – Rudolph Polli	
				Phil Sharpsteen – Frank Hacker	110
4.08	3			Gerald DiVincenzo – Michael Farrell	
				Kathleen Farrell – Patricia DiVincenzo	96
3.06	4			David Rock – Bruce Downing	
				Wayne Burt – Sonja Smith	95
2.42	5			Richard Saval – Judith Donald	
				Judith Hofbauer – Ann Gordon	93
2.07	6			Wayne Hersey – Bryant Jones	
				June Dorion – Donald Campbell	91
4.02		1		Helene Miron – Michael Miron	
				Leonor Fleishman – Leonard Fleishman	87
2.64		2/3		Claire Gardner – Denise Olson	
				Agnes Kurtz – Thomas Kurtz	77
2.64		2/3		Paul Reardon – Linda Bouyea	
				Mary Tierney – Bonnie Clouser	77
2.27		4	1	Scott Perry – Arthur Aiken	
				Robin Kerr – Jeannie Clermont	75

Marilyn Hacker Memorial Pairs

The ninth annual Marilyn Hacker Memorial Pairs took place on Saturday, August 2 at the Burlington Bridge Academy in South Burlington, VT. The format was 2 sessions of bridge with the customary Bove's Restaurant lasagna dinner between sessions. Your Table Talk editor would like to thank the owners of the Burlington Bridge Academy, as well as several friends who made dynamite desserts, for their efforts in making this day as festive as possible. There were 13 tables for bridge. The winners were

MP	A	B	C	Names	
4.89	1			Gerald DiVincenzo – Michael Farrell	398.00
3.67	2			Judith Donald – Fred Donald, Jr.	375.00
2.75	3			Thomas Smith – Frank Hacker	364.58
2.06	4			Patricia DiVincenzo – Kathleen Farrell	360.50
3.63	5	1		Penny Lane – Peter Tripp	354.54
1.40	6			June Dorion – Wayne Hersey	343.21
2.72		2		Ruth Stokes – Jay Friedenson	311.50
2.04		3		Bonnie Clouser – Patricia Nestork	310.08
1.53		4		Rudolph Polli – James Thomas	309.00
1.21		5		Jackie Kimel – David Shaw	304.00
2.10			1	Richard Clark – Gordon Johnson	282.50
1.58			2	John Newton – Sally Newton	272.75
1.18			3	June Silverman – Ronald Silverman	265.38

Vermonters On The Way Up

Congratulations to the following VBA members who have achieved new ranks in the master point hierarchy. Well done!!

Junior Master:

Barbara Buchanan	Dennis Little	George Long
Elizabeth Perrott	Stephen Spalding	Robert Sullivan

Club Master:

Dulany Bennett	Theodore Brophy	Lee Corbett
Margaret Farriss	Lucille Leary	Joseph Morein
Marilyn Rice	Barry Rowles	Martha St. Onge
Anne Symmers		

Sectional Master:

William Beadle	Sallie Brophy	Edward Buttolph
Robin Cocking	Michael Furlong	Nancy Furlong
Zander Ponzo		

Regional Master:

Thomas Holmes	Douglas Wacek
---------------	---------------

NABC Master

John Conova
Sally Newton

Bertrand Nadeau

John Newton

Life Master

C Kirk Osterland

Bronze Life Master:

Ronald Silverman

Gold Life Master:

Courtney Nelson

J. Peter Tripp

Diamond Life Master

James Gordon

Frank Hacker

Tiernan Trophy Race

Every year the Vermont Bridge Association awards the Tiernan trophy to the VBA member who accumulates the most master points in the 4 Vermont sectional tournaments. After 3 tournaments, we have 1 tournament to go. The winners from the last 2 years are in the lead again, with Jerry DiVincenzo holding a very slim lead. An attaboy to Mike Farrell who is 3rd on the list despite having participated in only 2 of the 3 tournaments. Here are the top 10. Apologies to anyone I inadvertently omitted.

1.	Jerry DiVincenzo	33.55	6.	Wayne Hersey	21.84
2.	Phil Sharpsteen	33.21	7.	Pierce Smith	21.38
3.	Mike Farrell	25.87	8.	John Newton	19.72
4.	Frank Hacker	23.75	8.	Sally Newton	19.72
5.	June Dorion	23.07	10.	Paul Reardon	17.86

Scott Aborn Trophy Race

Every year the Vermont Bridge Association awards the Scott Aborn trophy to the VBA member who starts the year as a non-life master and who accumulates the most master points in the 4 Vermont sectional tournaments. After 3 tournaments, we have 1

Dec 6 Perrin Pairs, 10:30 AM (food at 10)/Burlington Bridge Academy/\$25per person

2008 VERMONT FALL SECTIONAL

October 24, 25, 26, 2008

American Legion Hall, Rte 4A, Castleton, VT

Sanction: S0810146

Friday Oct. 24th

**1:30PM Open Pairs, Stratified
Newcomer Pairs, Stratified**
**7:30PM Open Pairs, Stratified
Newcomer Pairs, Stratified
1st Session K-O Teams**

Saturday Oct. 25th

**9:30AM K-O Teams , Semi Finals
Open Pairs, Stratified**
**1:00PM Open Pairs, Stratified
Newcomer Pairs, Stratified
K-O Teams, Finals**
**7:00PM Open Pairs, Stratiflighted
A: (separate event) 0 to infinity Flight X: 0 to 3000 if entries permit
B: 750 to 1500
C: 300 to 750
D: 0 to 300**

Sunday Oct. 26th

**10:30AM 1st Session Open Swiss Teams, Stratified
0 to 300 Swiss Teams, 1 session**
~3:30PM 2nd Session Open Swiss Teams, Stratified

**Open Stratifications: A: 1500+ B: 500 to 1500 C: 0 to 500
Newcomer Stratifications: A: 50 to 100 B: 20 to 50 C: 0 to 20
(Stratifications may be adjusted by Director based on attendance.)**

**Price per session: \$8, \$1 additional for Unpaid or Non-ACBL members
Director: Dave Marshall
Partnerships and information: Jackie Kimel (802) 864-4321**

For lodging, we recommend Trak Inn at 2551 Rte 30N, Bomoseen, VT 05732. For reservations call 802-468-5251. They will have double rooms available at about \$60 per night and 2 bedroom condos for about \$100 per night. Their website is www.edgewatervermont.com.

Trak Inn will provide hot buffets with carved items and a large salad bar for \$16 on both Friday and Saturday night. Breakfast will be available at an additional charge on both Saturday and Sunday mornings,

IMPORTANT: Sometime during the 2:00PM to 3:30PM period on Sunday, there will be a short break between rounds of the Swiss Teams. Trak Inn will provide a between session cold buffet at the American Legion Hall for \$10.

A publication of the Vermont Bridge Association

Frank A. Hacker, Editor

310 Tremont St.

Barre, VT 05641

The Vermont Bridge Association, Unit 175 of the American Contract Bridge League publishes Table Talk quarterly. If you are an ACBL and Unit 175 (Vermont) member And have not received a copy of Table Talk, please notify the editor. Contributors' articles do not necessarily reflect the views of the VBA.

